

From: NorthTalbot

Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 2:07 PM

To: PEC <pec@london.ca>; Cassidy, Maureen <mcassidy@london.ca>; Turner, Stephen <sturner@london.ca>; Helmer, Jesse <jhelmer@london.ca>; van Holst, Michael <mvanholst@london.ca>; City of London, Mayor <mayor@london.ca>; Salih, Mo Mohamed <msalih@london.ca>; Hopkins, Anna <ahopkins@london.ca>; Hillier, Steven <shillier@london.ca>; Lehman, Steve <slehman@london.ca>; Morgan, Josh <joshmorgan@london.ca>; Lewis, Shawn <slewis@london.ca>; Squire, Phil <psquire@london.ca>; Pelozo, Elizabeth <epelozo@london.ca>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <pvanmeerbergen@london.ca>; Kayabaga, Arielle <akayabaga@london.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] please read - urgent - Banker's Row in peril

Importance: High

Please circulate widely.

City staff are recommending that a luxury hotel be built on the Thames River at the Forks behind the National Historic Sites of 'Banker's Row' at Ridout and Queens Ave..

This is terrible news but typical of the City's Planning Department that rarely considers the public's view on heritage preservation or public assets such as the Thames River. They just swoon at a glossy project. Your voice is urgently needed. Please, PLEASE send your comments to pec@london.ca asap. Below is a letter I wrote. Please use as needed.

See what is being proposed here: <https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=81163>

A second email will follow demonstrating concerns with the planning staff and their approach to heritage preservation.

Re: [435 – 451 Ridout Street](#) Planning Application OZ-9157

Dear Members of the Planning and Environment Committee,

- No Bonus Zoning should be awarded when the London Plan clearly states that heritage preservation is policy. If it is policy to protect built heritage then that policy should be upheld as practice. Council solidified this idea when they rejected a demolition request by Old Oak Properties of [93-95 Dufferin Street](#) citing both policy in the London Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement as rationale for not approving the demolition. The Bonus Zone awarded to Old Oak Properties was given under the 1989 Official Plan.

If policy was the cited in one case, then why is policy not referenced in every case?

Bonus Zones should not be awarded for adhering to stated policies. The public loses opportunities for community benefits that would be harder to gain otherwise.

- This planning application is another Camden Terrace at 100 Fullerton Street because it dwarfs the National Historic Sites of Banker's Row. It goes even further – obviates those buildings in comparison to the proposed 40 story tower and parking

garage. And that offends The London Plan which insists that new construction must be sensitive and complimentary to adjacent heritage buildings.

- The city does not take this section of the London Plan seriously. In every instance where a new tower is being proposed next to a heritage building, Council rarely discusses its impacts on the integrity of that heritage building. Whether it was the new tower on Hewitt St. next to the Unity Project House, 100 Fullerton Street on 93-95 Dufferin, the Azure Building against the Church on Talbot St. and now Banker's Row, the insensitivity of development on the integrity of these heritage buildings is not considered.

It is not enough - not to demolition heritage buildings. Heritage Buildings are unique and need to be showcased. Stand Alone. And new development must preserve and enhance their presence and vista.

- There should be no reduction in required setbacks because setbacks are important. They secure space from one building to the next and provide a sense of 'open air' and privacy. Setbacks also provide space for much needed landscaping and *open private space for its residents*.

Stick to the Plan. If Council every time throws out elements of the London Plan when it is still fresh and current, then there is no point referencing it as a road map going forward. It becomes subject to the whims of current councillors.

- It is only to the developer's best interest to design a hotel that is attractive. It doesn't make sense that a new hotel would NOT be designed well both from the inside out. Therefore, they should not be awarded with a bonus zone for 'design' because they are not doing anything special or 'giving' something back to the community. It is in **their** best interest to design an attractive building.

The entire concept of bonus zones is lost and rarely does the community benefit. Instead, the community only gets more crowded and congested spaces with diminished green space.

- This site floods. It is a flood plain. It is also a flight path for migrating birds and even though twice Council has been presented with concerns regarding 'fatal light awareness' and its severe impact on migrating birds – Council has taken no action. This building is ill suited for this site.

There are parking lots across the downtown core where such developments would be better suited that are also owned by Farhi Development. It is being placed here for marketing purposes to exploit the Thames River and a National Heritage Site which are public assets not to be exploited by one property owner. (Please note – 'property rights' are not true rights because rights are equal across all people and property owners do not have greater rights than a person that does not own property).

The public matters.

- Even though this application impacts several **public assets** such as Harris Park, the Thames River and several National Historical Sites no notices were sent to area residents outside of the 120 metre radius rule except the Downtown Neighbourhood Association. Notices were sent to Museum London, the Court House, the RCMP Building and a couple of businesses and one highrise. The Downtown **DOES NOT** get the Londoner and hasn't for YEARS yet staff fail to recognize this problem even though it has been pointed out over and over again.

It can't be more rude to toss off area residents that care deeply about their neighbourhoods by simply hiding behind a 120 metre rule. That 'rule' is the least they can do. If the 'least' is your best, then we have a real problem here.

AnnaMaria Valastro