

Andrew Pinnell

From: Alex Sproll
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2024 4:56 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc:
Subject: 169-183 Victoria St S

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from
at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[Learn why this is important](#)

Hi,

I'm writing to email regarding the development proposal at 169-183 Victoria St S.

While the general scope of the development is likely appropriate to the site, there are some aspects which would make this proposal stronger.

The architecture is a bit basic but my sense is that the materiality may be better than the renders show? What would make this proposal stronger is:

1. A better ground-floor presence by way of individual townhouse entrances off of Victoria St. — these could potentially be 2-floor units and more closely align with the scale of housing on park street, providing better street activation. The cadence of white/brown brick seems to allude to this but acts as a facade only.
2. More family units - while the ratio of 2 bedroom units is decent, perhaps some 3 bedroom units could be included?
3. Amenity space. Given the high number of rental replacements/affordable units (great!), some communal space is required here - meeting room, library/playroom, kitchen, co-working space, patio? Perhaps extra space on ground floor or in mech penthouse? the one room and external patio only do not seem sufficient/flexible enough.

Thanks for your time!

Alex Sproll

Andrew Pinnell

From: Chris Colliver
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2024 4:29 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc:
Subject: 169 to 183 Victoria Street South - Comments

You don't often get email from [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi,

I understand the need for development in the Waterloo region, and have seen much of it already. This one hits closest to home so far, being 4 properties away on Park St.

A decade ago I happened to visit an open house just for fun, and dreamt of one day owning a house along Park St between Victoria and the park. Years later, my young family was thrilled to buy the house next to that one. Our hopes are getting dashed in both initial expectations and current hopes that we purposefully chose a property to be in what feels like a residential area.

My main concerns with this development include:

-Setting a precedent in encroaching on Victoria Park heritage area. Even though it's not the full property, this is crossing a line for one of Kitchener's most prized neighborhoods

-Too tall – I appreciate a “transition” and not dozens of stories, but can't we get 4-6 stories instead of 8?

-Traffic during and after construction – in totality in this area, despite each property being redeveloped tending to report that traffic impacts are found to be acceptable, I have a hard time believing that, or have a very different opinion on what is acceptable. I already have trouble getting out of my driveway

Thank you,

Chris Colliver

Andrew Pinnell

From: Claire D'Alton
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2024 3:59 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Subject: new build meeting follow-up Park/Henry and Victoria

You don't often get email from [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi

I hope I'm not too late,

The property to be built at the corners of Park/Henry and Victoria St.

I've lived on Park Street for almost 25 years now and have watched the changes and increase in traffic.

I listen to and watch at the traffic at all hours of the day with impatient and frustrated driver.

This an extremely busy street (PARK), there are lots of children, with school bus pickup and drop off.

Has the builder consider moving the to the underground parking over to the other side of the building,

(Henry)

Claire D'Alton

Andrew Pinnell

From: Devon Beare
Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2024 2:01 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc:
Subject: RE: Proposed Development @ 169-183 Victoria Street South

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [\[redacted\]](#) [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Andrew,

I received a notice in the mail regarding the proposed development at 169-183 Victoria Street South and wanted to provide some comments / ask some questions.

Comments:

- I like the concept drawing of the building.
- I like that the building is only 8 storeys, although I'd be more supportive if the building was capped at 6 storeys. Buildings at or below 6 storeys are favored in many European countries for their human scale and the sense of community. They tend to blend well with residential neighborhoods and can create a more intimate and walkable environment.
- I love that the building will have secure bike stalls, although I feel that only 1 stall per dwelling is too low. Ideally it would be 1 stall per bedroom.
- I'd love it if there was commercial space for a coffee shop or small grocery / convenience store. The neighborhood currently lacks these amenities.
- Given all the development planned for the area, I want to see dedicated bike lanes installed on Victoria Street (especially between King St and the Iron Horse trail) and more frequent bus service. There is currently only 1 bus (#20) running on Victoria Street and the frequency is only every 30 minutes. Bike lanes and 15 minute or better transit service would encourage people to use active transportation instead of driving. I would also like to see traffic calming on Victoria St as there are way too many cars and large trucks using the predominantly residential street.

Questions:

- What type of units will be available in the building (e.g. will there be any 3+ bedroom units for families)?
- Is this a rental building or a condo?
- Will the building have any environmentally friendly features (e.g. electric vehicle and e-bike chargers, net zero, heat pumps, etc.) or certifications (e.g. LEED, Passivehaus)?
- How many parking spaces will there be? The flyer states 'Reduced Vehicle Parking' but doesn't give an exact number. Is the number decided by the city of Kitchener (e.g. through minimum parking requirements) or is it the developer's decision?
- Will there be any requirements for affordable housing?

I look forward to attending the zoom meeting in September.

Cheers,
Devon Beare

Andrew Pinnell

From: Frank Etherington
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2024 2:43 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc:
Subject: Victoria St. S. 8-storey and traffic

Andrew:

I am responding to Wednesday evening's public/zoom meeting. Because we did not get a notification card about that meeting, please include us (140 Water St. S.) in future information about the 8-storey development proposed at Park and Victoria streets.

My main concern involves past commitments by the city planners and councillors that any future developments will preserve the character of the city's older residential neighbourhoods. This, of course, has been destroyed by the recent approvals of enormous high-rise buildings at Park and Victoria streets overlooking and dwarfing the Victoria Park heritage area and the nearby Cherry Park neighbourhood where most buildings are little more than two-storey homes.

I also cannot understand how professional planners and transportation officials can ignore or minimize the increasing traffic issues at and around the Victoria and Park intersection.

This 8-storey building which nibbles away at the heritage area, provides about 50 parking spots for 120 tenants. Even if 100 need vehicles, particularly in winter months, where will they park? On nearby residential streets or in the already over-burdened park?

In addition, the developer's representative did not address where delivery vehicles would stop without a lay-by. The only options are Park, Victoria or Henry, all of which will obstruct and disrupt traffic flow.

The traffic created by the 8-storey building will be in addition to the 400-500 vehicles generated daily by the nearby high-rises. Much of that traffic will pour down Park to Jubilee further snarling traffic in Victoria Park. Jubilee is, of course, a busy route for ambulances and other emergency vehicles.

Despite these and other concerns, I applaud efforts by developers of the 8-storey building to provide 24 affordable apartments to help replace the existing residences that will be demolished on Victoria Street. I would also ask how many affordable units will be provided in the neighbouring high-rise buildings at Park and Victoria.

Thanks

Frank Etherington

Andrew Pinnell

From: Kandace Bogaert
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2024 2:45 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc:
Subject: 169-183 Victoria St. South Comments/Questions

You don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Andrew,

As requested in the mailer sent to us, please find our comments/questions on the proposed development below:

Comments re. Proposed Development in Our Neighbourhood - Victoria St. between Park St. and Henry St.

1. Current residents - it is our understanding that each of the proposed lots which are encompassed by the proposed development have current residents living in them, some as renters in the homes, or tenants in the two storey apartment building on the corner of Henry St. - when/where are these residents expected to go? Have they been offered any compensation for losing their homes? Have they been told they will be expected to vacate, and what options for moving back in would they have to the new building etc.?
2. Demolition - as part of the Victoria Park heritage district, the proposed development would be destroying several homes which were built in the early 20th century that were intended to be protected by the creation of the district. How many homes will be demolished? What heritage assessments have been done? How does this fit with the presumption against demolition outlined in the heritage plan for this area? Did the developer consider "moving" the buildings as outlined in the plan? Will the materials be preserved from the demolition to aid in the repair of similar heritage homes as outlined in the district plan? Will the city continue to approve plans for demolishing homes in this heritage district? Our worry is that this sets a precedent for the future of our neighbourhood - owners who do not live in the neighbourhood, and rent out their properties, who are concerned primarily for profit will continue with a lack of maintenance with the understanding that they can sell their property to a developer who will demolish for maximum profit, which will eventually erode the heritage nature of the district.
3. Density - also part of the Victoria Park heritage district plan, there is a requirement to "blend" the density of developments so that it is not a stark contrast to the low rise neighbouring buildings. How has this been proposed to be addressed? The nearest residential apartments and homes are two stories - the proposed development is eight. In the 2021 census, there were approximately 84 residents, in 38 dwellings on this city block. The proposed building would increase the number of dwellings more than fourfold as well. A two or even four storey building would seem to "blend" much more appropriately.
4. Parking & Safety - With heavy traffic and no parking on Victoria St. or Park St., and a one way St. with very limited parking on Henry St, and with restricted parking allotments in the proposed development plan, how is this density to be appropriately and safely accommodated? Where will the

entrances and exits for the development be? What about resident and visitor safety trying to find parking - how many pedestrians have been struck by cars crossing Victoria St. already this year? How will the city prevent the residents of Henry St.'s driveways being blocked with an increased need for street parking nearby? Similarly, the bike lane on Victoria St. ends at the railroad tracks (after West St.), and does not continue in front of this proposed development. Will the city be expanding the bike lane on Victoria St. so residents have access to safe means of transport with the proposed limited car parking?

4. Design - how are the units set to be laid out? Are they designed for actual families to live in, or to maximize developer profit? Are there sufficient units allotted as affordable housing, with 2 and 3 bedroom options for families?

5. How long will the proposed development take? Is there any risk of the development not being completed on time? Henry St. is a one way street - if access is blocked by construction, how will residents access their properties?

6. What about the requirements for green space - what are the plans for this?

Looking forward to the discussion this evening and thank you in advance.

Thanks,
Kandace & Robert (cc'd)

Andrew Pinnell

From: Lianne Overholt-Stevens
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2024 11:10 AM
To:
Subject: The proposed development at 169-183 Victoria St.S

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

I am completely against this development at 169-183 Victoria St S.

It is too close to the park and the Heritage homes that surround it.

I live at _____ and there are century old trees on Henry St that are vital to a healthy neighborhood.

They would be removed to create this development.

The traffic at _____ is very busy and it's difficult to get onto Victoria St S. By adding another building where 5 apartment buildings(3 new ones on Garment and Victoria St.S and 205,215 Victoria St S)already exist will cause more congestion.

Victoria Park depends on its surroundings for its animals and trees to survive. The more congestion and pollution from cars and people living near it, the harder it is for the animals and trees to survive.

I vehemently am against another building near _____.

It should be built near Victoria St and Weber St

Also I am against this building at 169-183 Victoria St S as the noise and destruction would affect this beautiful area.

Possibly the drilling to create the building could affect the land our building is on and make it unsettled. And in turn my home.

Signed

Lianne Overholt Stevens

Andrew Pinnell

From: Mary Peplow
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2024 8:58 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc:
Subject: Zoom Neighborhood Meeting Victoria- Henry Street - Park Street - 169 Victoria.

Hi Andrew,

I was on the call tonight for the above development.

I must say we were very disappointed that we had received no information on this development at all. It was a neighbor of mine that forwarded the info from the postcard he received.

I spoke with other people on Park Street and they told me the same thing.

My home is at 55 Park Street and in the 9 years I have lived here I have invested over \$175,000 into renovations and landscape/gardens.

50 Park Street had always been a beautiful home with award winner organic gardens and beautiful landscape. Since the investors took over they have rented out the houses by the rooms and have done nothing to maintain them.

50 Park street has had rooms divided by dry wall to accommodate as many people as possible. I have been told 8 unrelated people in a one bathroom home.

We have had many complaints with them on the upkeep and lawn cutting. I have met with Saadi several times to complain and finally the city took action and had the lawn cut.

I just spoke with him a few weeks ago on doing a fence between us so I don't have to see the overgrown mess and the backyard. A good neighbor fence where we split the cost.

He said he was coming into town but has never shown to discuss.

My concern is how do we know this rental will be well cared for, their properties ARE NOT.

With rentals there are fewer rules/regulations than there are with condos. Balconies in rentals often can be more of a dumping ground or storage space and that is something we would have to look at from our backyards.

I really don't want to look into balconies with summer/winter tires, bikes, laundry racks etc.

The sun will definitely be affected in my yard. That is where my afternoon sun is until sundown. That will be totally blocked.

I am also concerned with 50 Park as I have been told that garage is being torn down and there will be some sort of electrical unit there. That is also where the underground entrance to parking is.

Traffic going onto Victoria may not be too bad but traffic turning onto Park will only further congest what we go through each day on this street.

Since there is so little frontage it appears the building will be to the far back of the property line – literally putting that building in my back yard.

And how will service trucks, moving trucks etc ever be able to access the narrow space?

Why weren't Juliette balconies suggested for the back portion of the building since it is such a tight space- or Juliette balconies on the whole building. With limited frontage it would also be a better aesthetic.

I have been told that the value of my property will decrease significantly due to the loss of privacy. Not something I wanted to hear.

8 stories is just too high for an area that generally has been approved for 4 story.

I moved into the Historic/Heritage area because I wanted to be part of that culture and the park. I didn't think my yard would now contain a high rise.

Very disappointed to say the least.

Mary Peplow

Andrew Pinnell

From: Peggy Nickels
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2024 1:59 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc:
Subject: 169-183 Victoria Street South - Comments
Attachments: 240925 Letter to Developer & City re 169-183 Victoria Street South - Draft.docx

Hi Andrew,

Thanks again for meeting with me online to answer my questions this week. Please find attached my comments on the 169-183 Victoria Street South development. If I'd had more time, I would have liked to send it in the name of the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Association Development Committee, but the timeline was too short to get VPNA Board approval, which our committee needs for any public statements. Several of our Development Committee members had input.

I hope we can continue to be engaged in consultations and would appreciate receiving the site plan approval, when that is complete.

Peggy

September 25, 2024

Andrew Pinnell
Senior Planner
City of Kitchener
PO Box 1118
Kitchener, ON N2G 4G7

Dear Mr. Pinnell,

I am writing on behalf of the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Association (VPNA) Development Committee in response to the proposed development at 169-183 Victoria Street South. This development is directly adjacent to the Victoria Park Heritage Neighbourhood and so is of great interest to our VPNA Development Committee. Our Development Committee's purpose is to advocate for sustainable and livable development in and around Victoria Park. Our four priorities for development, are to:

- Provide a supply of affordable homes;
- Balance green spaces with development;
- Develop with climate change in mind;
- Include the community as an integral part of the development process.

We have reviewed the supporting documents related to the developer's application and would like to share the following comments and recommendations related to our priorities.

Affordability – we are pleased to see that this development will ensure that 20% of the 120 units will be affordable based on the CMHC's definition. Our concern is that the plan includes only 1- and 2-bedroom units which will not increase affordability for families needing three-bedroom units.

Recommendations:

- that 5% of units be 3 bedrooms to provide affordable options for families.

Green Spaces – The City's Spaces Report released in June 2022 shows 6 of 9 downtown neighbourhoods in need of park space. Given the recent high rate of population increase, the need to create increase green space makes it imperative that developers contribute to livability.

We are happy to see that the developer is planning two amenity spaces for residents: one on the ground floor with some green space included, and a second on the penthouse level. There are no details regarding green space in the penthouse amenity space.

Further, we are encouraged to see attention to pedestrian-friendly space surrounding three sides of the building, with attention to trees, shrubs, and gardens, which also help to cool and clean the air, provide shade for walkers and habitat for birds and pollinators, and absorb rainwater. Our concern is that road-

widening will eliminate the space needed for these key elements that are essential for walkability and climate mitigation.

Recommendations:

- that the developer ensure the rooftop amenity space includes plants, trees, shrubs, and possibly a rooftop garden;
- that a green roof be considered for the rest of the roof;
- that an additional setback of 2 meters be considered for the Victoria Street South side of the building to ensure adequate space for trees after road widening;
- that trees and plants be selected according to their ability to withstand and mitigate the effects of climate change, and that a maximum number of trees be planted to at least replace the ones being removed.

Building for Climate Change – In 2019, the City of Kitchener joined all other Region of Waterloo municipalities in declaring a climate emergency. It is incumbent on all new developments to maximize ways of protecting the environment and minimize their green house gas emissions and environmental impacts.

We are encouraged to see that attention to sustainability is mentioned in several areas of this developer's application. These areas include drought-tolerant, salt tolerant, and native vegetation, locally sources materials, use of light-coloured hardscape surfaces to reduce heat island impacts, high performance energy-efficient building components, larger-canopy trees for shading, low-consumption plumbing systems, and EnergyStar appliances. Our concern is that, in many areas, they qualify their statements by prefacing them with "where possible". This implies they are not committed to ensuring this level of sustainability. Addressing climate change requires more than good intentions; it demands commitment.

The developer also notes in the Sustainability Statement that solar panels and enhanced water conservations systems such as grey water and rainwater harvesting are not being considered at this time.

The developer notes that there will be 53 parking spaces for cars but doesn't mention any plans for EV charging. There will be 120 bicycle parking spaces, one for each dwelling.

Recommendations:

- that additional commitments be made to construct all aspects of the building with climate change in mind, including: energy sources, choices, and conservation; water conservation; rainwater run-off and heat mitigation; and choice of building materials;
- that solar panels and enhanced water conservations systems be considered and committed to, if feasible;
- that all car parking be equipped with EV charging stations;

- that secure visitor bicycle parking be provided.

Community Engagement – During the pre-application stage, there is a great deal of discussion that takes place between developers and planners, prior to any consultation with citizens. Both developers and planners are understandably committed to a design that is already far advanced before citizens have a say. It is our belief that it would be helpful to all – developers, planners, and citizens – if the community were engaged earlier in the process.

Recommendation:

- that both planners and developers engage citizens earlier in the development process, and invite engagement to ensure ongoing consultation and communication throughout the development process.

We are committed to a positive and collaborative approach to development in our neighbourhood. We want to work with developers, city staff, and other neighbourhoods to continue to make our City a healthy, vibrant, and inclusive place to live.

We encourage you to keep us informed of all opportunities to contribute to this development process. Thank you for your consideration of our comments and recommendations; we look forward to connecting with you in the future.

Sincerely yours,

Peggy Nickels

Peggy Nickels, Chair

CC Councillor Debbie Chapman, City of Kitchener, Debbie.chapman@kitchener.ca
Kristen Barisdale, GPS Group, kbarisdale@gspgroup.ca
Members of the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Association Development Committee

Andrew Pinnell

From: Rachel Yavnai
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2024 1:54 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Subject: Re: 169-183 Victoria St S Proposal Development

You don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

Hello Andrew,

I am a neighbour to the proposed development to be located at 169-183 Victoria St South. I am emailing to share my comments in advance of the neighbourhood meeting on September 25 2024.

I live in a rental unit which is one of two adjacent residential properties that will be most directly affected by the construction of this development. I greatly appreciate that this development proposal is not 40+ stories tall, as was decided for the development across the street at 97 Park. Mid-rise development is a must to keep up with our city's need for housing in a sustainable and intentional way! However, in reference to the [City of Kitchener's Strategic Plan 2023-2026](#), I do not feel that the proposal aligns in all the ways that it has potential to. **120 total units, with 92 being 1-bedroom or studio units.** If the intent is to densify, this is not the way to do it. I encourage further consideration into the types of dwellings we want to create to achieve our city's [Housing for All](#) plan, since we have seen plenty of small-sized, urban developments in recent years around Kitchener that don't accurately reflect the needs of families in our community.

Further, I am concerned for the current residents of 169-183 Victoria St S. **Will our displaced neighbours receive adequate support to find alternative housing?** In reference to the [Housing for All](#) plan:

"We're exploring ways to support tenants in Kitchener who rent their homes. One of the tools available to cities is a rental replacement bylaw, which would apply when six or more rental units are demolished. We're conducting a financial analysis on this tool and what it might mean for current renters and developers. Staff plan to bring a report that covers the full range of tools available in Kitchener to support renters to city council in late 2023."

Will the tools above be provided to our neighbours? Given the substantial rent increases in the past few years, I am worried that some of the long-term residents will find this transition difficult. Can they receive priority to rent a unit in this new building at a reduced rate?

Lastly, the [Arborist Report](#) provided recommendations to remove 4 of the 6 trees directly in our backyard (trees #A, B, C, G). I would like to voice my concern about this, and compel the developer's to consider a plan to save these trees. Based on the proposal, the side of the backyard will then look upon the rear of the building right next to the move-in and waste entrances where 3 of the 4 trees currently provide coverage. If this is not possible, I would urge there to be a plan to replace this vital tree coverage.

Thanks for your time.

Rachel Yavnai
Neighbour, Henry St.

Andrew Pinnell

From: Sara Okuka
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2024 9:02 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Subject: Re: 169-183 Victoria street South

You don't often get email from [redacted] [Learn why this is important](#)

Apologies, I meant Joseph St. is the one way. Not Michael St.

Sara Okuka

On Wed, Aug 21, 2024, 5:41 p.m. Sara Okuka wrote:

Hi I wanted to voice my concern regarding the building proposed. I am for development and for more housing, however making Michael St a one way has made Victoria St a nightmare. Look up the accident report on Victoria St & Michael. Every week there is an accident, even pedestrians hit. Making it so all the new condos exit onto Victoria is so dangerous and Victoria is already a main roadway for the city. I wish the city would plan this better. I live on Michael and when we want to go to somewhere, we would turn right on Victoria and right on Joseph st. Now that Joseph is a one way we all have to go left on Victoria towards Park St.

I hope there's a plan for all this traffic that it's piling up from all the condos. So many one ways now in Kitchener and you can't even then left on many streets due to the ION.

Sara Okuka

Andrew Pinnell

From:
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2024 8:31 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Subject: 169 Victoria St. S.

Andrew,

I will begin by asking a 'loaded' question - do city staff do a review of all documents in the Supporting Documents folder?

The reason I ask is this: Within the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment document prepared by mcCallumSather, there are some (to me) serious errors and inaccuracies. For instance, on Page 2 of the report, under Location of the Property, the Municipal Address is incomplete and the Location and Boundaries description is wrong. Further, pages 13 and 32 have not transferred properly and are an incomprehensible jumble of letters. The text for figure 39 (on page 50) makes no sense at all and on page 67 there is a reference to 8 Henry Street, which does not exist.

These errors and inaccuracies allow me to question the veracity of the entire report. This is not the first time I have detected significant anomalies in Supporting Documents. I must ask again - does anyone in your department actually review these documents prior to release?

I also have some concerns with the real accessibility of the service entrance from Henry St. On the site plan drawing, the depiction of a garbage truck driving nose first into the service driveway is completely spurious. Given the placement of the waste room in the proposal and the narrowness of the service roadway, the only way a packer truck will be able to usefully access the waste room is to back in. I have measured Henry St. The roadway (curb to curb) is barely 20 feet. The turning radius of a typical packer truck is 30 - 40 feet. I can't imagine a garbage truck backing into the service driveway to load garbage without using the sidewalk and probably the lawn of the property opposite.

I invite your comments.

Sincerely,

Sheldon Atos

Andrew Pinnell

From: Tim Willcox
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2024 11:05 PM
To:
Cc:
Subject: Re: Zoom Neighborhood Meeting Victoria- Henry Street - Park Street - 169 Victoria.

Mary:

Unfortunately I was unable to be on this online session, and I completely side with you.

To be blunt, this whole proposal is complete bullshit, and should have been immediately rejected upon receipt by city staff.

The Victoria Park heritage district and the built environment that surrounds it, should be "hands off".

I believe it was 2 years ago, that city staff held a public information session at the Victoria Park pavilion, that invited input from local residents, to comment on numerous long term planning proposals for the Victoria Street South corridor.

I have never seen the results of the input, we submitted.

To promote intensive residential and commercial development along this corridor, is understandable, but an 8 story apartment building, on the perimeter of our heritage neighborhood, does not fit in, with the current landscape.

I remember in grade 8, we had an urban design project in Environmental Studies, that taught basic neighborhood planning concepts, and adding the massing of an 8 story apartment building, next to a century old heritage district, would probably have received a failing grade.

It's that simple. I am too tired right now to even get into the nonsense that comes out of 200 King West, across all levels, but someone has to put their foot down before proposals such as this, get green lighted and approved, and set a precedent for future development, that will only detract from what we have worked so hard to preserve, on a heritage district level.

Hopefully on the evening of October 26, 2026, I will be the next Ward 9 councillor, and the preservation of our built heritage will be priority number one.

Tim Willcox
Prince of Park Street

1.

Good day ~ just a note for the records!

I can see this project happening but I really think its a little too much for our neighbour hood - given what is planned in nearby locations.

2.

Eight stories is too much, my take would be to keep the height at the tree line, four to five stories! ... or at least a staggered height - so it's not a "wall" of windows & structure staring down on all of us! i.e. higher at the corners and less in the middle.

3.

I'm hoping my vision here can become a talking / doing continuum for the negotiation process ahead. (that's what architects are for!!)
... you're dealing with the heart of Kitchener - with this neighbourhood!
... coming onto the south side of Victoria St is a first. am I wrong?

4.

Piracy is important to
us all!

/ The saying that I've
heard several times....
.... Kitchener is drunk,
on Progress!
Don't be, please.

5.

/ Hope what I've written
rings true!

Thanks for this!
R.B. McDonald..