

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 370 South Street and 124 Colborne Street (OZ-9418)

- Councillor Hopkins: I understand we have a presentation here from staff. I would like to go to staff to, to the presentation. You have up to 5 minutes. Thank you, Mr. Maitland. Any technical questions from the Committee? Councillor Lewis.
- Councillor Lewis: Thank you Madam Chair. Just one technical question and it's on the piece that staff are recommending refusal of ground floor commercial on. I recognize that we're working from existing policy documents and, and plans; however, as we know during the last almost two years of a pandemic situation there's been a considerable change in the, the vacancy and the demand for commercial space and I'm wondering if that, if any sort of analysis, planning impact analysis, took that into consideration given that I think probably no one wants to see this Vision SoHo development result in a bunch of vacant spaces created in a building on the ground floor with potentially no demand for commercial use. Through you to our staff was consideration given to the changing commercial real estate market and demand for commercial spaces or are we working from a policy basis that predates the pandemic change in real estate demand?
- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. Maitland.
- Michael Pease, Manager of Site Plan: Hi. It's Mike Pease, Manager of Site Plan. I can answer that question through you Madam Chair to Councillor Lewis. In, in some respects they are proposing some commercial spaces; however, the zoning that was in place prior to the zoning that's before you today already provided some flexibility to have either residential or commercial so refusing it in a sense is already advocating or provided for what's already permitted so it's just a policy change to reflect what is already in place. The policies prevent permissive, it's not prescriptive so that, that's the zoning already in place to allow for that flexible approach whether it be commercial or residential.
- Councillor Lewis: Thank you Mr. Pease. That's extremely helpful as always from you in the many years I have been working with you on different applications so thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Any other technical questions? I do have a quick one to staff regarding the parkland dedication. If you can expand on that parkland dedication? I understand it's five percent but if you can just add a little bit more context to it.
- Leif Maitland, Site Development Planner: Through the Chair, the standard requirement is five percent cash in lieu. There's, there's no additions or there's no change from any other standard proposal for parkland. I guess, I'm, I'm not sure if there was another element to the question that I may have missed.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yeah, just so it's not cash in lieu it is the five percent we are going to be getting?
- Michael Pease, Manager of Site Plan: Through you Madam Chair, it's Mike Pease again. Just to reiterate what Mr. Maitland said, so I think the question was about parkland dedication and in this case, it would be cash in lieu based on the number of units. There's a rate per unit that would be applied. There would be no other parkland applied to this area. Just as a reminder as well, there is the civic space that is at the four corners intersection that is a separate city project that is occurring at

some point in the near future I would hope but the park would be separate, and it would be public land that would be owned by the city.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for that clarification. I'd like to now go to the applicant.
- Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Limited: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of Planning Committee, it's to Harry Froussios from Zelinka Priamo Limited, a Senior Associate. I'm pleased to bring forward this application on behalf of the Vision SoHo Alliance Group this evening and with me in attendance this evening is also Ron Rowbottom who is the, the Vice Chair of Vision SoHo Alliance and we also have Jim Sheffield and Tim Wickens of Nicholson Sheffield Architects as well here to address the Committee and able to answer any questions that, that may arise. Firstly, we just want to thank staff for their efforts; there's been a very strong collaboration between staff and the Vision SoHo team. There's been several meetings held in order to bring this application forward for consideration in a very timely fashion. We're very appreciative of their efforts. I'll be, I'll be brief, Mr Maitland has already provided a very excellent overview of the application. It's an application to facilitate the redevelopment of a portion of the Old Victoria hospital lands for residential uses including affordable housing within five new buildings and two existing heritage buildings. An application which is unique, appropriate and necessary. It's unique, to our knowledge it's the first of its kind. The proposed redevelopment is being undertaken by Vision SoHo Alliance which is comprised of six non-profit community-based organizations all with previous development experience in the in the City of London. There are Chelsea Green Home Society, Homes Unlimited, Indwell, which is based out of Hamilton but they're rapidly becoming a prominent affordable housing provider in the community, the Italian Seniors Project, London Affordable Housing Foundation and Zerin Development Corporation. These organizations have joined together with the common goal of providing housing opportunities which are sustainable, accessible and affordable while also integrating the development into the SoHo community in a responsible, comprehensive and coordinated manner. Through the retention and reuse of the existing health services and War Memorial Children's Hospital buildings, the historical and heritage significance of the property and the area is also being preserved as part of the, as part of this development. There has been extensive public engagement through the efforts of the Vision SoHo team including hosting two separate virtual open houses to interested, interested members of the public. Both open houses were well attended, and we were very pleased the overall level of support that was provided for the project. This application is appropriate, the amendments will realize the goals and objectives of the Provincial Policy Statement, both London Official Plans, the Old Victoria Hospital and Secondary Plan which encourages mixed use and residential intensification, a mix of housing types in a compact built form and the integration of heritage buildings to create a diverse and inclusive residential and mixed-use neighborhood. The proposed amendments will respect the current height permissions established for the various areas within the Secondary Plan area and will make efficient use of the lands to provide much needed housing opportunities in the community and lastly it's a necessary application, the amendments are necessary to facilitate the proposed development which will provide approximately six hundred seventy-four housing units of which a minimum of four hundred those units will be affordable housing units and one hundred of those are at least one hundred of those will be deep affordability rates. It is the intent of the Alliance to begin construction as early as 2022 with the goal of completing the project in 2024. Approval of the proposed amendments will assist the City of London in realizing its immediate goal of providing necessary affordable housing units to a wide range of families, individuals and special needs groups in order, in our community in a very timely fashion. We support the staff recommendation to approve the necessary amendments the Official Plan, The London Plan, the Secondary Plan and the Zoning By-law. We have no issue with the staff recommendation to refuse the amendment relating to commercial uses on the ground floor based on the interpretation we heard

this evening that they want to maintain the Policy in its current form and it would not preclude the proposed development. With that Madam Chair and members of the Committee we thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Vision SoHo Alliance. As I've noted before we are available to answer any questions you may have and I thank you again for, for allowing us to speak on their behalf.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for being here. I would like to go to the public if there's anyone here that would like to make a comment please come forward.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Madam Chair, we have Kelley McKeating joining us by Zoom and we do have Wayne Ray in the Committee Room.
- Councillor Hopkins: Just wondering who we should go to first.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: You may wish to go to Ms. McKeating first.
- Councillor Hopkins: Ms. McKeating.
- Kelley McKeating: Thank you. It is Kelley McKeating and I'm speaking both on behalf of myself personally and the Architectural Conservancy of London and I just want to express strong support and enthusiasm for this development proposal and I'm speaking to 3.4 and 3.5 here. The proposal is good for the SoHo neighbourhood, it's good for the greater London community and as a bonus it's good for the conservation of heritage architecture. The proposed new buildings have designs that are sympathetic to the two existing buildings with the scale that's respectful of the two existing heritage buildings. I just wanted to, a lot of the times when ACO London speaking we're opposing things, we're being negative, and this is an opportunity for us to be positive and I wanted to seize that opportunity. Thanks very much.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you very much. I'd like to now go to the committee room 1 and 2. Sir, if you come forward, please. You can state your name and address if you wish and you have up to five minutes.
- Wayne Ray: My name is Wayne Ray and I live at 430 South Street. Through various discussions and two heated ones today we have a few that we think are important points. One I believe was answered, although I'm not clear about the commercial. I'll start with that one. The nearest grocery stores are a mile to a mile and a half way in either direction Oxford and Richmond and I believe Commissioners and Wellington with that amount of traffic coming and going there, is there, is there not a plan for like a large convenience store or small grocery store or even Shoppers Drug Mart that sells food as well? This would cut down on traffic in the area and a lot of the seniors wouldn't have, you know, who can't get out, we'd not have far to go. The main concern is the, at 430 South Street, I believe 40 of the 70 units are of Polish descent, immigrants, after the Second World War. There was no notices in the native language, most of them don't know what's going on, they're having difficulty, you know, reading and speaking English and I tried to talk to several of them and they, they just know there's a building going up, that's the limit of the conversation going. Through several discussions we were wondering why the largest building, eleven stories high, is going to be like within a hundred feet of our building blocking the entire westerly sun where a lot of seniors need sunlight and what's the possibility architecturally of switching the five and the eleven so that the eleven storey overlooks a vacant, hardly used parking lot for the church and five storeys, is would be right beside our and not be that much of an inconvenience for the westerly sun particularly in the winter; it's going to be pretty dark I would think with eleven storey building overshadowing the seniors building. The third point, the final point is, was brought up, is South Street between Colborne and Wellington because of all the, the new traffic and also the new building that's on the south side of South Street will it be converted to two-way traffic between Wellington and Colborne to alleviate cars going past say the seniors building and the next one

over 440, it's the next population with a lot of families. That might be something no one's considered but I think that or we think that we can alleviate a lot of the traffic but our primary concern is this huge building blocking ours. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I'll ask one more time if there's anyone here that would like to speak to this recommendation? I see none. We'll go to the Committee to close the public participation meeting.