

Sent: Friday, April 22, 2022 1:30 AM

To: ppmclerks <ppmclerks@london.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] submission: request for delegation status File # OZ9127

Dear Committee Members.

Professional Planners are bound by a Code of Ethics that requires them to represent a client **ONLY** if they can defend an application in good faith on Appeal. This Code of Ethics applies to all professional planners whether independent or working in the private and public sector.

The refusal of the zoning amendments by the Planning Department is understood as being a decision based on this Code of Ethics. The amendments are indefensible as good planning because they are too aggressive for the land, would have negative consequence for the neighbourhood and are completely disrespectful of the planning rules that were established by an extensive public process. And more importantly, offend provincial planning rules.

All zoning amendments were rejected because when considered as a whole they constitute bad planning and could not be defended on Appeal. The refusal is based on what is represented by the applicant.

Many residents of North Talbot felt that we were finally noticed as a true community and not just a hollow empty neighbourhood on the wrong side of the tracks. And are grateful that the Planning Department considered the policies that apply to this neighbourhood and the impacts on the people that live here.

It is understood that York Development dismissed concerns raised by planning staff and residents and decided to walk away and approach Council directly hoping that Council too would dismiss staff's recommendation and ignore resident's concerns.

And why not? Many members of Council have interpreted their role as redefining the London Plan on a case by case basis - the very antithesis of an Official Plan which is written to guide a city on a collective set of principles. This application breaks all the planning rules and not just a little bit. York Development is banking on Council - in an election year - that they will support their proposal. And that's why we are here today. So please do not accuse planning staff on not working with York development. York Development is not the only person in the room.

Any suggestion that the historical brewery and the homes of the brewmasters can be moved to another site is outrageous because the very history of the Kent Brewery is directly linked to the site next to Carling Creek, the CP Rail and the entire industrial area of the 'Richmond Village' where many of the original buildings still stand and repurposed.

This suggestion also steals the heritage of North Talbot away from the community who has long been proud champions of the diverse history of the area from mansions of the elite to cottage homes of laborer's of the 19th century.

Attached are two photos: 1) is the rear of the homes of John Hamilton and his son Joseph Hamilton - the brewmasters of the Kent Brewery and 2) a successful development on Queen Street, just around the corner from City Hall, where a heritage building was preserved and a graceful, complementary new development was built behind it. A similar approach could happen here with a thinner building, less

units - open to everyone - and where green space is preserved. This, of course, would be a much smaller development keeping within what is permissible under 'the rules'.

And Council delayed designating these buildings under the Heritage Act until they saw what York brought to the table and we now expect Council to keep their promise. Please designate these buildings under the Act because they deserve it.

Intensification will be an election issue - not because people oppose it - but because intensification only works well if carefully planned where the end result is a greener and livable city. Intensification if done badly does not result in a vibrant city so please stop interchanging the word 'vibrant' with 'intensification'.

No one 'buys' it anymore.

Sincerely

AnnaMaria Valastro



