

Dear Councillor Members,

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 ask and expect bonus zones for any development that is not a square box. There is nothing special about this development architecturally or design and does not complement in anyway the heritage features of the adjacent heritage 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 is little value in setting aside a small fraction of units at market value if the people displaced by the development cannot afford it. It is important to understand the housing problem properly. There is a housing problem because the only housing being build 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.

The drawings of the building along Dundas and Hewitt streets have no space for street trees or green space except in concrete boxes. We know that trees in concrete boxes cannot thrive and die. They become sickly and only make the street more derelict.

There is no green space onsite for residents that sufficiently accommodates the resident population. I feel there is 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 well 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 is either rental units or size of some rental units, then so be it. It is not acceptable that in your race to build you comprise 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, it will block crucial sunlight for the lowrise housing on Hewitt. Those residents will only receive early morning sun which will eliminate their ability to grow food is desired and place the rest of the day in shadow. No bonus zone should be awarded for eliminating the vast majority of sunlight to residents.

Finally, there is nothing special about this development. Architecturally it is plain. Other than providing housing it has a negative impact of the community. It blocks significant sunlight to adjacent lowrise housing, it is not complementary to the adjacent heritage building or the character of Old East Village, it provides little exterior green space to its residents, does not contributes to the tree canopy of the area, it evicts current residents and does not offer substitute housing at their current affordability.

This sort of development lacks ethics because individuals with wealth move in and dominate others of less wealth and have the ability to oust them from their homes. It is Council's role to set a balance to ensure that these developments play a fair role in replacing lost affordable housing and contribute to intrinsic qualities of the broader community. It is not enough to just profit from expensive housing.

Thank you

AnnaMaria Valastro

133 John Street, Unit 1

London, Ontario N6A 1N7