

**From:** Sara Rans

**Sent:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 11:07 AM

**To:** PEC <pec@london.ca>; Wise, Sonia <swise@london.ca>; Fyfe-Millar, John <jfmillar@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Ann Street and St. George Block - York Development Proposal

These are my comments regarding the revised application OZ-9127 - Ann Street and St George Street Block - York Development Proposal

I do not support this proposal.

At the last Planning and Environment Committee meeting, Council arbitrarily decided that the approval of this development is dependent on a minimum of thirteen (13) affordable residential rental units, including one (1) studio unit, one (1) one-bedroom unit, five (5) two-bedroom units, and six (6) three-bedroom units (reflective of the unit mix proposed in the building).

This approach to housing affordability will not replace the affordability of the currently existing units on site. What are your plans there?

Council will be evicting individuals that currently have housing they can afford. Many working individuals and families cannot afford new housing because they cannot afford the first and last month's rent. They may have to live in shelters, sometimes with their families separated until they have accumulated enough wealth to secure housing. This approach evicts people from their homes, without properly considering what those people's fate will be.

For onlookers, Council seems to be acting in self-interest without really understanding if these actions are hurting people or making the problem worse.

It will be no surprise to anyone that forcing an unrealistic deadline of June 20<sup>th</sup> to resolve serious flaws in this development seems never to have intended to achieve a different outcome. Council was simply sending a message that the 13 affordable units were enough to win Council support.

This is the same approach used to approve the development at 560-562 Wellington Street, which also broke good planning principles, had little public support and resulted in an Appeal. I guess this will happen again, with legal costs that no doubt further delay the development of affordable housing in the core and beyond.

So this letter contains a complaint that should be considered and a question that needs answering. I expect more than a response of receipt.