

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – East Village Holdings Limited, relating to the properties located at 690, 696, 698, 700 King Street, 400 Lyle Street, 701, 725, 729, 735, 737 Dundas Street, and 389, 391, 393 Hewitt Street

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much Ms. Wise. Technical questions from the Committee? Councillor Lewis, go ahead.
- Councillor Lewis: Thank you Mr. Chair, just a very quick one. Of the 393 parking spaces in this proposal, do we have a sense of what number would be publicly available? When we have ground floor commercial, of course, there's a necessity for people to sometimes access that ground floor commercial by vehicle so is there an opportunity for the public to do that in this case or are these parking spaces currently proposed specifically for the residential units? I do note that there's a surplus between the unit count and the parking count.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead Ms. Wise.
- Sonia Wise, Senior Planner: Through you Mr. Chair, there is parking that would be set aside that would satisfy the requirements of the commercial uses at the ground floor so that would have to be located somewhere within the structure; however, a lot of the parking that is provided is in an effort to alleviate some of the pressure on the local parking demand which is also created through the existing apartment buildings. It is anticipated that a large amount of them would be taken up by residents that are in the existing apartment buildings as well as the future proposed phase for your consideration.
- Councillor Lewis: Thank you for that. I just wanted to ensure that some consideration to the commercial parking space need was being given and I hear that it is. I don't need an exact number, I'm just glad to hear that that has been part of the discussion.
- Councillor Squire: Any other technical questions? I just have one Ms. Wise and it's about the podium, the whole aspect of the podium and it's something that seems relatively new from my point of view in the City of London and I'm really interested in how the community input and sort of design principles went into the podium here, which seems to me to be fairly extensively designed and to be fairly large.
- Sonia Wise, Senior Planner: To you Mr. Chair, so I believe the podium design evolved both directly and indirectly through the comments we received. Some of the direct changes, there was a desire for the first design to have more of a horizontal feature that connected the vertical brick features so that is something that we heard from the community as well as the Urban Design Peer Review Panel and in terms of material use type those things also were improved. The indirect inclusion could be the additional height that is included with including more parking levels. We did hear that the existing parking situation is an issue and in order to accommodate more parking, the podium did rise two levels but the overall design, I think, captures a lot of comments that we received and provided a better interface with Dundas Street.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. I think that's, just from my point of view, that's a real positive, the podium aspect. Moving on now to public.
- Mayor Holder: I have a question Chair.

- Councillor Squire: I'm sorry Mr. Mayor. I keep missing you Mr. Mayor and I apologize for that. Go ahead.
- Mayor Holder: Thank you. To our staff, I know that the detail around bonusing and obviously as a result of what is occurring going forward is more inclusionary zoning so how does bonusing get into it at this point when it hasn't broken ground. What was the, I'm just trying to understand the dates associated with when we are allowed to bonus and when inclusionary zoning takes place. If you can help me understand that timing and how it affects this future project.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead Ms. Wise or someone else if they are able to answer.
- Sonia Wise, Senior Planner: Through you Mr. Chair, so the timing of this application, it has been active for the past year which means the policy framework that was in place when this came in did contemplate bonusing and still does contemplate bonusing. There will be an eventual phasing out and a transition time over the next couple of years up to about September 2022 where aspects like inclusionary zoning might come in and take the place of some other projects that may have been dealt with through bonusing and in keeping in mind that, the bonusing that was eventually sort of negotiated is also aligned with our future provision of priorities so it's something that we would have liked to see if bonusing goes away. I hope that helps. Sorry.
- Mayor Holder: Well it does. If I might Chair, and this is to staff, I'm glad to see that as part of that process, negotiated or otherwise, that it includes thirteen affordable housing units within that. Sorely needed. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you Mr. Mayor. We are going to go to public participation now unless there's any other technical questions. I know that people will be joining us and I don't know if they are listening now. Are they? Just for anyone that is going to be speaking, just so you're aware five minutes, we'll be timing that and we'll try to give you notice when there's thirty seconds left but we do hold to that time limit to, to move the meeting along and in terms of comments we try to stay away from any derogatory comments about other speakers or, or anything in particular, it makes the meeting proceed a lot smoother so I'll go to. Is the applicant here to make. The applicant is here? Can't hear me?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Blackwell you need to take your phone off mute, please. Star six I believe will unmute you.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Blackwell, are you there? Yeah, I'll go to the next person, we'll come back to the applicant so next speaker, whoever that might be. We're going, this is going well so far. This is Dr. Grzyb.
- Councillor Squire: Doctor? Hello?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Again, anyone joining us by phone needs to unmute their phone by using *6.
- Councillor Squire: Oh, there's somebody who must be on. Who am I speaking to?
- This is not the applicant, this is Amanda Grzyb from Western Unity Project but I think I should probably be speaking after the applicant.
- Councillor Squire: No, no, we are not going to wait, you're going to go now.

- Dr. Amanda Grzyb: Ok.
- Councillor Squire: You have five minutes. Go ahead.
- Dr. Amanda Grzyb: I was the first one to unmute my phone.
- Councillor Squire: Yes.
- Dr. Amanda Grzyb: Thanks, thanks so much for making it possible to participate in this meeting. I have been on every kind of online format possible but this one is new, calling into a Zoom meeting so my name is Amanda Grzyb and I am a Professor at Western University and I'm also Chair of the Board of Directors for the Unity Project for Relief of Homelessness in London which, as you know, is an emergency shelter located at 717 Dundas Street which is directly beside the proposed development and that is the heritage building to which the speaker referred to earlier. A little bit later my colleague Rick Odegaard, who's also a long-time member of Unity Projects Board of Directors will speak to outline some specific concerns that we have related to rezoning and bonusing provisions in the application including density, height, setback from Dundas and setback in particular from the property line next to our facility but I would just like to speak briefly to Unity Project's main concern and this is related to the proposed number of affordable rental units in the, in the apartment building. I was really heartened to hear the discussion earlier in this meeting about the issues of homelessness and affordable housing. We're certainly facing a crisis in the City and this is one that will be exacerbated by the economic impacts of Covid-19. Once this is all over I think we are going to be dealing with this for years to come and all of us have seen a growing number of people who are sleeping rough in the city and, of course, we're very supportive of the recently enacted emergency measures to prevent people from freezing to death on the streets over the winter. At Unity Project, for more, more than a decade our staff and program participants have been experiencing the impacts of this housing crisis and we experience it every single day. Our Housing Stability workers struggle to find affordable rentals for our program participants and we know that there's an acute shortage of affordable and supportive housing in the city. Based on the reports, and I heard this reiterated in the overview, Medallion's proposal includes thirteen rental units that will be leased at eighty percent of the average market rent for thirty years and so the first question that I think the first question we would like to ask is whether apartments at eighty percent of the average market rent in London can really be characterized as affordable. Would somebody who's working for minimum wage or someone on ODSP or OW really be able to afford a unit in the new Medallion building? The second question is whether thirteen units is enough, is it going to make an impact or really any kind of dent in the affordable housing crisis that we are dealing with. Should we be asking for more? The third question, and this is not really a rhetorical question, it's an actual question, how many affordable units were lost when Medallion began to develop those properties so is the thirteen units replacing the number of affordable housing units that were displaced? Were there more? Were there less? I think this is an important question to ask and then finally I think we would like to ask the Committee what the ethical obligations are of for-profit housing developers like Medallion and Medallion, I would note, is a for-profit company based outside of our city, right, they are based in Toronto. What are their ethical obligations to collective local solutions for affordable housing and for addressing this crisis in our community? Should they be doing more, particularly when they are not even based in London, they're based in, in Toronto. I think the main point we would like to make is that in exchange for compromised rezoning of the area and Rick is going to outline those details a little bit later taking into account some concerns we have about setback and density, Unity Project would like to ask the

Committee and the City for a much more robust affordable housing provision in this proposal and we would propose a minimum of thirty rent geared to income units, not eighty percent of market rent, but rent geared to income.

- Councillor Squire: You're now, just so you know, sorry, you have thirty seconds remaining.
- Dr. Amanda Grzyb: Okay. So hopefully, and that's actually the last point I wanted to make, so thirty rent geared to income units for at least one hundred years and we really welcome more rental units in the city, we need them, but we believe the city should take a really holistic strategic and ethical approach to affordable housing in, particularly in relation to for-profit developers and developments that are situated outside of our own city. Thanks so much for listening to our concerns, taking them into account and for your time and the ability to participate in this meeting. I really appreciate it. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Thank you very much for your thoughts. So now we are going to try to go to the applicant. I'm hoping the applicant is online. Unmuted.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Kot you're now in the meeting if you could unmute your phone, please.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. I'm not, I'm again, I'm not going to, we're going to wait, do we have someone else who is able to enter the call, please? Alright, who's on the line?
- It's Luka Kot from Medallion Developments.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Welcome. You have five minutes, you have five minutes
- Luka Kot: I'm trying to get hold of Brian here, Brian is supposed to provide the presentation on our behalf but I just wanted to say good afternoon to all of you and also to the members of the public that are in attendance. My name is Luka Kot, like I said I am here on behalf of Medallion Developments, just wanted to quickly.
- Councillor Squire: Sir. Sir. Just before we go on I just want to remind you that you have five minutes and we will be holding to that and I will let you know when you have thirty seconds left. Go ahead.
- Luka Kot: Thank you and yeah, so I just wanted to show my appreciation to the staff and to the community at large and we worked very hard together to develop this project. I think we all could be proud of and satisfied with it. I'm here just observing all the Committee's and public's comments and I hope that we address most of the concerns as it relates to the project and I think through Brian's presentation we will be able to do so. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. We are hoping to hear from Brian. We're trying.
- Luka Kot: I will try him after this.
- Councillor Squire: Alright, thank you. The next person. Is someone else on the line?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Ms. Valastro you are now on the line.

- Councillor Squire: Ms. Valastro? It seems to me that there's people are not muting and if anybody's listening you really have to unmute before we can hear you. It may sound straightforward. Who is on the line?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Ms. Valastro you are unmuted but we are unable to hear you.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: Oh, because I am not saying anything. Can you hear me now?
- Councillor Squire: Yep. As always Ms. Valastro you have five minutes and we'll let you know when there's thirty seconds remaining.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: Sorry, I just have to, I just have to shut down, I just have to shut down, I am, AnnaMaria Valastro. Hello? Hello?
- Councillor Squire: We're here Ms. Valastro. We are waiting for you to start speaking.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: Okay. I don't agree that.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Ms. Valastro, you need to turn the volume out, off on your computer.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: Okay. Everything is ready to go now. I apologize. It's a little bit awkward.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Please just go ahead, just go ahead.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: I don't agree that this development deserves a bonus zone. Bonus zones are to be awarded in exchange for unique or extraordinary features including enhancing community character, developers, it has become a custom for developers to ask for bonus zones for any development that's not a square box. There's nothing special about this development architecturally or design and it does not complement in any way the heritage features or the adjacent building or character of the streetscape of Old East Village. This development should only be awarded a bonus zone if they house the current residents that will be displaced at their current rental rate because market value is unaffordable to many working and underemployed individuals. That's the problem. Market value is unaffordable because the market is targeted towards upscale housing where the developer can make the most money. There's little value in setting aside a small fraction of units at market value if the people displaced by the development can't afford it. It's important to understand the housing problem properly. There's a housing problem because the only housing being built is high-end housing and this raises the market value for all housing; therefore, residents that are being displaced by this development need new units at their current rental rate. That would be deserving of a bonus zone. The drawings of the building along Dundas and Hewitt Streets have no space for street trees or green space except in concrete boxes. We have already been there, done that and now know that trees in concrete boxes cannot thrive and die, they become sickly and only make the street more derelict. There is no greenspace on site for residents. I feel there's a lack of sensitivity or maybe understanding at Council as to the importance of ensuring ample green space for residents. In their race to build it is understood that developers must make room for green space for residents as part of the overall health of their living space and broader community. If this means a reduction in either the rental units or size of some rental units then so be it. It's not acceptable that in your race to build you compromise components that define healthy living otherwise you are creating a concrete jungle and more

progressive communities have moved away from that sort of planning. The tower is too high. Combined with the existing towers on King Street it will block crucial sunlight for the low-rise housing on Hewitt. Those residents will only receive early morning sun which will eliminate their ability to grow food if desired and place the rest of the day in shadow. No bonus zone should be awarded for eliminating the vast majority of sunlight for, to residents. Finally, there is nothing special about this development. Architecturally it is plain. Other than providing housing it has a negative impact on the community. It blocks significant sunlight to adjacent low-rise housing, is not complimentary to the adjacent heritage building or the character of Old East Village, it provides no interior green space to its residents, it contributes and doesn't contribute to the tree canopy of the area, it evicts current residents and does not offer substitute housing at their current affordability. In closing, I just feel like the, the City needs to set a higher bar for what a developer can get a bonus zone for. I don't understand, like, what we're afraid of to, to make sure that future development encompasses all the qualities that make a living in the poor or anywhere healthy and vibrant and this is just another concrete block in the middle of a great community. So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much for your input. Appreciate it. Alright, who is on the line? We're waiting for our next speaker.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Odegaard you are now on.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Odegaard, are you there?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Odegaard if you could please hit *6 that will unmute your phone.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Odegaard are you on the line?
- Rick Odegaard: Yes I am.
- Councillor Squire: Alright Mr. Odegaard, as I indicated to others you have five minutes for your presentation and we will give you a note, we will let you.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Ms. Valastro.
- Councillor Squire: Okay, can you hold, can you wait for a moment, Sir?
- Rick Odegaard: Yes, I can.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you and Ms. Valastro are you still, is your phone still on?
- Rick Odegaard: She was coming through just fine when I was.
- Catharine Saunders: I think we are ok.
- Councillor Squire: No. We were hearing her in the background, Sir. Alright Mr. Odegaard, you have five minutes if you'd like to start.
- Rick Odegaard: Great. Thank you very much Mr. Chair. As Dr. Grzyb mentioned I'm a long-time volunteer with the Unity Project as well, the next-door neighbour to this development. I'm the current Treasurer of the Project. I first of all wanted to thank Sonia Wise for her complete and speedy responses to all of our questions that we fired at her. A lot of organizations are taking a long time and blaming Covid on it, but not you, thank you. I want you to know that we are

in favour of commercial and residential development on the street. We do have some issues with this particular proposal though and as it relates to now the new design I am not familiar with, I am operating off the renderings that were sent out a few weeks ago so I have not seen the updated design and I cannot comment on it other than to say that the previous design, we liked the setback but we do not like the tower height. The shadow line that was mentioned by the previous caller for existing buildings, our own building which is like a two and a half story century duplex, the shadow line goes half-way up the buildings on the other side of Dundas Street right now. This development, the shadow lines are probably going to extend all the way across Queens Ave. The existing zoning on the corner property permits twelve storeys with a density of two hundred fifty units per hectare. What they are asking for is double the height and triple the density, it's a density that exceeds even the King Street development and we're wondering why, when you want to have a friendly frontage on Dundas Street, a busy Dundas Street, you would allow something that's going to loom over the street like a twenty-four-storey building with that kind of density. The design is, is, the density is, we think, too high. The parking spaces, in terms of bonusing, I don't understand why this three hundred ninety-three parking spaces is a response to the market demand for parking, it's, why are we bonusing because they are providing parking. They need to provide parking to rent their units and to satisfy the lack of parking on the existing buildings on King Street. The affordable housing issue Amanda dealt with does a five percent of the units in affordable housing warrant a bonusing provision. We would like to be involved in the site plan approval stage. We are concerned about the side yard setback. Currently, the zoning calls for 4.5 metres up against our property. We hope that that is going to be the case, the zone, rezoning requests zero to 4.5 metres, I don't know where that zero is happening, I haven't seen anything that shows it on our side and we have one final item which may seem minor, trivial to you but it's significant for us and that is when Medallion first built King Street they agreed to allow a garbage bin on their property adjacent to our property for our use, we have a very tight site garbage bin, it would be really disruptive, we don't know where that fits in to the new development, is that indeed, even if that's, that's going to be continued. That's it. Thanks very much for your time.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much Mr. Odegaard. We'll try to get your questions answered as part of the presentations today. Next is the applicant, I hope, finally or the applicant's representative? Oh, okay and who am I, who's on the line now?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Ms. Pastorius from Old East.
- Councillor Squire: Ms. Pastorius?
- Jen Pastorius: Hello everyone. I'm sorry, I'm just getting my text situation.
- Councillor Squire: I was just going to comment on how much better for the Mayor, I mean I don't know what's, what's going on here. I think he has more influence than I do but that should be obvious. Ms. Pastorius, go ahead, you have five minutes.
- Jen Pastorius: I appreciate, I appreciate your patience. Yeah, so my name is Jen Pastorius. Hello everyone. Happy New Year. I'm from the Old East Village BIA and generally I have to say we, as Sonia mentioned, we held a one of our very last in-person meetings on February 2, 2019 to speak to this project. Generally speaking I would say the community was generally positive about the idea of development but our community is also very attentive to details so they had quite a bit of detailed feedback, concerns as well as suggestions and in the more recent renderings I, it seems to suggest, and in conversations with City of

London Urban Designer, that these, most of the challenges around or concerns around public, around urban design, have been addressed, for example, the height of the transom windows which would reflect the heritage components of other buildings in the area has been addressed. The setback is, is farther back and it's kind of, it agrees with the cadence of the other three and four storey buildings in the general area and the parking was addressed as well which, well, was, it was a concern which was brought to the table and the number of parking spaces is a response to that concern. The, generally speaking, the design of the property as it stands now as presented tonight, we are pleased with the commercial spaces, we think it's a benefit to the community, it will connect the commercial area from English into the western part of the corridor and also an increase to residential units are always beneficial in addition to the affordable housing component to the project. Regarding the parking, again, like I said, we had a lot of concern around parking, there's a current parking, some would say crisis in the area regarding Medallion's residence so the increase in parking comparatively to units was a positive development; however, we won't really know how well this remedy has worked until the building is built and the people are in the parking spots to see whether or not that is actually enough. The community itself also had some other concerns that were, to be honest, outside the scope of this particular application but were included in the planning participation meeting so I wanted to include them here. Those are related to the ongoing maintenance of the building itself, both exterior and interior. Also, there was a connectivity piece that was promised in Phase 1 by Medallion in order to create a commercial building as well as a walkway to connect residents from the buildings themselves on King Street directly to Dundas. That has not happened and so we are hoping to work with Medallion to move forward to ensure that these kind of developments do manifest in the near future. In closing, generally speaking, I would say in relation to the comments that were made on February 2 that the adjustments have been made to, to remedy many of the concerns of the people had around urban design, parking, you know, as I said I think it's a cautious optimism situation and again, we are excited about further development in the area and hope to work with Medallion in the future to remedy some of the ongoing challenges. Thank you.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. I hate to say this but do we have the applicant now?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Blackwell if you could hit *6, please.
- Councillor Squire: It is important that we hear from somebody, that we hear from the applicant, but this is sort of the third or fourth time we've tried this exercise. If we took a brief adjournment would that help or would it, is it alright if we take a, just a five minute adjournment to see if we can make sure that the next person, is there anyone else besides the applicant? No. That's the next person so if it's alright with the Committee I don't think we can skip the applicant so just, we'll, Councillor Lewis is moving, someone second a five minute adjournment. Councillor Hopkins. Just a show of hands. All in favour. I think everybody, that's everybody supporting. We'll take five minutes to get the applicant online. Okay, we are going to go back in session. I'll call the meeting to order and I am assured that Mr. Blackwell is on the line.
- Brian Blackwell: Good afternoon Mr. Chairman.
- Councillor Squire: I just want to remind you that you have five minutes. Did you listen to the other presentations?
- Brian Blackwell: Yes, I, I've been having technical issues with my computer and I think I have heard most of it.

- Councillor Squire: Okay. I didn't know.
- Brian Blackwell: I apologize if I've missed some.
- Councillor Squire: Okay, if you wanted to address any of those concerns that would be fine. Otherwise, I will give you your five minutes. We'll let you know when you have thirty min, thirty seconds, left. Go ahead.
- Brian Blackwell: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will get right to answering some of the questions that were, that were asked. Number one, I just wanted to start by thanking staff for all their help on this application. I'd like to say that the Secondary Plan allows for twenty-four storeys, I want to start with that. I want to indicate to all staff that the underlying zone for this area is BD Zone so it allows this type of development. There was talk about HDC. We've had a few meetings with HDC Mr. Chairman and the numbers that we have proposed, and they've approved, are based on the latest approval, development approvals that have been approved, that have been approved lately by planning staff. The thirteen units and the breakdown has been reviewed by HDC and has been approved. Someone was talking about the bonusing. Yes, the affordable thirteen units of affordable units that was approved by HDC is part of the bonusing and, you know, there were other elements, ie. the building design and underground parking. That is part of your London Plan and the original OP requirements, so I wanted to let you know that. We did have meetings with, we did have one open house meeting and we did have a meeting with senior staff in the Old East Village and we believe, you know, at that meeting there was a lot of discussions regarding the building. Mr. Chairman I want to let you know that we've changed the building four times. We've worked with your Urban Design Planner. He was at the open house, he was at all the meetings, he was at the Urban Design Panel, he has taken all those, all those, comments that he has heard and we worked with him to get, to get to this stage. We have looked at that Mr. Chairman. Regarding parking, we have added an extra ninety parking spaces to this development, just to this phase development because, because we know that we have issues with parking on the site so just for this phase we've added an extra ninety parking spaces. Mr. Chairman, regarding the access of Hewitt Street, we, we hired our Transportation Engineer to work with staff engineering department so we have, with the discussions that we've had and our modelling, we've proven to staff that the access off Hewitt Street is appropriate from a setback from Dundas Street. Mr. Chairman, I want to be very clear regarding the building, when we were dealing with the Urban Designer we looked at the building massing, we looked at the elevations, we looked at the setback at the point towers, we looked at the podium fronting onto Dundas Street. We went into detail on the, on the height of the glass fronting onto Dundas Street, which is fifteen feet so we went to that type of detail, Mr. Chairman. We looked at materials, we've, you know, your Urban Designer, we are close to the Unity Project and he asked us to provide setbacks which we did. We went to LACH. LACH had no issue regarding the heritage look of our building. We did do an HIA regarding the zoning which there was no issues regarding your staff related to the heritage component. Mr. Chairman, we do have a garbage bin for the Unity Project on our property. We are still going to carry that forward. In our design we will have a bin and I could say that very clearly. We will have a bin for the Unity Project. They will go through their fence, we will provide that access to our garbage area in the new building and they will have.
- Councillor Squire: Could you wrap up, Sir, you're just hitting five minutes.
- Brian Blackwell: Okay. I, I just wanted to explain, this application, we have worked with City staff for a little over a year now on this application. We feel, we

feel that we fulfilled most of the concerns in the community and, you know, we're happy to build this next space.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you.
- Brian Blackwell: Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much, Sir. Is there any other public participation? I understand there are no other public participants so I will need a motion to close the public participation meeting.