

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision – 21 Withrow Avenue

In addition to those outlined in the Consultation Details section of the report, the following outlines the written and oral submissions received between the publication of the report and prior to City Council's consideration:

Number of delegations/submissions

Number of delegations at Committee: 11.

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between November 4 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda) and November 14, 2019 (committee meeting date): 27.

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Emma Blanchard, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP, and Jonah Bonn, Bill Holmzan Consultants Inc. (applicant) (oral submission)

- provided an overview of the proposed two-phased plans for the site, including rehabilitation of the privately-owned Kilmorie House, and surrounding development that respects it and will co-exist with the fabric and lotting pattern of City View.

Moe Farhat (written submission)

- proposed development of the property is in line with the urban development the City of Ottawa is approving, and is needed in the area to encourage growth as well as to promote the City View area as a family-oriented area.

Nicholas Giorgio (written submission)

- those in City View who are opposing the development are original home owners that moved there with their young families back in the late 1950-1960s, and who refer to new residents of the community as "intruders";
- the new development is exactly what the area needs;
- the builder is meeting all requirements, he is adhering to the heritage home on 21 Withrow and complying with that; the land around this original home is being divided fairly into single lots and there is no interference with the heritage home;

- there are a number of trees being left on the site to accommodate the new homes and Greenland;
- opposed to the City trying to direct taxpayers' funds to purchase the property to simply turn it into a park.

Primary concerns, by individual

Nick Tinker (oral and written submissions)

- suggested the City could reject the proposal for the following reasons:
 - ❖ a unique, historied heritage property with first class greenspace is being sacrificed in this development for a small luxury development lacking mature trees composed of large houses with huge driveways on tiny lots;
 - ❖ the smaller lot size is destructive of the neighbourhood fabric;
 - ❖ City View is already in a parkland deficit, and these 13 new homes with no greenspace of their own will draw on a neighbourhood that is already in park land deficit; cash in lieu funds should have been collected on more than 100 infill homes in the community, which could have put towards purchasing this property, however, this property has been given an artificially inflated value beyond what the cash in lieu could possibly support by entertaining a development that goes far beyond the zoning density;
 - ❖ the property does not reflect the character and importance of the existing heritage home, which should include open space and mature trees that are hallmarks of the estate's heritage; there has been no effort to design with nature or with heritage, which could have been done just by respecting the bylaw density in the neighbourhood.

Peter Ludwig (oral and written submissions)

- concerns about the impacts on the historic Campbell-Kilmorie residence as well as the lands surrounding the structure, and the impacts on the community stemming from loss of mature trees and public green space;
- suggested the report and proposed zoning by-law amendment are ill-conceived, disjointed, flawed and disconnected and neither meet fundamental sound planning principles nor heritage, environmental, green-space or community values;

- the most fundamental flaw with the project seems to be the City's flawed trifurcation approach taken in respect of the unique features of the subject property and the lack of respect and consideration given to the surrounding community and residents, which has resulted in this oversized and out-of-character development, including environmental degradation;
- concerns that an insufficient amount of time was given to the community to review the comprehensive staff report and development documents, and prepare submissions in advance of this meeting;
- concerns about fair and due process and lack of elected representation for City View, given the ward Councillor's absence.

Joan Clark, President, City View Community Association and Kilmorie Heritage Society (oral and written submissions)

- spoke of efforts over the past four years to save Kilmorie House and its lands, including the heritage designation of the house;
- concerns about the loss of heritage and the loss of greenspace;
- objected to site-specific rezoning for the subdivision;
- suggested the site should be a community hub and gathering place, not a community precedent-setting subdivision;
- talked of the need to acquire the property and save it from development;
- suggested there was insufficient time given for community consultation once the report was released for this meeting.

Arthur Capling (written submission read out by David Clark)

- concerns about development that is not sensitive to the existing heritage home and unique property and will create a loss of public access to it;
- noted a lack of park land and open space in the community, and indicated this development would both preclude such an opportunity and under-provide the minimum requirement, with no public amenities being proposed;
- concerns about over-development of the site with lots that will be out of character with the lot fabric of the neighbourhood, building height that will impact the existing streetscape, and building that has no apparent aesthetic design quality;

Nancy Wilson (oral and written submissions)

- agreed with points raised by other speakers and worried about the loss of so many mature trees on the site.

Jane Moore, Chair, Poets' Pathway (written submission read out by Nancy Wilson)

- concerns about loss of Confederation Poets' heritage properties;
- concerns about loss of public access to Kilmorie;
- suggested public gardens, educational programming and public events should be implemented at Kilmorie.

Jill Prot (oral and written submissions)

- suggested many of the City's Official Plan policies have not been considered in the review of this proposal, in particular how the proposal will impact City View in terms of greenspace, drainage and stormwater management services, air quality and climate change, and cultural heritage resources:
 - the City of Ottawa should never allow 100 trees to be removed, within an urban area that lacks parkland, trees and natural features; City View is locked between 4 major roads, major vehicular routes, and extensive commercial development along Baseline Road, Woodroffe, Clyde and Merivale;
 - the trees provide so many benefits to this community, including mitigating the effects of the extensive traffic by reducing the overall concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, removing particulates from the air that can impact physical health and well-being, assisting with storm water management, preserving soil, and supporting wildlife;
 - the City View community lacks parkland and open space, having one of the lowest ratios of parkland in the City, and the situation is getting worse each year, mainly because properties there are being divided to allow for infills.

Mary-Sue Haliburton (oral and written submissions)

- raised concerns about: loss of a heritage property unique to the city; stormwater runoff management; loss of mature trees and conditions suitable to support tree canopy; loss of greenspace and access to the heritage property;

- she has provided numerous briefs and submissions to various bodies, including the Committee of Adjustment, in defense of the preservation and protection of the heritage property, which is a unique treed space of cultural and national significance
- adding 14 houses to the site and raising the ground level will have irreversible and damaging effects on existing trees and storm water management, will prevent sufficient root space for tree canopy growth, and will cut off public views and access to Kilmorie House
- there is a separate proposal currently in the planning stages that could see a high-density development and chapel located nearby, which would add even more densification and detriment to the neighbourhood.

Ben Glosson, Poets' Pathway (oral submission)

- spoke to the significance of Kilmorie House and its impact on artists and poetry, being one of the great estates of Ottawa, owned by William Wilfred Campbell, one of the renowned "Confederation Poets"; suggested the lands of Kilmorie are a green cathedral that inspire in a way all artists can relate to, and performed "A Wood Lyric" by Wilfred Campbell.

Karen Lynch (oral and written submissions)

- expressed concerns about overdevelopment of the site, impacts on community health and livability, air quality and climate due to loss of greenspace, tree canopy and natural environment
 - the rate and type of infill development in City View is contrary to the goals of the City's new Official Plan, to create the "most livable mid-size city in North America"; if it continues; the existing extensive tree canopy, all other plant components, and the diverse species they support will be gone, as well as the environmental services and health benefits they provide to improve quality of life;
 - Kilmorie is environmentally significant and the removal of trees and green space does not support the City's commitment to a climate change strategy and will be detrimental to the community health and 'livability'; Kilmorie should be preserved for the 'public good'.

Moe Royer (oral submission)

- supported the comments and concerns of the previous delegations, acknowledged the significance of community concerns, and supported their desire to maintain public access to the heritage property.

Robin Jackson (written submission)

- stated support for the Kilmorie Heritage Society and their efforts to preserve 21 Withrow in City View as a City park; having a park for future generations where none exists in this area is worthwhile and the plans of the Society to reclaim the gardens with heritage flowers has definite appeal.

Andrea L. Howard (written submission)

- lack of ward representation at the City to make a decision at this time:
 - the neighbourhood has not been properly represented at City Hall following Councillor Chiarelli's leave, and distribution of his duties between Councillors Moffatt and Hubley;
 - the Community Association had been working closely with Councillor Chiarelli, who had recruited support from other levels of government and the broader community over a multi-year period, to save the property at 21 Withrow for community use and heritage purposes;
 - the City has chosen to take advantage of a narrow window of time in which the community is not properly represented at City Hall to push through this zoning bylaw; the community did not elect the Councillors that currently share the responsibility of representing ward interests in this matter, and the City appears to be attempting to actively circumvent community rights to representation on this matter of substantial interest.
- the proposal to allow infill development on the site is problematic:
 - City view has been subject to quite a lot of infill development, often at the expense of the neighbourhood's mature trees, and always at the expense of the character of the neighbourhood;
 - residents who bought properties in the neighbourhood in part because of this character are losing that part of their investment when contemporary infill properties are built, and receive nothing in

return from fees the City earns in exchange for granting major variances to neighbourhood standards;

- infill properties built in City View have been almost exclusively high-priced luxury homes selling for prices in excess of median home values in the city of Ottawa, making these infill homes targeted toward already wealthy families for whom housing availability is not a concern.
- the space should be retained for the enjoyment of all members of the community, to preserve an important heritage property, and to promote its use as a park.

Kirsten MacCormack (written submission)

- stated support for the Kilmorie Heritage Group's proposal to save the property; suggested it is an exciting and rare opportunity to preserve an important piece of Ottawa history and also give City View residents and others in the surrounding neighbourhoods a beautiful gracious park land where they can celebrate our Canadian poets.

George A. Neville (written submission)

- the proposed development of the site is premature and totally irresponsible of developers, City councillors, and City planners;
- it is a historical oasis replete with a heritage house, spacious green space, and over a hundred mature trees of differing species and such a cherished site would be sought after and preserved intact by major cities of the first world if it were within their precincts as it lays now within Ottawa, the Nation's Capital, on the verge of being sacrificed for ultimate intensification with mini-sized cookie-cutter lots and dwellings;
- once gone, it cannot be restored, and the stately heritage protected house itself is deserving of the intact site-grounds to set it off and preserves its historic and cultural significance;
- objections to the City Planning Department Planning Rationale:
 - the rationale that the proposed intensification is within close walking distance to both Merivale Road and Baseline Road, which are shopping and transit corridors and that such proximity provides opportunity to choose alternative modes of transportation and access services without relying as heavily on the automobile, are attributes that apply equally to the establishment of a Kilmorie cultural centre at the Withrow site, for

seniors, sportsfields, gardens, poets, writers, musicians, indigenous citizens and the public at large;

- the rationale that the developer has made significant efforts to preserve or replant trees, which will contribute to maintaining the environmental integrity of the subject site, is no match for having designated the Withrow site as urban natural feature for its richness and diversity of mature trees, or for retaining well established trees in a natural setting of more than a century;
- the rationale that the stormwater management plan on the site will have a positive impact on the natural down stream systems that accept the stormwater flows because it has been designed such that flows will not increase from current levels is a spurious claim that does not acknowledge that the site in its current state of open land acts as a sponge or area for absorption of precipitation, not only for rainfall but for surrounding runoff; the City has been derelict in not attending to surface drainage needs of City View streets in this area over the past decades, such that now the idea of utilizing underground storage tanks for controlled release of water run off becomes a panacea for neglected and postponed infrastructure needs;
- the rationale that Cash-in Lieu of Parkland is proposed to be taken, which can be used within the ward, and city-wide, to contribute to parkland renewal and acquisition, because it was determined that this area had adequate access to various types of park and open space areas is ironic and counter-active in that the uniquely natural and rustic character of the Withrow-site property would provide a natural oasis retreat for residents and visitors to the area, unmatched by any of the small number of parks of City View; yet the City is prepared to take Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland for development of this site, destroy its natural amenities by development with the intent to use the proceeds to acquire parkland or amenities elsewhere;
- the rationale that the smaller lots proposed will not generally be visible from the public street, and therefore will not adversely or negatively impact the existing established character within the neighbourhood fails to consider that with the introduction of the [Kilmorie] private road, and the intense placement of housing around the Kilmorie heritage house, the latter will be not be easily seen as it is now down its long laneway viewed from Withrow Avenue; the additional four houses proposed along the frontage of the Withrow property, together with the five proposed houses behind (east) these four, will render it impossible for Kilmorie to be seen

from Withrow Avenue, and access to Kilmorie heritage house will be made more difficult, requiring it to be approached from the far east, off Rita Avenue, which is a dead-end.

Laura Cohen (written submission)

- there has been exponential growth in the neighbourhood over the past 18 years in terms of old homes being razed and large homes being built, which has changed the character of the neighborhood and has had a major impact on existing infrastructure, which has not kept up with the rapid intensification;
- 21 Withrow represents an important historical reminder of the community's evolution and its early roots, which is not insignificant, is also a lovely green space that benefits the environment and residents' wellness
- cutting down a vast forest for yet another development is disheartening and a mistake
- the property could be used in so many different ways, but 10 new homes is not the community's vision is bad for the community; it is not only an issue of land, but of respecting heritage and valuable green space
- City View is not treated with the same respect and protection as other neighbourhoods; it is used to bypass Baseline/Merivale with little to no traffic calming or safety measures
- the property is a community hub that protects heritage and brings the community together in a place to meet, play, reflect and be in nature, and it deserves protection.

Christine Biljan (written submission)

- she does not support the subdivision and the continued degradation of the community
 - has lived in the area over 40 years and seen continual variances get approved that have allowed builders to change the neighbourhood character and appeal, squeezing in more and more homes and people, but not increasing any green space or parks and trees to compensate;
 - the neighbourhood is characterized by larger lots and is integral to the character and long-standing appeal of the area;
 - there are next to no park spaces or green areas in the entire neighbourhood, and this is an opportunity for the community to

preserve a space for this generation and those to come; while the proposal states intentions to preserve the trees, the amount of disruption and destruction from the building of so many homes will no doubt have an effect.

Kay Stanley (written submission)

- has historical ties to the community and is a strong supporter of the efforts of the Kilmore Heritage Society to preserve not only the heritage-designated house but the parklike grounds surrounding the house; provided historical context on the development of the area and the property at 21 Withrow; the application for the proposed subdivision and housing development is approved, an important piece of Nepean's heritage will be lost forever.

Dawn Van Dyk (written submission)

- the City has an approved Urban Forest Management Plan to ensure Ottawa's treescape is prioritized, protected, and properly managed; the plan is expected to: sustain and create a tree-canopy of large and tall trees and create and sustain an urban forest that is diversified, healthy and resilient to the challenges of the urban environment, and able to withstand the challenges of climate change;
- the original property surrounding the heritage home at 21 Withrow meets these requirements.; building a small subdivision on the property is not consistent with the goals of climate protection.

Brian Inouye (written submission)

- there is a lack of child-friendly park space in City View, especially when compared with newer subdivisions' amenities; in addition, being bounded by busy streets, lack of sidewalks and street lights, excessive traffic because of the college kids and people short-cutting Merivale road, this all gives the perception that the neighbourhood's streets are less safe for children than in newer subdivisions;
- while urban intensification is needed, taking advantage of the availability of the space at 21 Withrow to establish more safe play space will encourage families to come to the area and in fact benefit intensification in the longer run; it would be a shame to see this space simply introduce more cars and traffic in the same zone where there is already a lack of safe child-friendly space.

Anthony Pecorella (written submission)

- the proposed lot size is small and not in accordance to the local by law, and will set a bad precedent for the area;
- traffic along Lotta Avenue, St. Helens, Withrow and Cleto will increase tenfold, and visitors to the subdivision will have to park on those streets because no visitor parking spaces are being provided in the proposal; as well, the common driveway of the subdivision has no space for snow removal, so it could be moved onto St. Helens Avenue;
- having so many houses condensed in a small area, plus the removal of close to 100 mature pine trees, will take away the beauty and quiet nature of the area, causing lots of noise, commotion, traffic issues and bright lights.

Allison White-Gaudet (written submission)

- the land should be developed responsibly, not just to cater to the real estate market, or even saved for a park at some point;
- the owner of the property has plenty of space to create larger lots (i.e. 65' wide) and build fewer homes; fewer homes would still be hugely profitable in this real estate market, where any new home in the neighbourhood is valued at \$1m+ (build costs are significantly below, profits are high);
- the stone home at 21 Withrow is a heritage property; any new homes should have an architecture that is sympathetic and complements the original home; stone cladding is not enough, the structures and style need to work with the 1840's stone house, not clash (Hendrick Farm in Chelsea is a good example of sympathetic architecture, and community based building);
- there will be added traffic and the surrounding road situation has to be addressed;
- drainage needs to be addressed to ensure the property can sustain this many new homes without causing problems to the surrounding properties (i.e. basement flooding);
- there will be many trees lost that that contribute to the urban canopy;
- questioned whether the developer is resubmitting the same plan as was previously submitted in an attempt to get the plans passed while Councillor Chiarelli is away from City Hall;

- there is a lack of park space in the area, City View having the smallest percentage of parkland in the entire city, and City View Park itself is small and in poor condition; the developer should not be allowed to build 10 new homes at once without improving the neighbourhood (either through the City's initiative or donation by the builder to improve park space); while the neighbourhood is rejuvenating, thanks to builders, kids need a place to play; parks also reduce crime somewhat, which is a growing problem in City view; adding more park space or improving City View Park is a win-win, giving added value for home prices and improving the neighbourhood's standard of living;
- if that many new homes are added, the neighbourhood must be upgraded to benefit the community, not the developer;
- the renovations to the heritage house should be carried out sooner so it does not fall prey to demolition by neglect.

Tammy Laverty Hall (written submission)

- appreciates the growth of the neighborhood but also has reservations about all the huge houses being built and the loss of the "character" and history of City View;
- would like the property to be kept as a park and heritage home to visit, but understands it can be difficult and expensive;
- if the development proceeds at 21 Withrow, she is vehemently opposed to the developer punching a hole through Rita Avenue, the dead-end street on which she lives, or being granted anything less than the current zoning, frontage (50 ft frontage) and sizing for any homes to be built.

Patricia Kaiser (written submission)

- over the past 15 years, has seen more and more large lots in the neighbourhood being divided and having two houses built instead of one, which reduces the amount of plants and trees in the area; opposes the infill of some of the only remaining green space, 21 Withrow, with a subdivision.

Doris Luckert (written submission)

- the land at 21 Withrow Avenue has heritage, architectural, cultural, ecological and historic value; it is also the last remaining green space in

City view, which can be used as a passive park and potentially so much more;

- City View is in the R1FF residential zone, which mandates a minimum lot width of 64 feet (19.5m); however, most of the original houses are on lots that are 100 feet wide with large mature trees; since the Committee of Adjustment allowed the first 'minor variance' of a 50 ft lot width, in 2011, the neighbourhood has been inundated with similar 'minor variances' for lot width, lot coverage, side yard setbacks, and height, which has resulted in development that is changing the neighbourhood dramatically, and in particular, is reducing greenspace and the number of trees in the area, and very few developers have had to pay 'in lieu of parkland' fees;
- for a community of around 900 homes, with an average of 1-2 people per home, adding over a hundred homes with a capacity of 7 bedrooms per home over the past few years has dramatically increased the area density and will lead to a doubling of the community population in the near future (especially if these homes are rented to students);
- the neighbourhood has the lowest parkland to people ratio in Ottawa; the number of infills shows no sign of diminishing, but this unique historic property should be preserved for future generations and not subjected to more of the same construction.

David B. Flemming, Heritage Ottawa (written submission)

- in 2016, Heritage Ottawa supported the designation of Kilmorie House under part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* "including enough surrounding land to provide adequate setback and context.", and also supported efforts by members of the City View community, under the auspices of the Kilmorie Heritage Society (KHS), to preserve it and the entire property at 21 Withrow Avenue for public use;
- Heritage Ottawa has not been involved in this matter since the designation of Kilmorie House, but, on the understanding that the KHS has been diligently seeking support for the park concept and has made some progress in being able to propose a way in which their wishes could be realized, urges Planning Committee to delay consideration of this application until the KHS has had an opportunity to present their most recent plans to the ward councillor and City staff.

Julie Fontaine & Jean-François Marion (written submission)

- supports the community project to preserve the property, and asked the committee to consider that the neighbourhood has less parks and communal spaces, bike paths, sidewalks and community-oriented spaces than others;
- is disappointed with the newly renovated Parkglen Park, which is small and has no amenities and does not compare to the surrounding neighbourhoods' parks.

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The committee spent one hour and thirty-six minutes on the item

Vote: The committee considered all written and oral submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as presented. An additional motion was approved by the committee to refer the completion of the subdivision process and registration of the subdivision plan to staff in accordance with the Delegation Authority By-law.

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between November 14 (Planning Committee consideration date) and November 27, 2019 (Council consideration date): 5.

Primary reasons for support, by individual

None provided

Primary concerns, by individual

Allison White-Gaudet (written submissions)

- disagrees with the Planning Committee's belief that City View residents have adequate access to parks; City View has the lowest percentage of parkland in the entire city, and this needs to be addressed and seriously taken into account - especially when adding a new subdivision;
- City View Park is small, lacks amenities, needs repairs and is not very welcoming; it is a far walk for most in the neighbourhood, and is not worth the trek for many, and there are no other usable parks within safe walking distance from the neighbourhood;
- City View Park should be re-landscaped and new amenities added (e.g. new benches, picnic table, shade structure, a toddler playground) or

additional trees, given the City will be receiving fees from 14 new lots, and given the neighbourhood will be losing so many trees on Withrow;

- the neighbourhood is rejuvenating and home are selling at high prices, but there is no decent neighbourhood park and the City is neglecting the neighbourhood in that way;
- private land that is used as 'park space' by the community cannot be counted as greenspace, as it can be developed at any time, including the field at Elizabeth Wyn Wood Alternate School and any property owned by Algonquin College;
- the City View Community Association has made some valid points in its arguments against the development and disregarding any ideas of theirs about creating a park / arts centre or acquiring the house / property. Developing 21 Withrow, and considering the neighbourhood's deficiencies in parks, should be considered carefully; it's not an either / or situation – it's whether or not the proposal makes sense for the land use, considering the area's parkland and greenspace deficiencies; it's not unreasonable to ask the developer to re-draw his proposal, reduce the number of homes, etc.;
- City View and College Ward residents are not being adequately represented at City Hall right now; encouraged Councillor Chiarelli to attend the Nov. 27 Council meeting about 21 Withrow as City View residents currently do not have adequate access to parkland, and there isn't enough park space to serve an additional new subdivision, and the neighbourhood needs full representation from its councillor to advocate for City View.

Peter Ludwig (written submission)

- concerned that the City seems to prefer development on the property, rather than recognizing its significance and rich cultural, heritage and environmental value, and preserving the surrounding parcel of open green space and mature trees as a public park;
- asked that the plan of subdivision be rejected, as it is not in the best interest or spirit of sound planning principles as applicable to the character and values of City View and Ottawa, and that Council initiate measures to ensure that the entire 21 Withrow parcel and stone house would be designated heritage under the *Ontario Heritage Act* and that 21 Withrow be acquired through purchase for a new open space green park;

- referenced the various interventions he has made in support of protection of the property;
- provided reasons to reject the application, including:
 - ❖ lack of elected representation at City Hall, with Councillor Chiarelli's ongoing absence;
 - ❖ inadequate notice to the community of the report to be considered by Planning Committee (7 working days), and thus insufficient time to review and prepare written and oral submissions, and an apprehension of bias given a rush by the City to then make a decision on the matter at the November 27 Council meeting;
 - ❖ the brevity of time allotted to public speakers at Planning Committee (5 minutes) and the lack of questions to delegations, along with the ward Councillor's absence and the committee's vote in favour of the development raises questions of fairness;
 - ❖ the recommendation before Council would lead to an oversized and out of character development rather than a much-needed open green space park, denies public access and sight lines to the Heritage stone home and results in a development that will result in severe environmental degradation;
 - ❖ there is ambiguity and confusion surrounding the designation of Kilmorie and what is actually included therein, which raises serious concerns about process, and about what and how development of the site can occur without impacting the integrity and interconnection of the whole Kilmorie parcel;
 - ❖ under the development plan, the existing landscape would disappear, setbacks for the infill units from the private street would be inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood homes and streets, elimination of so many coniferous trees would create a solid wall mass running the full lot width of 21 Withrow Avenue, and excessive environmental damage could also be caused by such factors as the loss of permeable soil and trees for water absorption in an area where there are no storm sewers;

- ❖ the loss of so many trees will affect not only aesthetics, but the mental and physical wellbeing of the neighbourhood and the environment;
- ❖ the City seems to have allowed severances for properties without collecting fair fees on the issuance of new infill construction project permits in City View, and putting these receipts toward ensuring the adequacy of open green space such as what a new park at 21 Withrow would offer;
- ❖ there is no basis on which to evaluate the long-term benefit - cost analysis of the developer's project, and the Planning Committee has not accurately accounted of the need for parkland at this location.

Beatrice Tobin (written submission provided by mother, Giulia De Rosa)

- worried about the loss of trees and the impacts on nature, animals and people in the area;
- wondered why other neighbourhoods can protect their green spaces and this neighbourhood cannot;
- suggested the people in the neighbourhood could pay a little bit more on their property taxes, in order to raise money to buy the property from the landowner, and that the City hire the developers of the proposed application to build a nice park area for the community instead and to renovate the heritage home for public use.

Owen Haggart (written submission)

- there is no need to destroy heritage greenspace to make way for so little high-priced development, for the developers' profit, when there are many areas of the city that could be built on with higher density buildings that would not involve the destruction of precious green space;
- the house and property should be persevered for future generations.

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all oral and written submissions in making its decision and Carried the report recommendation as presented.