

## **Document 2 - Summary of Written and Oral Submissions**

### **Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment, 26, 36 and 40 Armstrong Street and 961, 967, 969, 973 and 979 Wellington Street West**

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: 5

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between August 30 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and September 9, 2021 (committee meeting date): 24 (including the delegation and applicant presentations noted below)

#### **Primary concerns, by individual**

**Hintonburg Community Association, represented by Cheryl Parrott, Linda Hoad, Larry Hudon, and Kristi Ross, Kristi M. Ross, Barrister & Solicitor** (oral and written submission; slides held on file)

- requests that you refuse this application because it fails to conform to the policy direction in two legally binding Secondary Plans: the Wellington West Secondary Plan and the Scott Street Secondary Plan
  - ❖ the Proposal is a high-rise building whereas the Wellington Secondary Plan stipulates that new development on the Traditional Mainstreet should be mid-rise in form
  - ❖ the Scott Street Secondary Plan places a portion of the Proposal within the "neighbourhood line" which is designated for the conservation of existing low-rise built form with intensification planned for outside the neighborhood line
    - the Scott Secondary Plan stipulates that a portion of the Subject Lands fall within the "Neighbourhood Line"
    - The Neighbourhood Line in the Scott Street Secondary Plan should be respected as it represents a negotiated compromise for the location of increased intensification and areas where a low-rise character should be preserved

- ❖ These Secondary Plans are contemporary and should not be ignored and set aside in the absence of a thorough policy process to change the policy direction for traditional main streets to permit high-rise development
  - The language “notwithstanding the policies of the Official Plan” is key as it illustrates the proper interpretation of the Secondary Plan: Secondary Plans take priority over the overarching Official Plan and can stipulate different land-uses and maximum heights.
- ❖ Failure to conform to the Secondary Plan should result in an amendment to the application to bring it into compliance with the Secondary Plan (or a rejection of the application) not the amendment of the Secondary Plans
- ❖ they were adopted with full knowledge of the coming LRT line 1, and with ten years of experience with LRT line two period. It meets the planning objectives of the OP for intensification and compatibility. Over the last 10 years developments have been able to meet this plan.
- ❖ there is a mechanism to achieve higher heights inside context, and it is that that should be utilized, and not a fundamental shift from mid-rise to high-rise for a 12-story proposal.
- From a policy perspective, this application tests the City’s commitment and statements, in the current new Official Planning process, that the City will respect and bring forward current Secondary Plans. If the City is willing to set aside a clear and well-developed policy framework for mid-rise heights on Traditional Mainstreets and the Neighbourhood Line, this has negative implications for the new Official Planning process, and community by-in to that process.
  - ❖ The Official Plan states that development on Traditional Mainstreets should be “medium-density.” While the overarching Official Plan permits Secondary Plans to allocate higher densities, this has not been done in the Wellington West or Scott Street Secondary Plans
  - ❖ Changing a fundamental policy direction, such as transitioning Traditional Mainstreets from a mid-rise character to a high-rise character needs a higher level of public and community engagement than the minimal public consultation provided through a development application under the Planning Act.

- ❖ When a Secondary Plan is approved and in place, the City has an obligation as per section 4.11, policy 10 of the Official Plan to “assess the appropriateness of the development using the criteria for massing and scale established in that Plan”. This includes height as well as stepbacks
- the Planning Rationale in the Staff Report indicate that the Subject Property can justify greater height by virtue of the site being a “gateway.” The policies in the plan limit gateway developments to a mid-rise form, with a maximum height of 9 storeys
- contrary to the assertions in the Planning Rationale that the proposal complies with the 45-degree angular plane for transition, the Staff Comments that “elements of the proposed building do pierce the plane” show that the building is not compliant with the 45-degree angular plane and thus does not appropriately transition to the low-rise neighbourhood within the requirement of section 4.11 of the Official Plan.
- A 2-metre step back is required on buildings over four stories to form a two to three story base to ensure the existing low-rise human scale. The proposal has a very small 0.8 meter set back at the second story. Then it rises to 9, and then ten stories. It does not comply with the purpose and intent of the policy vision to ensure compatibility with human scaled buildings. It’s the position of the HCA that the requirement for step back must be maintained. The following buildings do comply with the Secondary Plan:
  - ❖ There’s a high-rise building that was accommodated in the secondary plan due to a density transfer to accommodate the historic Bethany house in the front and is set back from the street, reducing the impact.
  - ❖ There’s also a new nine story building, and it’s identified as a gateway intersection of Parkdale.
- The new R4U zoning on Armstrong allows 8 units on small 10 by 30-meter lots and that is equivalent to a density of 266 units per hector. This is far greater density than 80 units per hector that the new OP is looking to attain in the new urban transit corridor over the next 25 years period. We did not oppose this and so we are more than playing our part in intensification.
- Ottawa community immigrant services organization is just to the left of the site. It is a mid-rise building of nine stories built 30 years ago, and it does not impact Armstrong St, predates the secondary plan, and still meets all aspects and provides a huge community benefit.

- ❖ There are 28 solar panels on the roof that will be completely shaded in the afternoon in the winter months, according to the submitted shadow study, so there will be some revenue impact to this nonprofit housing.
- The applicant offered two units to be set aside as affordable rental units in perpetuity by a legally enforceable agreement with a nonprofit housing provider. This offer was an important precedent for affordable housing in Ottawa which we would like to see repeated.
- It's important for residents to have trust in the planning documents that they negotiated with city officials and developers. Secondary plans and CDP are negotiated plans where the community buys into and agrees to support intensification within parameters of the plan. The investment of time and effort by all parties is significant. Community members speak to protect what they love, where they live, while helping define housing in the city. Once the secondary plan is approved, it becomes part of the issue official plan. Therefore conformity to the secondary plan should follow.
  - ❖ The Planning staff report is justifying amendments siding alignment with the intent of, rather than adherence to the details of, the secondary plans. The role of the secondary plan is a key element of discussing within elements of the plan. there will be little confidence in cities assurances that secondary plans will be respected, undermining years of negotiations. Such exceptions that potentially further eroded the official plan.
  - ❖ Councillors must ensure that the citizens' confidence and trust in the planning process by making the right decisions and following the agreed upon planning framework. They must trust that the official plan, secondary plan, community plans are the result of meaningful stakeholder engagement.
  - ❖ When secondary plans are not respected, trust and declines and skepticism occurs.

**Brian Innes** (oral submission)

- Supports HCA comments.
- Don't make a mockery of the secondary plans by allowing something twice as tall as what is permitted.
- The spirit of the neighborhood is shaped by its buildings. These are predominantly mid and low-rise buildings.

- chose to live on from this area based on what exists and what is permitted to exist. The secondary plan is a well-thought-out vision for this neighborhood. This is a plan that people participated in and shaped.
- the developer's initial proposal for 23 stories is just ridiculous.
  - ❖ the land use rules only allow for six stories.
  - ❖ when someone buys property with certain zoning, they can't go against the comprehensive plan for the neighborhood. They can't build a building two or four times the height of what is allowed.
- Approving this means that all these planning documents don't have meaning at all.
- How can a 12-story building be consistent with the plan that allows for 9 storeys? How does high-rise fit a mid-rise character?
- As we near the finalization of the next official plan, we should know what plans mean. Development should reflect the community's vision.

**Jake Hanna** (oral submission; video held on file)

- Hintonburg currently has an overall density of 88 units/hectare. With 2743 new units approved for construction, density will increase to 122 units/hectare. Recently passed R4U zoning allows for 8 units on a 300-meter square lot, which translates to a density of 266 units/hectare. This proposed building would be 850 units/hectare 25 years from now.
  - ❖ We're meeting and exceeding intensification goals set for 25 years from now.
- According to Rod Lahey during an open house, the properties should have been a bad acquisition, but the client decided to move ahead with it. A bad business decision shouldn't lead to a bad planning decision.
  - ❖ In this same open house, the developer says that the sole rationale for the height of the building is the expense of the land as it was parceled together.
- Set a precedent by upholding the existing Plans. Otherwise, the overall effect on the neighbourhood will be political cynicism from residents.

**Emily Cumbaa** (written submission)

- object to the revised proposal

- agrees with the Hintonburg Community Association and Councillor Leiper that the proposal does not comply with the Community Design Plans
  - ❖ proposal is still too high, does not respect the set-back by-law, moves the Neighbourhood Line, and would change the character of the neighbourhood.
- The responses provided to the earlier objections of residents, the Community Association, and Councillor Leiper are not satisfactory.
- If approved, this development would overturn the Community Design Plans, contravene the integrity of the municipal planning process, and disregard the community's view.
- hopes that the city will respect by-laws, community planning, and the views of residents

**Jane Szepesi** (written submission)

- agrees with the Hintonburg Community Association and opposes the proposal
- Developments must follow the plan

**Deborah Murphy** (written submission)

- proposal is not consistent with the low-rise neighbourhood agreed in the Wellington West and Scott Street Secondary Plans that were both developed by City staff and the Community
  - ❖ will set a precedent for future development within this community that ignores both secondary plans
- proposal is out of scale with the low-rise residential community and Wellington and Somerset as Traditional Mainstreets.
- The large footprint of the development that faces my community is not characteristic of the rest of the community
- In favour of densification, but a building of 12-stories would allow a high-rise in a zone that is capped at mid-rise, not conforming with the present plan or proposed new Official Plan governing growth for the next 25 years
- This development should respect the 6-story zoning on Wellington

**Guy Landry** (written submission)

- disappointed in the direction this development is taking, and encourages members of the Planning Committee to adhere to the approved plans for this site (capped at 6 stories)
- concerned that taller buildings along Wellington Street will severely detract from what makes Hintonburg a desirable neighbourhood
  - ❖ Somerset Square is an amazing site, with tremendous potential which can be achieved with a development that conforms to the approved plans.

**Stuart Trew** (written submission)

- opposed to the current plan to build a 12-story high rise on the site
- the proposal violates the city's official secondary plan, which caps buildings at six storeys on Wellington, with a potential to go to nine stories at so-called designated gateways.
  - ❖ why are city staff recommending ignoring the cap to allow the private developer to build a 12-storey unit?
- Should council agree with staff on this, it will set a bad precedent for allowing high-rises in midrise zones across the city.
- The developer wants to build tall to make more money.
- Approving a 12-storey building on that site would be undemocratic. It violates the city's own plans, arrived at democratically, and will undermine the community's faith in local government.

**Maša Vucetic** (written submission)

- Opposes the development proposal at 961-979 Wellington & 26-40 Armstrong S, as it does not conform to the present plan

**Ben Waldman** (written submission)

- Opposes the height of the proposed development at 979 Wellington and adjacent properties. It does not conform to the present plan or to the proposed new Official Plan governing growth for the next 25 years which caps heights on Traditional Main Streets at 9 storeys.
- each approval of additional height inevitably sets a precedent in a neighbourhood, thereby allowing for even more height for the next development. This proposal uses the adjacent OCISO building at 9 storeys as part of the justification for their request for an increase to 12 storeys. Taller buildings do not make better neighbourhoods.

- Increases in height will lead to the "canyonization" of Wellington Street. It will lead to a wind tunnel effect and lack of sun on Wellington similar to what has already occurred on Richmond Road just west of Island Park.
- Planning Committee should not be swayed by the fact that the Proponent has reduced the number of stories from its original 23 to 12. Committee should take into account not only the number of stories but the overall height.

**William Szepesi** (written submission)

- respect the 6-storey zoning on Wellington
  - ❖ The location itself has a completely different character and has narrow streets unsuitable for the high traffic volumes associated with the 148 planned parking spots.
  - ❖ Vehicle access to this location will create congestion and noise for this peaceful residential neighborhood.
  - ❖ The blind corner next to the LCBO is already a hot spot for pedestrians, and additional local traffic at this corner will be dangerous and block up the low capacity of Wellington.
  - ❖ The sun will be blocked by this planned 12 story building for many local residents
- understand that the developers have paid a high price to acquire these properties, but that does not give them the right to override existing regulations in this way

**Ravi Philar & Carol Card** (written submission)

- frustrated to see further erosion of the City's Official Plan and the Secondary Plan with these two developments
- opposed to the developers' requests to exceed the 9-storey maximum height at each development. Why have Secondary Plans if the City's Planning Department won't abide by them?
- Strongly opposed to the creation of a wind tunnel on Wellington St.

**Ed Overstreet** (written submission)

- The proposed development is an excessive deviance from the city plan for this neighbourhood.



- residents might just as well never bother to participate in the consultation processes for future plans, since such approval would signal such participation would be a waste of our time.

**Barbara Clarke & Richard Nolan** (written submission)

- In a Canadian Press/ Leger poll the level of trust in politicians was rated at 18%. Even lawyers were rated at 54%. The erosion of trust between citizens and politicians is a major challenge for our society.
- For 10 years developers and citizens have relied on the secondary plan and no exceptions have been made. This proposal does not even meet the proposed new Official Plan governing growth for the next 25 years which caps heights on Traditional Main Streets
  - ❖ They have been arrived at through participation of all concerned and represent a compromise that respects all participants' values
  - ❖ Rely on plans that have been developed publicly and that have given rise to predictable results. They are a bond of trust between the citizenry and politicians.

**Nicola Brodie** (written submission)

- have witnessed vast changes to the infrastructure and character of our neighbourhood, most of which occurred in the last 5 years and have devastated the community, pushing out local, poorer families and single people.
- mature trees and green spaces have been uprooted and replaced by paved areas for parking. This, in a time of climate change, environmental concern and threat to native species.
- The rapid transit system was the justification for intensification in this area, crowding our small streets with cars.
- many of the units created are so expensive that they are unaffordable and can only attract people who have no connection to the area. I understand that there may well be growth but not at the expense of our residents being made homeless to expand the wealth of a few
- development in the vicinity should conform to plans that were agreed upon and should respect the 6 storey zoning on traditional main streets such as Wellington St.

**Chris Khng** (written submission)

- the development is in contravention of the Wellington St W Secondary Plan, which allows for 6 storeys (and up to a maximum of 9 storeys) at designated gateways, and only 4 storeys on the full depth of the Armstrong lots. This development would be the first in 10 years to not adhere to the Secondary Plan.
- there will be an upcoming Parkdale and Wellington proposal for 18 storeys which is also too high, will cut off lines of sight, increase already congested traffic flows, and cause more challenges for living in what is already a very quickly densifying neighbourhood
- appreciate the desire to increase potential growth in the area, but it must be done in a way that respects the configuration of the neighbourhood and also not cause more problems in terms of dangerous traffic flows, congestion, movement, noise, and livability.
- Planning Committee should look towards more affordable housing options in the neighbourhood and city, instead of increasing the already inflated housing market with further condo developments.

**Kevin Pickle** (written submission)

- Opposed to overturning the 6-storey zoning rule
- neighbourhood is already under stress due to near-constant tearing down and the erecting of multi-occupation homes
- The architectural heritage is being destroyed, green space reduced, and traffic congestion greatly increased
- Allowing buildings taller than 6 storeys in a residential area such as this will lead to the loss of human scale which is one of the most attractive features of Hintonburg and Mechanicsville to renters and home buyers

**Deborah Ironside** (written submission)

- The proposed buildings exceed the height allowed in the Wellington Street West in Hintonburg/Wellington Village has a Secondary Plan (2011 updated to 2021) that directs height of 6 storeys except at certain gateways where a possibility of 9 storeys may be granted. This location is not a gateway – it is in the middle of a little used stub of Wellington Street.
- The Official Plan itself recommends a maximum height of 9 stories. Any decision to newly permit high rise buildings should only be taken after a

comprehensive study and extensive public consultation that addresses the whole area, not just a limited report by the planning consultant for the applicant of this proposed development.

- If this proposed development is accepted, it will be seen as a breach of trust between the City of Ottawa and the Residents of Ottawa
- cautions Councillors on Planning Committee to consider both the clear language of the existing, up-to-date and defensible secondary plan currently in place, as well as the context in which this decision being taken before voting on this issue.

**Hélène Labbé** (written submission)

- The caps on building heights (in the Secondary Plan and the Official Plan) on traditional main streets are specifically stated as mid-rise with a usual height of 6 storeys and a maximum of 9.
- Main and adjacent streets are already congested in the neighbourhood. Judging by the available parking spaces proposed one cannot rely on residents forgoing owning a vehicle.
- Asked numerous questions, including but not limited to:
  - ❖ Why has Hintonburg been chosen as the main area of intensification in the city, notwithstanding the proximity to a light rail station?
  - ❖ Why does the city continue to allow the demolition of modest low-income residences only to replace them with more of the same high rise costly condo/apartments?
  - ❖ Where are low-income residents supposed to live?
  - ❖ Why are more green spaces, true green spaces, not incorporated into the Official Plans?

**Carol Paschal** (written submission)

- this development would result in the demolition of an entire existing block of Hintonburg, which also happens to be located at the gateway to the neighbourhood.
- It is far too much density for the small neighbourhood and will result in increased traffic and congestion.
- it doesn't make sense that the developer would be allowed to provide 148 parking spots for 248 apartments given that Bayview Station is within walking

distance, which does not support the City's goals with respect to walkable neighbourhoods, increased use of transportation and the environment

- The Wellington St. W. Secondary Plan only allows for 6 storeys on Wellington St. W, with up to 9 storeys at designated gateways and 4 storeys on Armstrong.
- would result in a bad precedent being established for the remaining parts of Wellington St. W and any other traditional main street in the city
- contradicts the proposed new Official Plan for the next 25 years which limits heights on traditional main streets at 9 storeys.

#### **Maurice Lewis** (written submission)

- Voting “yes” means
  - ❖ a rejection of the Wellington Street Secondary Plan and an okay to more high-rise buildings on Wellington Street
  - ❖ Creation of a precedent for the rest of Wellington Street
  - ❖ Abandoning the 2011 Secondary Plan

#### Primary reasons for support, by individual

#### **The applicant, as presented by Rod Lahey, RLA Architecture; Miguel Tremblay, FoTenn; Maureen Flanigan, MLDevco** (oral and written submission; slides held on file)

- The OPA would revise the permitted height of the building from 6 and 9-storeys to 12-storeys in the Wellington Street West Secondary Plan. The ZBLA would implement a site-specific height and setback schedule.
  - ❖ Although the Secondary Plan currently contemplates 9-storeys on the westernmost portion of the ML lands, the large site area, separation to abutting residential areas and proximity to transit stations and corridors allows for the reconsideration of policy documents, including the Secondary Plan.
  - ❖ the U-shaped building provides a mid-block connection envisioned by the Secondary Plan and a positive transition to Armstrong House, an important heritage structure in the Community.
- the site occupies the entire block bounded by Wellington Street West to the south, Garland Street to the west, Armstrong Street to the north, and Hilda Street to the east, and has an area of approximately 2,915 square metres,

with frontage of 57.39 metres along Wellington Street West and 50.8 metres along Garland Street.

- The site is located at the intersection of Wellington Street West and Somerset Street West. Both streets are designated as Transit Priority Corridor (Isolated Measures). The site is located within 600 metres of Bayview Light Rapid Transit (LRT) station. Once the Corso Italia LRT station is constructed, the site will be within 600 metres of two rapid transit stations.
  - ❖ there are only a few sites on Traditional Mainstreets that coincide with proximity to LRT stations or Transit Priority Corridors. There are also very few large lot, entire-block sites that provide for sufficient opportunities for transition and proximity to community space.
- In response to comments, the previous design for a 23-storey tower with a six-storey podium has been redesigned to a 12-storey, U-shaped mixed-use residential apartment building, with varying 9 and 4-storey podium heights and step-backs.
- The site faces is directly across from Somerset Square. By way of a Community Benefit, ML is providing a financial contribution to raise the road to allow the City to enhance Somerset Square.
- The revised design provides for an appropriate built form transition achieved through incremental changes in building height, street fronting, at-grade units, strategic placement of taller buildings, landscaping and streetscaping, sensitive massing, pedestrian access, architectural features and building step-backs.
- the proposed development and the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications are reasonable and appropriate for the site and represent good planning.
- Location: highlight the uniqueness of this site and its relationship to the community. The adjacency to the park is front and center with the closing of the street on Wellington St. The Armstrong House is immediately to the north. There's an existing 10 story building across Hilda St and an LCBO across Garland St.
- Originally start with just a 9 story building on Garland St, and then they acquire further property to make up  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the site. Purchasing the other properties on Hilda St allowed us to close off Wellington St completely and give an opportunity for the City to use that park area for something unique. It

also allowed us to move our access to an underground parking garage to Hilda St, which helps control traffic.

- ❖ Armstrong House was originally fronting on Wellington St until the land was divided. By opening the center block of the property, Armstrong House is reconnected to Wellington St
- Retail areas are fronting on Wellington St. On Armstrong, there's 2 story, 3 bedroom townhouses. Thought this would be a unique approach to our frontage on Armstrong St.
- Took the sandstone material used on Armstrong House and replicated it on the frontage on Armstrong St to connect the two.

**Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision:** Debate: The Committee spent two hours and 18 minutes in consideration of the item.

Vote: The committee considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as presented.

## **Ottawa City Council**

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between September 9 (Planning Committee consideration date) and September 22, 2021 (Council consideration date): 4

### **Primary concerns, by individual**

#### **Linda Hoad, Co-chair, Zoning Committee, Hintonburg Community Association**

- Opposes the proposal for a 13-story development
  - ❖ Nine storeys is the maximum height permitted in the entire Secondary Plan area, and then only above 6-storeys at specific gateway sites that are identified by address for possible increased heights through rezoning.
- a decision to newly permit high-rise buildings on the Traditional Mainstreet should only be done after a comprehensive study and extensive public consultation that addresses the whole area, not just a limited report by the planning consultant for this applicant.
- The planning rationale provided by the applicant relies in part on the assertion that the Somerset Square policy area of the Wellington West Secondary Plan (defined on schedule B of the Plan) is a “gateway location.” This is an inaccurate interpretation of the Secondary Plan, which defines

specific gateway locations (individual properties) where such rezonings may take place.

- ❖ there is no provision for expanding the gateway locations in the Plan, so the planning rationale should not include an assumption of land consolidation or that a high-rise will be developed at this location. Relying on a fictitious future high-rise context at the gateway sites is not justified
- it is our position that the by-law requirement for a setback of 2.0 m above the 3rd storey/12.0 m must be enforced. Similarly, the requested reduction of the required corner yard side yard setback from 3.0 m to 2.0 m on Hilda Street and to 1.8 m on Garland Street must be refused.
- the Scott Street Secondary Plan clearly and definitively provides that the Neighbourhood Line shall not be moved simply because of lot consolidation and further states that the existing areas outside the Line are sufficient to accommodate necessary intensification.
  - ❖ no rationale has been provided for moving the Neighbourhood Line beyond their wish to consolidate lots and provide a uniform planning regime, contrary to the clearly stated policy in the Scott Street Secondary Plan.
  - ❖ the Neighbourhood Line must not be moved to accommodate the desire to construct a high-rise building where one was not envisioned.
- the correct angular plane to be used to achieve appropriate height transition to the adjacent low-rise neighbourhood should preferably be that required by By-law 2012-349 which establishes the angular plane from the neighbourhood line, or at the least should be drawn from the property line of the Armstrong house at ground level (B), or from the rear lot line of the proposed consolidated lot of the subject property at 14.5 m (A) as in the TM 11[2461] zone.
- while the HCA does not oppose the proposed mid-block pedestrian connection, we want to emphasize that it cannot be considered a public benefit or basis for the proposed development to be approved.

### **Julianna Foster**

- disappointed with the recent decision to allow the development of a 12-story building at 961-979 Wellington St W.
- location is zoned for 6 storeys, and even if it were a gateway into Hintonburg,

which it is not, 12 storeys still exceeds the accepted 9 storey gateway height.

- This location is already congested and cannot adapt to such an increase.
- sets precedent for the proposed development at Wellington and Parkdale, at an already congested intersection, and next door to a retirement residence and long-term care home
- Why have an Official Plan if it is ignored when a developer makes a request? Why engage the public in consultations if our wisdom of living in this community is ignored?

❖ Loss of trust in the Planning Committee

### **Joe Van Ryn**

- These proposals are excessive and are part of an over intensification of the area in recent years
- Large number of projects proceeding simultaneously is too much. Give time to see the impact of what is already underway before approving more.
- There's a huge demand on infrastructure and services in the neighbourhood and add to the noise and congestion
- traffic congestion and parking issues on Parkdale and the surrounding area will surely get worse even without these recent developments which will take those concerns to a new unprecedented and unjustified level.
- urge the committee to not allow these projects to continue as proposed and to limit the size and scope of it to preserve the fabric of the community in Hintonburg and surrounding area.

### **Primary reasons for support, by individual**

#### **Daniel-Robert Gooch**

- In favour of allowing higher building heights.
- Disagrees with the Hintonburg Community Association, of which he is a member

#### **Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:**

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations without amendment.