

This response will also serve to provide comments to council.

Rodrigo, James, and LeeAnne, I was unable to attend this meeting due to illness.

I have listened to the recording. Thanks.

I am disturbed by the mental model the city is taking on this matter, and would request a number of steps be taken to address what is effectively a planning failure.

First of all I think there is consensus on the need for some kind of proper restoration and nice development of this property, and I do appreciate your time on this discussion.

I totally disagree on assumptions made by city staff on how this should be done. When listening to the session, no one responded to Beth's question /statement that the property may not be worth the asking price given the need for cleanup. When selling a house, it is worth less if it needs work. This should not be the city's / community's problem to facilitate an outcome for a company that used and polluted a property over years by approving a zoning / development that by all measures is out of line for this area.

I totally disagree with city staff regarding how significant this area is for parkland, trails, wildlife, floodplain, etc. This is a rare opportunity to have a development in line with the river in the inner city rather than line it with concrete. These criteria appear to be ad hoc, arbitrary, but mostly short sighted. Do you think 50 years from now our kids will think we protected enough green space?

We bought our house in 1990 when my job took us here. The neighborhoods rallied against excessive density in development of the piano factory and ancillary property. The result was a much better reasonable outcome.

Regarding the mid 2000's zoning changes, I note that councillor Leanne Caron observed there was no way to even tell what was changed without individuals doing a side by side analysis. (Which no one was even made aware of). Clearly if residents had been made aware, concerns would have been raised. This was either sloppily rushed, or staff knew it would be unpopular, so best kept under the radar. I also wonder what involvement ArmTec had in that process Either way, the rezoning process was clearly flawed, should be reversed to the original vision, and potentially redone with a proper process.

I also disagree that questions of infrastructure needs should only dealt with when proposals are made. That may be true for some details, but there needs to be a reasonable assessment of what is feasible or desired during zoning. There is no

way of dealing with that many people without totally wrecking the local community experience. This neighborhood is single family homes with a couple low impact industrial businesses.... I'm sure you would be opposed to towers blocking sunlight, looking down into your yards near any of your houses.

A development without cars is also not remotely realistic to the needs of working families. I believe this to be self evident. There are neither the road accesses or space for that many cars let alone visitors. Dufferin and side streets are already jammed with cars. This will have a huge impact to current homeowners.

While Morgan spoke in favour of her experience in Burlington, I would say that is not comparing apples to apples. People knew what they were moving into and made that choice. This is changing what we bought into.

I suggest:

1. Reverse the flawed zoning decision that was done without any consultation of those impacted.
2. Figure out what an appropriate development scale may be...park, low or medium density. Armtec should be responsible for cleanup either directly before sale or indirectly through a lower property evaluation. If the property becomes abandoned, Armtec should be heavily taxed.

Randy Jackiw