	Comment Received		Comment Summary	How Comments have been Addressed
Comment #1	Following Open House #2 June 2017	Issue 1	Owner would prefer not to live in a heritage district.	Staff acknowledge this preference. Staff have outlined the benefits of living in an HCD including access to grants, certainty of the character of the area for the future and of what is permitted for their neighbors, access to resources and staff advice.
		Issue 2	Owner would desire to have the same development rights as those approved for All Saints Church.	Any owner is entitled to apply for variances or amendments to existing policies governing zoning and land use in the City. These are however, specific to each site.
		Issue 3	Owner is concerned with the quality of life in Sandy Hill. They would prefer tasteful new construction to preserving an old existing building and modifying the interior.	Staff acknowledge that often old houses have a reputation for having issues that could impact the residents who live there. But if they are maintained well, they can provide excellent living conditions for another 100 years. There is a difference between and old house and a heritage house. It is also not best practice to preserve only the façade of a building. The HCD Plan seeks to preserve the buildings in their entirety and the Plan provides the City with policies to ensure that the properties meet standards that ensure the quality of life is good in Sandy Hill.
		Issue 4	Owner acknowledges that there are very few single family dwellings left in area compared to 40 years ago. The owner suggests that we have to accept that the remaining ones will be developed in the next 40 years and is concerned that a heritage district is not the best way to orderly develop these properties.	The City's Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) encourage the provision of different housing types throughout the city. Intensification is also encouraged in the urban centre. These policy documents, in balance with the HCD Plan are used to provide direction for how areas will develop into the future. The single family dwellings contribute to the character of Sandy Hill. The Official Plan and PPS also direct that significant cultural heritage resources be conserved. Since single family dwellings are

				so readily being developed, there is all the more need to preserve the ones that remain that have heritage value.
	Comment Received		Comment Summary	How Comments have been Addressed
Comment #2	Following Open House #2 June 2017	Issue 1	The owner feels that the community has not been consulted enough during the HCD process.	There have been two public open houses throughout the HCD study and Plan development process. In addition to these meetings, 2 working group meetings were held during the spring of 2018 to undertake a detailed review of the plans. Staff were also available throughout the process and offered to meet individually to discuss the concerns. The <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> requires that one public meeting be held. The Planning Committee meeting on August 28,2018 will serve as the statutory public meeting.
		Question 1	What were the architectural and design considerations taken into account when deciding what 'should' and what 'shouldn't' be considered heritage?	The properties within the study area were evaluated as part of the Phase I of the Sandy Hill Heritage Study. The evaluations are part of the Heritage Survey Form. Each property was scored and categorized. Properties in Categories 1-3 were determined to be contributing buildings to the District.
		Issue 3	What is the recourse for owners, if they feel that such designation should not apply?	Any owner may object to the District designation by making oral comments at the statutory public meeting on August 28, 2018 or by submitting written comments.
	Comment Received		Comment Summary	How Comments have been Addressed
Comment #3	Following Open House #1 June 2016	Issue 1	Owner is concerned about the damage to their house at the end of Besserer Street due to the construction on Rideau Street the previous summer.	There are heritage grants available for restoration work.
		Issue 2	Owner is concerned about the amount of property Ottawa U is acquiring in Sandy Hill, as well as the number of students who do not respect the houses in the area.	The Ontario Heritage Act does not regulate tenancy and staff currently work with representatives of the University for the properties they do own to ensure they are well maintained. The designation could inspire students to take more pride in the houses that they live in.

		Comment Summary	How Comments have been Addressed
Comment Received			
Following Open House #1 June 2016	Issue 1	The owner does not feel that the building is significant enough to warrant designation. They note that the building has been altered substantially and would like the building to be re- evaluated to become a non- contributing building.	Staff met with this owner to discuss the evaluation process, and review why the property in question meets the test for a contributing building. Despite the alterations, the building represents many of the attributes and contributes to the character of the District.
	Issue 2	The property is a rental building and therefore is not a taken care of in the same way that a building with a long term resident would be.	The Ontario Heritage Act does not regulate tenancy. The Plan does not require that an owner reinstate elements that have already been altered. It is encouraged, but not required. The "heritage status" of the building could be used as a selling/rental feature.
	Issue 3	The owner is concerned that a future owner's renovation plans would be restricted by the designation.	Proposals for alteration are considered on a case by case basis. The designation does not extend to the interior, so renovations to modify the interior use do not require a heritage permit.
	Question 1	Is there any monetary assistance from the City to repair damaged foundations?	The City offers grants for restoration work up to \$5,000.
Comment Received		Comment Summary	How Comments have been Addressed
Following Open House #2 June 2017	No issues	conservation area. The owner enjoys the mix of residents and the history of area. The owner expressed that they intend to remain in the area but feel that when they decide to sell their home, they would like to receive a fair market price. They feel that the	Staff have received these comments and have included them as part of this report.
	Received Following Open House #1 June 2016	ReceivedFollowing Open House #1 June 2016Issue 1Issue 2016Issue 2Issue 2Issue 2Issue 3Issue 3Question 11Comment ReceivedQuestion 1Following Open House #2No issues	Comment ReceivedIssue 1The owner does not feel that the building is significant enough to warrant designation. They note that the building has been altered substantially and would like the building to be re- evaluated to become a non- contributing building.Issue 2Issue 2The property is a rental building and therefore is not a taken care of in the same way that a building with a long term resident would be.Issue 3Issue 3The owner is concerned that a future owner's renovation plans would be restricted by the designation.Question 1Is there any monetary assistance from the City to repair damaged foundations?Comment ReceivedNo issuesThis owner is in favour of the proposed conservation area. The owner enjoys the mix of residents and the history of area. The owner expressed that they intend to remain in the area but feel that when they decide to sell their home, they would like to receive a fair