

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.10 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 556 Wellington Street

- Councillor Cassidy: so Mr. Yeoman I wonder if you could, you know, and that sort of everybody has sort of talked around this so I wonder if you could just explain clearly why we're not talking about rezoning why there isn't a rezoning or Official Plan Amendment application before us tonight.
- Paul Yeoman, Director, Development Services: Thank you Madam Chair. So the proposal that's before you tonight for the site plan, public site plan meeting, is consistent with the zoning that's provided and so we're looking right now to refine the site plan related matters that are contained in the Site Plan Control By-law so the zoning is in place for it and so it's the other matters that are under consideration tonight.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Yeoman. I wonder if that's it or if Ms. Dent is also going to weigh in here or should we just we go straight to the public now? Okay the silence is giving me the answer I need so I will go to the committee rooms and I understand there are a number of people that are here for this matter so just let the clerks in the room know that you would like to speak and make your way to the microphone and you'll have five minutes please provide your name and you'll have five minutes to address the Committee. Go ahead.
- Mary Anne Hodge: I'm a resident on Wolfe Street and also a member of the Friends of Victoria Park. There are many competing pressures in the world today and as you all know I am deeply concerned about the climate emergency and increasing density in the core is important to that issue but I don't support density at any cost. I understand that this proposal or this meeting is the last tick the last of approval that they need for this development to proceed and I'm very concerned about the heritage aspect of this proposal you can see in the few remaining heritage homes on Wellington Street that the grandeur has already been lost due to zoning changes that happened before the West Woodfield Conservation Plan was established. So I ask myself what is the purpose of a heritage conservation designation and so to get answers I read the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation Plan which this property is located in and this Plan says that its purpose is to offer long term protection to areas that have important or identifiable historic and architectural resources and I think we would all agree that the Victoria Park in the surrounding neighbourhood are important reminders of London's expansion in the mid-1800s when the civic and industrial leaders of London created this Park and built their mansions around it. Generally it is the streetscape that is the focus of a Heritage Conservation District and that is also true in the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation Plan as the Plan so eloquently articulates street trees on boulevards are often linking elements extending like ribbons throughout the neighborhood to tie it all together. So streetscapes recognize that a building is intimately connected to its site and to its neighbors and an individual building is perceived as part of a group and requires all the neighbourhood all the all of its neighbors to conform to create the full effect so this Plan emphasizes that when buildings need to changes it's in this connection between the buildings that needs to be maintained. So the heritage plan states that as well existing road right of ways and width should not be increased unless required for public health and safety or bike lanes and so widening roads also goes against any climate change emergency recommendations so we keep that lens on it as well. The heritage conservation plan also asks that new buildings respect the heritage character of West Woodfield through attention to height, built form, setback, massing, material, other architectural elements which the Heritage Planners have agreed that this it does not conform to. It also notes that a building that would otherwise be consistent with its neighbors in former massing which this doesn't but even if it did it can have a disturbing effect on this consistency in the neighbourhood if it sticks out in front of the general line of building façade which this plan this proposal would stick out severely. So inherent in the heritage conservation plan is the mandate to preserve the streetscape it is not just the value of each individual

building but in the collective. 556 Wellington Street it's a highly coveted development site why because it overlooks our beautiful and historic Victoria Park and it terminates at Wolfe Street which is also a very desirable location due to its well preserved heritage homes and a very picturesque tree lined streetscape. 556 Wellington gains some of its value from its proximity to Wolfe Street. Being in a Heritage Conservation District has its advantages and disadvantages, ask any of the property owners on Wolfe Street and they will tell you that conforming to the heritage conservation requirements has meant higher renovation costs and building restrictions but the benefits are cohesive streetscape and the preservation of the architectural details that make this street treasured in the city. We only ask the same standards apply for all of the property owners along Wolfe Street. The report from the Heritage Planners emphasizes that this proposal does not integrate well with existing buildings on Wolfe Street and they see no evidence of trying to transition to the lower density of the street. The London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) have listed the many requirements the heritage conservation plan does not fulfill and we have not seen much movement on this by the developer. So aside from the scale and massing the biggest ask that I have is for the developer to respect the streetscape, having a consistent build edge something that is urged by planners on the Wellington Street side and we also ask that this be the case on the Wolfe Street side. We ask that they move the north façade of the building so it is in line with the general line of building facade on Wolfe Street. This would result in a better integration with the existing streetscape so I urge you to heed the advice of the Planning staff and LACH and reject this proposal.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Hodge. Are there others who would like to comment on this? Come to the microphone, don't be shy. I have someone in Committee Room 5? Okay no Committee Room 1 and 2? Go ahead yes go ahead state your name and you'll have five minutes.
- Danya Walker, 570 Wellington Street – See attached submission.
- Hazel Elmslie, 63 Arcadia Crescent – See attached submission.
- Councillor Cassidy: Ma'am, you are past your five minutes. I wonder if you could wrap it up soon.
- Well, did you include Danya Walker's stuff?
- Councillor Cassidy: Yes, ma'am. You, you get five minutes to speak. If other people want to come and have five minutes they can come and have five minutes.
- Alright, so, lastly I am asking Canada Life the ultimate owner of the project to walk the talk. Proudly displayed on its webpages under the banner Community and Social Responsibility their commitment includes supporting our communities and committing ourselves to sustainability. This project is exactly what the community of London does not want in the neighbourhood of the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District which is supported by The London Plan. It may meet zoning but it certainly does not meet heritage and I hope I have illustrated a number of other shortcomings. Furthermore there is nothing to suggest that this project is committed to sustainability. Where are the ecar charging stations?
- Councillor Cassidy: Ma'am, you are well past six minutes.
- What are the plans for waste reduction? And I could go on but I guess I am cut off.
- Councillor Cassidy: I wonder if you could provide your name ma'am?
- Sorry?
- Councillor Cassidy: Could we have your name for the public record?

- Sorry. Hazel Elmslie, 63 Arcadia Crescent.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you very much. So I'm sorry and I also neglected to ask if the applicant is here and would the applicant care to address the Committee? You can go ahead sir. State your name and you have your five minutes.
- Greg Priamo: Since the rest of the public has already gone forward I'm wondering whether it would be appropriate to let them finish their comments and then I would have the benefit of being able to comment on those too and sort of close the loop on some of these issues.
- Councillor Cassidy: I think that's fine. Thank you. So back to Committee Room 1 and 2. I see you there sir standing, come to the microphone, state your name and you'll have five minutes.
- Garth Webster: I live at 320 Wolfe Street. I just want to finish what this lady was reading. Zero lot lines allowed looking at footprint on page SPA 004 we note that the building extends beyond the sight lines of the houses on Wolfe Street and beyond sight lines of Centennial Hall to City Hall. This is disappointing as these sight lines were considered very important in the decision making process for Victoria Park Secondary Plan proposals. Involving sight lines was one of the areas of agreement by many of this stakeholders in that proposal. Zero lot line will also limit the utility of retail portion so that any restaurants would not be able to have viable patio areas. Outdoor amenity space is nonexistent being limited to terraces or balconies tied to units. Unfortunately fourteen of these units will face the solid cement wall building. I think you read this. Sorry I think it's a bit repeating but outdoor amenity space is nonexistent being limited to terraces or balconies tied to units. Unfortunately fourteen of these units will face the solid cement wall of Building 2. This will also significantly affect the amount of light in these units. Furthermore another 24 units will be looking directly into the lovely windows of the units of Building 2 or rather 16 Building 2 units will have a very nice view of Building 1 balconies. I understand that a wind study was not required because this development is not in the downtown area that requires one. This is a bit ironic as it is in the downtown when it comes to zoning but not when climate is an issue. Because the study was not required I was told by city staff at the last LACH meeting that it was not asked for. The wind study would not provide, was not provided, that much useful information not only for Victoria Park but on the probable wind tunnel effect of Building 2 on 34 units of Building 1 with balconies facing Building 2. A balcony is not much use if it's too windy to use. I also note that floor 5 of Building 2 will not have walls CSPA 806 SPA 155 this is the top floor of the parking levels in Building 2. I wonder what effect wind will have here and how they will manage the snow in the winter. The traffic study does not address three important facts Wolfe Street is narrower than local roads in the neighborhood. Wolfe Street has no boulevard to accommodate snow removal. Wellington Street is closed almost every other weekend between Dufferin and Central between June and September this summer notwithstanding. Furthermore we're in the beginnings of the new age of online commerce, there does not appear to be any consideration given to package delivery on other than Canada Post. Will Wellington Street be subject to constant lane blockage because deliveries are made to the door facing Wellington? That is where GPS will direct all the drivers. Lastly I'm asking Canada Life the ultimate owner of the project to walk the talk. Proudly displayed on this web pages under the banner, Community and Social Responsibility. Their commitments include supporting our communities and committed ourselves to sustainability. This project is exactly what the community of London does not want in the neighborhood of West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District which is supported by the London Plan. It may meet zoning but it certainly does not meet heritage and I hope I have illustrated a number of other shortcomings. Furthermore there is nothing to suggest that this project is committed to sustainability. Where are the e-car charging stations? Could there have been green roofs? What are the plans for waste reduction specially recycling and composting? What is included in the project that is above and beyond what is required by-law? I view that as a minimum standard Canada Life and previous Great West Life have promised more than minimum standards. I therefore

request that PEC support in WHCD, volunteers of LACH and the recommendation of very skilled in decades city staff and reject this proposal. It could have been built twenty-five years ago but it does not belong the third decade of the 21st century.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Webster. Any other members of the public who wish to comment? State your name and you'll have five minutes.
- Thank you. My name is Kate Rapson and I'm the Chair of the Woodfield Community Association. I sent a letter to PEC last week and we ask that you support the decision made by LACH regarding the Canada Life application at 556 Wellington Street and refuse the heritage alteration application. The Woodfield Community Association supports all the points made by LACH. A few key items. There's a few things I would like to highlight. In policy 4.3 of the West Woodfield HDC the plan states new buildings shall respect and be compatible with the heritage character of the West Woodfield Area through attention to height, built form, setback, massing, material and other elements. We don't believe this application reflects many of these characteristics, design does show brick and other materials but it does not in character in terms of set back and heights. The recommendation also in the Woodfield HDC is that the buildings be no more than 8 to 10 stories; however, and then 3 stories for buildings adjacent to houses on Wolfe Street, specifically in Princess Ave; however, this is obviously up to 18 stories. The application shows, also shows, a widening of Wolfe Street which is not supported by the HDC, HCD sorry. Wolfe should not be widened, the green boulevards are recognized and should be protected as stated in the Heritage Conservation District guidelines. I recognize, we recognize, that this site is, the zoning is an extreme conflict with the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District and it also the Downtown Area Zone also sort of flies in the face of HCD. So with that we believe the Downtown Area Zoning is a mistake and the new London Plan, is a mistake in the new London Plan for the south end of the Park and should be revised to closer respect the policies and guidelines as outlined in the West Woodfield HCD. In addition, just referencing the traffic study, note that's not part of this application, but it states that there be no more than a hundred cars added to the local traffic on Wolfe Street. However should be noted that there will be 328 residential parking spots and 204 Canada Life employees spaces so that's kind of odd I don't see how it could just be limited to a hundred cars on that street so maybe we could ask for clarification from the developer on that. I have a few suggestions in just specific to traffic. Can the City respond to, with, traffic calming suggestions for Wolfe Street? It is a lovely little tree lined heritage street right now. Could Wolfe be made into a one way street, is that an option? Can there be pedestrian walk, crosswalks be installed at the end of Wolfe Street crossing Wellington? That's already pretty dangerous I can only imagine to be worse with this building and also how will traffic be managed during festivals? This application will set a precedent for lands abutting to the Park so it bears high significance to future public asset access and overall health of this small urban park. It would be far better if this application could be considered once the Victoria Secondary Plan is complete. Collectively we need to protect the green space for our future and focus intensification where it's allowed and logical. That's it. Thank you very much for your time. Appreciate your listening. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Rapson. Any other members of the public who would like to speak? Come to the mic. You'll have 5 minutes. Please state your name.
- Soon as I stand on the dot. My name is Kelly McKeating. I live at 329 Victoria Street and I am speaking on behalf of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. I'd like to start by saying that I think it's a little bit unfortunate that staff in their introductory remarks didn't mention that the staff recommendation regarding refusal of the heritage alteration permit, which was endorsed by LACH just last week. The timing of this application I think is unfortunate. Approval of the site plan application would give the impression that the public feedback and the concern regarding building heights around Victoria Park that was voiced at the PPM in front of PEC earlier this year hasn't been heard. It seems to me that the current zoning is an error or perhaps an oversight, it is a shame that the zoning of this particular area wasn't

changed when the HCD plan was finalized twelve years ago. Regardless of that hiccup, the view of the ACO is that the HCD plans recommended maximums should be respected. We all want intensification in the core and we all want buildings instead of parking lots as a couple of the Councillors mentioned earlier this evening but this building is too high and has too large of a footprint for this particular parking lot. There's an Ontario Municipal Board decision from 2015 that's supportive of this perspective. That decision, which was in Toronto the OMB determined that respectful separation district was critical to conserving the heritage attributes of the neighboring designated and listed properties and we believe that that precedent does apply here. We also agree with other comments that you've received that it would be preferable that the main floor of whatever building is eventually built should be residential and not commercial. And then finally I would not like to make a comment about the shadow studies in the site plan application package. I was appalled and aghast to see that at least in March and September the shadows of this building will extend all the way to Waterloo Street and that several of the houses on Princess and Wolfe would be in shadow for the entire afternoon during those times of the year. It seems to me that this is just incredibly unfair to the people who live on those streets to lose their sunshine to lose their privacy and this is a building that just should not be built in this particular location. I thank you for your attention.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. McKeating. Any other members of the public who wish to speak? Anybody in Committee Room 1 and 2 who are looking to speak to this application?
- Committee Room Staff: We don't have any more speakers in this room.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thanks very much. So I'll go to Committee Room number five, the agent for the applicant is there. If you would like to come forward, state your name and address the Committee. You have five minutes.
- Thank you Madam Chair. My name is Greg Priamo and we're the Planning Consultants for Canada Life and Great West Realty Advisors on this project. There's certainly a lot to unpack in the comments. There are two matters that the Planning Committee, excuse me that the Planning Committee is being asked to deal with tonight. One is consideration of this site plan by way of a public site plan meeting and it's largely colored by the heritage aspects if, if we weren't in a heritage district and there wasn't a requirement for statutory site plan meeting we'd be moving through the site plan approval process with staff and trying to address their concerns as has been catalogued by Planning staff where we're you know notwithstanding the heritage issues we're very close to completing what would ordinarily be deemed an acceptable response to the zoning and an acceptable response to the City's planning tools otherwise. That being said and as you know we've provided some correspondence particularly with respect to the heritage report and the recommendation from LACH where we were asking Planning Committee to reconsider their recommendation and support of the issuance of a heritage alteration permit. We appreciate that there was the content of the report prepared by staff it was certainly comprehensive. We did feel that it was unbalanced and that it focused a great deal on what they felt were the shortcomings of the project with very little consideration given to the matters that we brought forward to try to make this project a better project. There was assertions in the report that we didn't address, heritage issues. We provided a lengthy and comprehensive heritage alteration or heritage impact assessment prepared by a qualified heritage consultant and we provided several comprehensive responses to concerns raised through the various site plan steps that we've taken over the last few years. We never did receive any response from heritage staff as to our impression of, or, our response to their concerns. They've just continued to go back to their original position notwithstanding the fact that we provided responses but that being said. In short, we are in disagreement, we think that this building and the design approach that we've evolved with in working with staff has the ability to fit in this neighborhood particularly because it's at the edge of the neighbourhood, the built form of the neighborhood, I appreciate the park is part of the HDC but the built form in the neighbourhood, we're in a portion of the Woodfield neighbourhood that has seen some conversion and intensification

because of its proximity to the downtown and park so not all parts of the Woodfield neighbourhood are identical and when we're looking at the heritage district policies I think we have to have regard for that and in this particular instance I think we've done that. We've established what we believe to be an iconic building working within the parameters of the zoning that's on the site. I appreciate some of the comments and we've indicated to the public and to staff in the fullness of time it would be our preference for instance to have the ground floor of this building be residential but the zoning as it currently exists right now requires that the main floor be commercial. As we move forward if we get support for this application we would certainly entertain the prospect of looking at the necessary variances to allow for the main floor to be used for residential purposes. Since we've made the application we worked with staff to make considered improvements. The primary concern raised by staff was the rear portion of our development and in particular the parking garage. We've moved from an open concept parking garage to a fully enclosed garage with architectural features and building materials that match the rest of the building as staff have indicated more recently through discussions with the city we've agreed notwithstanding the fact that the zoning doesn't require it, we've agreed to move the building. We did lose some parking spaces and it does change some of the dynamics of the ramp system and the parking garage but we felt it was it was worth addressing given the concerns raised by staff. And so we did move the building off of the east property line three meters to allow for a planted garden which is ample space to allow for trees to grow and provide a buffer from those from that wall along the property line that you know the building sides on to our building it doesn't front and it's backyard has largely been converted to a commercial parking so it's not a particularly sensitive interface but nonetheless one worthy of consideration.

- Councillor Cassidy: You're past your five minutes Mr. Priamo. I'll give you a couple of seconds to wrap it up.
- Greg Priamo: So essentially in in this particular instance we think that we have we have met the tests of the of the heritage district plan we have met the tests of good planning and urban design and we certainly encourage Planning Committee to have regard for this submission that we made in that regard particularly the heritage impact assessment and the subsequent responses and support our application.
- Councillor Cassidy: Okay, thank you Sir. Thank you. I'll go back to Committee Room 1 and 2 just to make sure there are no other members of the public who would like to speak. I see one last person coming forward, if you could state your name, sir, you have five minutes.
- I'm Brian Evans: My wife and I own 297 Wolfe Street so we're in the crotch of the "L" formed by these buildings and it's been said already but I just want to emphasize that the back building butts fairly close to our backyards and it's a tall building so we will not see daylight which I guess is great from the standpoint of skin cancer but in terms of mental health it's nice to see some sunshine once in a while and they've show no regard for the neighbors. They have beautiful balconies built on this building for their people but for the rest of us will be without sunshine and it's I think it's a consideration. Thanks.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you very much Dr. Evans for coming out. Thanks for your perspective. Any other members of the public would like to speak? I'm seeing none so I'm about to close the public participation meeting; this will close the portion of the meeting where the, where you can provide comment so I just want to make sure everybody has spoken who would like to speak and I'll look for a motion to close the public participation meeting.