

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 24. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Properties located at 790, 792 and 794 Quebec Street (Z-8819)

- Matt Boda, Harrison Pensa, on behalf of the applicant – advising that the Thames Valley District School Board did approach the property owners on Glasgow Street as well; indicating that, if you question why just the three properties on Quebec Street, the homeowner immediately adjacent to the school on Glasgow Street was not willing to enter into terms for an agreement of purchase and sale that were reasonable to the school board so the school board did not move forward with the purchase of the other two lots on Glasgow Street which is why they are just looking to expand the school yard on the Quebec Street properties.
- Rene Capstick, 741 Glasgow Street – advising that he is the gentleman that the previous speaker was referring to; pointing out that as far as the school board approaching him about the sale of his home, it was not him that walked away, it was the school board, when the school board did not get the chance to dictate terms as to how he was going to sell his house, that is when they walked away; reiterating that it was not him, it was not his decision; they chose to dictate and he was not prepared to have anything dictated to him; as far as this site plan application goes, he would like to know what would happen if this application failed, what would be the implications to the students themselves; we have gone through a process here now where they had people accommodation reviews and one of the responses that he gets to the few that he has had is that it keeps mentioning a long-term plan; advising that the school was open for three months before this all started again, if we have had a site plan approval and we have gone through all these processes to come up with a long-term plan, why are we now sitting here, again, looking to expand this school; we are wasting tax dollars here not only because we are going to lose three houses from the tax role, we are also spending money, we have also incurred expenses on Quebec Street and we are looking to expand it because of these expansions; these were not decisions that were made by a community, there was actually a backlash in the Lorne Avenue area over closing Lorne Avenue in the first place; the school made the decision to proceed with the land that they had; it was an issue that was brought forward that there was not enough space, they were the ones that chose to proceed and move forward with the space that they had; asking why are we looking at developing this after less than three months of operation; these decisions do not happen overnight; throwing it out there to say that this decision was actually made well in place before the school actually opened; wondering why we are wasting all this money; noting that he cannot get answers from the school boards, he cannot get answers from anybody as to where these decisions are actually coming from other than they wish to dictate terms; as a public entity, he does not see where that is actually relevant, they are paying for these things and they are not getting results, this whole project has gone how far over budget in the first place; stating that the public budget that they were given was \$3.6 million in order to build this school and the last numbers that he heard were over \$10 million and that does not include this expansion; advising that he does not personally view this as an expansion at all, you have two separate lots; wondering how this benefits the students as to athletic performances or anything like that; stating that they do not connect; advising that the traffic in the area has already increased by adding busloads of students from one school to another; realizing that the schools whole thing is that they want to save money and bring better programs to the school; thinking they should save money by not wasting it on projects like this; put it back into the programs that are going to educate our students rather than building Goliath projects that do not make sense, that the public does not want; indicating that you can throw as many lawyers as you want at him, he is just here to try to protect himself; stating that he has lived in that house for twenty-five years and to have someone walk over to him and say this is what we are going to give you for your house and then walk away because they did not get the answer they were looking for, sorry, that is not democracy.
- Mae Hrycak, 788 Quebec Street – indicating that she is directly beside the properties that are going to change; advising that their preference was to keep the land as residential housing; stating that the original houses that were sold a few months ago, in the summer, were in good condition at the time that they were sold; indicating that, over the past few months, however, the structures have started to deteriorate, possibly with purpose for demolition; advising that partial demolition has already started; noting that certain parts of the houses have been taken apart but the structures are still standing there; feeling that, at this point in time, they have not been granted appropriate involvement in the rezoning application decision since the school district has left the properties vacant for so long now it is almost becoming the better choice to demolish them; believing that this impactive decision greatly affects them and yet it feels like this meeting is occurring so long after the

school board took possession that they are unable to express their concerns in a timely manner, which she feels is unfair and is being bullied; advising that the issues that she wrote in the written application that were important to where the future values of their property, including resale value, market desirability, possible property taxes changing, these are all concerns that she has initially researched herself because the process has taken so long and she wanted answers quickly; expressing concern with the effect of possible permits for herself as they are planning on flipping their house in approximately five years, possibly adding a second storey to their house and she is not sure if permits for that will now change as there will be a different type of property beside them if it is school property versus a home dwelling; if the rezoning application should be approved, she has a few requests and she would like actual guarantees from the school board on these – the integrity of their property during the demolition, specifically basement flooding due to land shifts or debris, prevention and clean up; noting that she did not see this specifically addressed in the written application today as shown in the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda, protection of their property from accidental damage from students should this become school property, such as balls hitting their house, students walking on their property, what sort of guarantees do they have from the school that something like that will not happen and, if it does, who is going to pay for damages; stating that in the proposal they are suggesting a six foot fence, she would like to suggest an eight to ten foot fence as six foot would not be adequate as it is pretty easy for someone to climb and maybe that is a school yard that people are in there after hours and someone could easily access their backyard if it is only six feet high; expressing concern, because she is directly beside these properties, would be adequate space for maintenance of her property on the north side for grass cutting, access to the gas meter as the property lines are right beside that property; wondering how she is going to access and maintain her side of the house if there is going to be a fence; expressing concern with ground grading to prevent water flow; asking for clarity on the road widening of thirteen metres; wondering if that is just for the demolition or if that is a permanent change.