

Re: delay in planning application review for 197 Ann Street

Urgent Matter - Please share with your family and friends.

A Heritage Update – please read.

In a weird twist of fate, the decision by Old Oak Properties to demolish 93 and 95 Dufferin Ave has sealed the fate of the Kent Brewery heritage designation.

Heritage designation of the Kent Brewery Building at 197 Ann St. and the family homes of the Hamilton Family, the brewery owners, at 183 and 179 Ann St is being heard on Monday Nov.16 at the Planning and Environment Committee (PEC) meeting. It is NOT open to the public. The staff report:

<https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=75931>

York Development currently owns these properties and is proposing to build a dense luxury student housing complex.

Here is my understanding of what is being proposed and how these two issues are linked.

Old Oak Properties will win approval to demolish 93 and 95 Dufferin Ave on appeal because when Council approved the demolition of Camden Terrance, their short-sightedness also gave license to demolish 93 and 95 Dufferin.

Camden Terrance was by far more culturally rich in heritage than its neighbour at 93 and 95 Dufferin. Unfortunately, Camden Terrance was a weathered building, and the *'snobbish voices'* advocated that the building wasn't 'pretty' enough to preserve despite its rich history. The same sentiment is also being expressed by York Development and some councillors about the Kent Brewery. 93 and 95 Dufferin were more 'tasteful' and therefore spared. Upon appeal Old Oak will argue that if Council demolished the most historical building, then the lesser of the two cannot be defended against demolition.

This has struck fear into the bones of the Civic administration because they cannot stop the demolition of 93 and 95 Dufferin because of their own past decision.

In a backwards twisted effort to avoid another Camden Terrace debacle, city planning staff want to 'cut a deal' with York Development to 'lock-in' the site plan at the current Kent Brewery so York Development cannot return with a demolition request at a later time. In exchange, Council will remove heritage designation off of the Kent Brewery and family homes of the Hamilton Family. York Development will only be obligated to retain heritage 'elements' – not the buildings but only 'elements' of those buildings in exchange for a bonus zone.

This is not clean and it gets worse.

Heritage designation does not impede creative design. It promotes it.

The preservation of built heritage, green space, parkland, yard setbacks etc. are all **BASIC planning principles** described either in the London Plan (heritage page

141) or in law such as by-laws. These principles are applied to ensure that developers build good living spaces.

These basic principles cannot be used as bargaining chips to get what you want. They are not for sale. The erosion of these basic planning principles is how we get horrible, oversized developments with no green open space, trees and so on.

Bonus zones are awarded when developers offer something extraordinary BEYOND the basic requirements that advance or improve the community. They are not intended to be given away at leisure or used to **pit one issue 'heritage preservation' against another such 'parkland dedication'**. Instead bonus zones are used to advance good design and community inclusion. Examples are:

- Using clean energy
- Incorporating public art
- Reducing parking space to reduce traffic and air pollution.

Heritage designation is intended to be reviewed on its own merits and not in a poker match. York Development wants heritage preservation linked to its request for a bonus zone therefore degrading the very planning principles Londoners worked so hard to establish through their participation and voices in forming of the London Plan.

Mayor Ed Holder is key.

The Mayor advocated on behalf of York Development at the Oct.19 PEC meeting like a nervous stage mom. The Mayor pushed hard to ensure that York was given an opportunity to rework the planning application to skirt heritage designation. And that is exactly what is being proposed.

This approach needs to stop because people are becoming jaded. If we are going to have corporate control of urban land then the least this city can do is set strong guidance and not try to 'out-smart' or 'go through the back door' to secure what is already stated in law as basic principles. That's the public expectation.

I am clearly very angry. I am tired of neighbourhoods being railroaded by members of council that make decisions on issues they know little about and make no effort to understand.

Who are these people and why do they run for office other than to become gainfully employed? Lord Help Us.

This problem is systematic and not unique to this neighbourhood.

This September City Council accepted a significant donation by York Development to raise a pavilion in a public park in the White Oaks neighbourhood. It was apparently a gift by York Development to the neighbourhood. But there was NO apparent public outreach to local residents to ask what they would like to see happen in the park. No one talked to the area residents. It was all about a wealthy corporation deciding what is good for the neighbourhood without engaging the residents. The donation can be perceived as a conflict of interest and at worst a 'bribe'. And Council accepted it.

Below is an email exchange with Councillor Stephen Turner who sits on the PEC. He voted to delay heritage designation until York Development brought back a new proposal. He insisted that heritage designation would be reviewed independently of the application. **Wrong**

His rationale was that he was not satisfied with a recommendation to designate the Kent Brewery by London's Advisory Committee on Heritage, by the City's Heritage Planner or the many individuals that wrote letters and waited more than three hours to voice their support for designation. He wanted to hear from members of the public. Some of us were already standing right there – for three hours we waited to speak - during a pandemic.

There is NO public participation meeting at this junction.

I felt we were treated with contempt and disrespected especially by Mayor Ed Holder. The whole thing is just so gross.

For all those individuals that signed the petition letter in support of heritage designation of the Kent Brewery and family homes, that petition is being submitted for the Nov. 16 PEC meeting. There are just shy of 100 signatories collected in just three short days, door to door and face to face. Support for designation is overwhelming.

Please read the staff report. These are just my interpretations of what is being proposed.

Be Good and Be Save

AnnaMaria Valastro

133 John Street, Unit 1

London, Ontario N6A 1N7

From [Turner, Stephen](#) on 2020-10-19 23:46

[Details Plain text](#)

The opposite of that, actually. I took pains to state that the heritage designation decision needs to be separate from the application.

Stephen Turner

Councillor - Ward 11

City of London, Canada

On Oct 19, 2020, at 11:34 PM, wrote:

Hello Councillor Turner,

Can you please offer an explanation as to why you decided to support delaying a decision of designation for the properties at 197 and 183 Ann St?

I walked away believing your decision was based on the proposed development application itself rather than waiting for a consultant's report or staff report providing evidence as to whether designation does or does not meet heritage requirements.

Thank You for clarifying.

AnnaMaria