

Schedule 3 to the Minutes of the
Council Meeting for Public
Hearings held on Monday,
December 16, 2013.

My name is Douglas Nazareth and I m a resident of 7480 Ash Street.

Thank you for heeding our concerns at the May Public hearing and sending them back to Planning. The work planning staff have done is quite thorough and makes sense. Having said that, I would like to request Council to pl take a moment to look at the big picture here. When area residents worked so hard on the OCP in the mid nineties we all agreed to having two lots subdivided in to 5 houses, two facing Ash and 3 facing Armstrong. Somewhere in that process and before the OCP was finalised ZS14 zoning was introduced on East West roads. So this development application is in fact completely in keeping with the current OCP. Having said that, we all know that Council from time to time will make amendments to the OCP to satisfy a particular developements needs. This is done in the developers and the cities interests. Would it not be nice if Council could amend the OCP for once in the greater interest of the neighbourhood? So here is what I would like to suggest.

The city should buy the backs of the two lots [7460 and 7480] from the applicant. Leave the proposed area completely undeveloped with the existing pedestrian walkway going through it along General Currie. This will naturally connect all of South Maclellan through Paulik park. There is a considerable amount of density along the perimeter of Souh McLellan and this will provide a welcome people oriented pathway plus ensure traffic calming at the very heart of South Mclellan.

If we were to go ahead with the developement, then we should allow just three houses on larger lots facing Armstrong, in the process saving many more beautiful, mature trees.

3] If all that I ask above is not possible, pl at least try to protect more of the good trees that are slated for felling. For example, there are two very beautiful and mature tree's right up against the fence on the west side of the proposed development that are clearly earmarked for removal. Could the city consider putting a protective covenant against those tree's from being cut down and build a house around them? Why not give the green of the tree's precedence over the green of the money for a change?

Thank you for your time and your kind consideration.