

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Angie Melo](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda 11.1
Date: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 4:16:00 PM

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

Hello, my name is Sasha Zambri, I live at [REDACTED] in Ward 10 represented by Sue McFadden. I am writing for the council to vote against the Streetsville Heritage Conservation District. This will prevent homes being built for low-income Canadians from being built next to a planned Major Transit Station Area. This will hurt people like single mothers, seniors, and young families such as my own. This planned needs to be voted against before it becomes impossible to build homes anymore as councillor McFadden has shown concern about gatekeepers stopping housing. This will make homes built today, younger than my own children, to be considered heritage properties and prevent them from being demolished and create new homes for community members. Heritage homes should be protected individually. They do not need an area to be protected when they have been protected for generations without a HCD.

I am deeply concerned about Section 3.8 on Adjacent Properties. The current wording appears to grant broad authority that could be used to restrict development in areas surrounding the HCD. While this section does not explicitly block housing, its ambiguous language leaves room for such an outcome. I strongly urge that this section be revised or removed from the proposed plan. The provision requiring adjacent properties to prepare a "cultural heritage impact assessment" introduces unnecessary delays in the planning process for housing on non-historic properties outside the HCD. Additionally, the legislation's strict requirements—such as evaluating shadow impacts on heritage attributes, isolating attributes from their context, and obstructing significant views or vistas—impose burdensome standards. These stipulations make medium- to high-density developments near the HCD practically unfeasible. Revising or eliminating this section would streamline approval processes, promote housing construction, and still safeguard the HCD's historical character.

Regarding Section 2.2.6 on New Construction, the language on height, massing, setbacks, and building scale in subsection B, along with height limitations in subsection D, needs reevaluation. Stopping the demolition of homes that were built yesterday is not preserving heritage. I love Streetsville but change has always been a positive thing and we need to make sure people can enjoy it and live in it. Stopping housing will make streetsville a ghost town. Although I understand that the plan is not intended to restrict development, it lacks explicit language affirming flexibility for heights exceeding 2.5 storeys or reduced setbacks. Housing should be 4 stories to allow for more homes for families. Since this plan will guide development for generations, it is crucial to include clear provisions that ensure these guidelines are not misinterpreted as rigid barriers to density.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns. I look forward to seeing revisions that promote clarity, flexibility, and balanced development.