



GCA Survey on Lansdowne Park Redevelopment: Results

The Glebe Community Association conducted an online survey via www.kwiksurveys.com between Wednesday, June 16th and Monday, June 21st, 2010. A message about the survey was sent to the GCA mailing list and the link was posted on our website and Facebook page. 79 responses were received. Verbatim comments from questions 2 through 9 are provided at the end of this document.

Introduction

The Glebe Community Association would like to know the opinions of Glebe residents on the latest plans for the redevelopment of Lansdowne Park. Because there is a range of opinions on how to best revitalize the park, we have provided a range of options in several of the questions. This will allow us to better understand what would be considered acceptable to the majority of Glebe residents. We can't hope to speak for everyone, but we do try our best to speak for the majority.

Please answer this survey by Monday, June 21st so we can accurately represent your views in front of City Council on June 24th and 25th.

Results

Question 1*

For sorting purposes, please provide your postal code.

This question was posed to ensure respondents were Glebe residents. A check against Glebe postal codes has not been conducted but all codes were K1S (central Ottawa).

Question 2*

Based on community consultations last fall, the GCA passed motions regarding the redevelopment of Lansdowne Park:www.glebeca.ca/committees/lansdowne/GCAmotionsOct272009final.pdf

Indicate your level of agreement with the GCA continuing to use these motions to represent the majority of Glebe residents' views on the redevelopment of Lansdowne Park.

Strongly Agree	53	- 67%
Agree	15	- 19%
Neutral	4	- 5%
Disagree	2	- 3%
Strongly Disagree	5	- 6%

Question 3*

Choose one preferred option for the redevelopment of Lansdowne Park.

Current proposal of a 30 year lease of some land with the entire site run by a Municipal Services Corporation	8	- 10%
A different private-public arrangement	15	- 19%
City owns runs and pays for the entire site	35	- 44%
City sells a portion of the land for commercial / residential use and owns runs and pays for the rest of the site	16	- 20%
Other (describe in Comments section)	5	- 6%

Question 4*

Choose one preferred option for a residential component of Lansdowne Park.

Current proposal of 12 & 14 storey towers condos above the retail and townhomes for a total of 280 to 290 residential units	7	- 9%
280 to 290 units in towers that conform to traditional main street height requirements (six storeys)	13	- 16%
Residential units along Holmwood only with height requirements as per zoning on that street	35	- 44%
No residential component	19	- 24%
Other (describe in Comments section)	5	- 6%

Question 5*

Choose one preferred option for a commercial component of Lansdowne Park.

Current proposal of 340 000 sq. ft. including large grocery store and cineplex	8	- 10%
No more than 60 000 sq. ft new retail for all of Glebe over next 5 years 121 000 over next 10 years (as per Glebe BIA)	28	- 35%
A restriction on sizes of stores regardless of total square footage (to avoid big box stores)	18	- 23%
No commercial component	16	- 20%
Other (describe in Comments section)	9	- 11%

Question 6*

Choose one preferred option for the stadium at Lansdowne Park.

Current proposal of \$130 million renovation	10	- 13%
\$38 million renovation (which City study says will last 30 years)	9	- 11%
Very minor renovations for 5 - 10 year lifespan to prove viability of football	15	- 19%
Remove stadium and civic centre at cost of \$15 million	5	- 6%
Remove stadium only	32	- 41%
Other (describe in Comments section)	8	- 10%

Question 7*

Choose one preferred option for the eastern section of Sylvia Holden Park (with wading pool and other facilities).

Accept the jury-chosen Design B which modifies the community park and integrates it into the Lansdowne Urban Park	14	- 18%
Modify Design B so that all recreational facilities are included with minimal changes	24	- 30%
Retain as is with no changes and separate from Lansdowne	37	- 47%
Other (describe in Comments section)	4	- 5%

Question 8

Which aspect of the Lansdowne Park redevelopment is of greatest interest to you? Rank in order with 1 being the greatest interest and 7 being the least interest. Use each ranking only once.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Responses	Total
Additional greenspace	68%	21%	5%	3%	1%	0%	3%	77	16%
Expanded farmers' market	9%	53%	20%	8%	4%	3%	4%	76	15%
New retail (other than farmers' market)	3%	7%	12%	24%	24%	14%	16%	74	15%
New residential	1%	1%	23%	33%	25%	11%	5%	73	15%
New office space	0%	0%	5%	8%	33%	43%	11%	75	15%
Refurbished stadium	11%	8%	8%	16%	7%	21%	29%	73	15%
Other (describe in Comments section)	16%	14%	27%	5%	7%	9%	23%	44	9%

Question 9

Which aspect of the Lansdowne Park redevelopment is of greatest concern to you? Rank in order with 1 being the biggest concern and 8 being the least concern. Use each ranking only once.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Responses	Total
Increased traffic (due to intensification of site)	25%	17%	21%	14%	13%	5%	1%	3%	76	13%
Finances (cost to taxpayers)	24%	25%	12%	13%	11%	11%	4%	0%	75	13%
Heritage (impact on Aberdeen and Horticulture buildings)	7%	4%	14%	21%	18%	14%	15%	6%	71	12%
Procurement (sole source nature of commercial development)	15%	15%	19%	16%	8%	8%	9%	9%	74	13%
Retail (impact on local businesses)	1%	7%	19%	19%	20%	16%	16%	3%	75	13%
Loss of trade show space (to a location outside the core)	1%	0%	3%	4%	3%	23%	14%	53%	74	13%
Loss of publicly owned space (to commercial uses)	16%	17%	7%	11%	15%	12%	21%	1%	75	13%
Loss of control of entire space (to a new Municipal Services Corporation)	13%	14%	6%	3%	13%	14%	19%	19%	72	12%

Question 10

Would you like to be added to the GCA's mailing list? If so, provide your email address here. It will be kept private and your responses to this survey will remain anonymous.

14 new email addresses were collected. Several respondents indicated they were already on the list.

Verbatim comments on Questions 2 through 9

Question 2

1995088	Far too complicated. Support the Lansdowne Park Conservancy nonprofit management model. The issue is not stadium, the issue is Lansdowne. Accept that Pro Football does not belong and take down the South Stands, half of the north and keep the arena and trade space.	View
1995186	Ownership must remain public.	View
1995212	I am a home-owner in the Glebe and I FAVOUR the Lansdowne Live proposal. GCA has been lax in expressing my view. They are sending the incorrect impression that all Glebites are opposed to Lansdowne Live.	View
1995662	The GCA motions reflect an "it's my ball and I don't want to let anyone else play with it" mentality. The GCA should be engaged in making the proposal better. This redevelopment will happen, with or without GCA involvement. It is much better to have been involved, and probably get some positive changes, than to have spent all the time complaining about process issues. Note that creating biased surveys, such as this one or some of the others that the GCA has done, only harms the credibility of the GCA. Some of the questions are not much better than the "do you still beat your dog?" style of question.	View
1995822	The GCA recommendations are very modest. They don't mention, for example, that the CFL has failed twice in Ottawa in recent years.	View
1996077	It still does not seem possible to support the OSEG proposal since it goes against the whole idea of proper process with respect to deciding how the site should be used and developed.	View
1996112	I think the traffic study which has come out is greatly flawed. Any sense would tell you that there will be enormous impact on the Glebe with the vision of Lansdowne the City is now proposing. Moreoever, any location of a stadium should be at a transportation hub. Also the City is bypassing its own principles re. housing. It is not only a flawed process, but I believe a corrupt process.	View
1996899	Agree with many but not all of the motions. I support 1a, b and c and 2a. I don't support much of 2b - I am against pushing for the array of impact studies requested. Go for the traffic study and the need for public land assessment. Forget the other 5. I don't agree with 3a, never have: stop fighting the stadium. Support 4a, except for insisting on the Farmers' Market, which could really go anywhere and doesn't need to be at Lansdowne. Support all of 5a except no need to push for "affordable housing", but the rest of 5a I support. Completely support 6a.	View
1997163	I think the GCA has done an excellent job of presenting information and giving people a chance to respond.	View
2006523	Come on, neighbours. We don't live in a stagnate country town. We live in a capital city that is under-developed and under used. You want no development? Move to your cottage. You don't want traffic? Move to your cottage. Give me a break. The vehemence with which some of you are anti-Lansdowne is off putting, petty and scary. Stop frothing at the mouth over a movie theatre and a grocery store. Our little upper middle class urban country oasis will be sullied by other people from the city clogging up your green space? Get a grip.	View
2006987	The employees and elected officials of the City of Ottawa never cease to surprise me with their incompetence. I really need to get involved in municipal politics at some point in the future. The development (and lack of competitive bids) of Lebreton Flats is simply absurd, and here we go again with Lansdowne Park. The RCMP should be brought in to investigate whether any city officials will benefit from the proposed Lansdowne Park redevelopment plan (i.e. will get jobs similar to Claridge's relationship with city officials!!).	View
2012221	While these principles were viable last October, after so much discussion, there would need to be some changes made to these motions, with some re-thinking of the detail to reflect current realities. eg starting all over again looking for proposals is not realistic now. However, all effort should be directed to REVISING the current proposals to provide a balanced perspective between commercial and green space.	View
2016372	Many of the motions have been addressed already.	View
2017967	You need to add the Horticulture Building issue.	View
2022311	I agree that Lansdowne should remain in public hands and \$130 million could be much better spent on making Lansdowne a vibrant recreational space. This amounts to a \$130 million subsidy for professional sport (CFL and others)-- if pro. sport needs such a subsidy to survive in Ottawa, then it is not a feasible business model.	View
2024724	I am strongly in favour of keeping the "park" status of Lansdowne intact (e.g. significant green space), while pursuing additional options that complement the current neighbourhood and Bank Street retail (e.g. farmers' market).	View

Question 3

1995088	Lansdowne Park Conservancy. A member of the community will be represented on the board.	View
1995273	let open competition bring about a preferred option	View
1995449	1.Developer takes the financial risk with limited and capped City exposure 2.Lease private lands to developer with lease that can be terminated for failure to develop and maintain in accordance with development agreement 3.City rent for commercial based on commercial revenue participating %	View
1995578	Frontage on Bank and Holmwood sold on open market with remaining land public.	View
1995662	The current proposal is the best we can expect to have given that the City wants the stadium fixed up (not a new stadium built somewhere else) and the City doesn't want this to end up costing too much (either up front or on an annual basis). No matter what the opponents of the proposal say, City staff show convincing numbers that this proposal will not be an ongoing tax burden. All other options listed above cannot be evaluated without real details.	View
1995774	public land and assets are being given away with no prospect of ever getting them back once they're sold, such moves are effectively irreversible (and short sighted) lets keep this asset public hands and decide together without pressure from one commercial proponent to act quickly to get a stadium where pro football can be played ; what a sham of an 'emergency' that is	View
1995822	The City should not hand this key location over to the development industry. The City should develop it in such a way as to provide an interesting place that will be a destination for Ottawa residents and visitors.	View
1996029	'twould be nice. could ottawa afford this?	View
1996442	Lansdowne Conservancy http://www.emcottawaeast.ca/20100603/news/Area+resident+pushes+Lansdowne+Park+Conservancy	View
1996603	City must maintain control over the entire site. Other uses and private resources can be used to help to pay for the site. For example, if there is a stadium on the site, operation and revenue form the stadium can be directed to private interests in retun for their capital investment.	View
1996899	Not well enough informed to state a preference withh confidence.	View
1996946	I am opposed to the current arrangement that is completely based on having a football team at the park -- what happens when it fails again? I would like to see the stadium off the park and start over with an international design competition for the whole site. I think that there could be a good partnership with private/public sector (e.g. retail, city art gallery, parkland)	View
1996956	I would support housing and commercial development under city ownership of a strip of land along Holmwood. I strongly oppose providing this valuable property to developers for their revenue benefits.	View
1997014	Keep Lansdowne in public hands and develop according to best planning principles including open design contest.	View
1997163	A possible alternative would be the conservancy proposed by John Martin.	View
1997415	- such a plan could and should include some revenue-producing activities that are mostly recreationally and entertainment-base - I would not rule out a phased refurbishment of Frank Claire along the lines of Molson stadium in Montreal, especially if the revenue could help pay for the future phases of the park and stadium	View
2002361	Let the federal government run it like Granville Island	View
2003423	We are not opposed to some form of public/private partnership or even fully city owned/operated. However the partnership should not adversely affect the citizens of ottawa	View
2006523	I am fine with the current city plan. This questions is confusing and poorly worded. Is this the current one? I like what is in place.	View
2006812	I don't believe public land should be given out, and if cost are too high, then selling a portion is an acceptable option.	View
2006987	Ottawa and the Glebe do NOT need another CFL franchise which is likely destined to fail yet again as I have not to date seen any viable football business model for this city. Get rid of the stadium and expand the civic center into a multi-purpose athletic center with indoor pool and track. Invest in the health of Ottawa residents, not in professional sport franchises & owners who will get rich on the concessions, etc.	View
2010862	Turn it into parkland except for the horticultural building and the Aberdeen Pavilion, which should be used for cultural activities and a permanent home for the Farmer's Market	View
2016372	The current option allows for the most benefit for the greatest amount of Ottawa residents. We will never get 100% buy-in for any solution. There will always be detractors. The current plan is the best we've ever seen.	View
2022398	If this option is considered unaffordable by the city, would also support selling a small portion of the land for residential (but not commercial) use, provided the scale of residential development is compatible with its surroundings.	View

2024724	As others have commented: great cities have great parks. This is the one remaining, centrally-located space that can become Ottawa's great park. Let us not squander it with commercial, retail & residential uses. Let us develop a vision for the park, and the proceed to its proper planning, design and implementation, with appropriate taxpayer input throughout. I was horrified to learn that the proposed agreement would allow the declaration of a significant portion of land to be surplus, with the private partner's having first right of refusal to buy it (which might entail further commercial/residential use).	View
---------	---	----------------------

Question 4

1995088	Not an inch. You go that route and it is just a matter of degree. 100% public. Period.	View
1995212	Too much residential. This was not part of the original plan. I feel there was some misrepresentation on the part of the developers in this regard.	View
1995217	How about some mixed housing so that not everyone has to have a high income to live in the Glebe?	View
1995282	There should be no residential component on city owned parkland	View
1995469	There can be some limited residential development, but not too much. Leased condos are probably the best option, tastefully mixed in with the rest of the site, no more than six storeys.	View
1995662	The Lord Lansdowne is already well over 6 storeys tall (I'd guess it's at least 10). The ideal answer is to have the buildings no taller than they need to be, but that depends on how the finances work out.	View
1995774	see above; no residential component except perhaps some affordable (and hi quality) housing	View
1995822	It would depend upon the use(s) that the rest of the site would serve. It's not possible to say precisely what if any housing should be installed in isolation from decisions on the main (uses of the Park.	View
1995849	It is a public park.	View
1996112	How many units can the area support. Who is living in these units? Young people without children, old retirees, or families? (There seems like a glut of condos already on the market.) It makes a difference to traffic and schools as to what is put there. A small residential component might work, but this seems like quite a large component, like a subdivision.	View
1996448	An optimal number of residential units in buildings that conform to traditional main street height requirements; this means a lower number that would leave enough space for a park and pool at least as big than the current figuration and would also leave space for building 2 new schools, one French and one English, which are desperately needed in the Glebe.	View
1996899	No high rises, no need to pack them in.	View
1996956	If housing is deemed important, public housing could be built along Holmwood with treed green space between the housing and the street. Ownership should remain with the city to allow future changes in the use of the park.	View
1997163	Six storeys along Bank but no housing on Holmwood so that the beautiful trees will be retained.	View
1997415	- potentially some limited rent-geared-to-income on public land but the sources of financing for this are probably not available	View
2003423	The current proposal is not in keeping with the neighbourhood	View
2006523	The same people who decry the building of sprawling suburbs are the same ones who don't want densification in the downtown core? Of course we do, just not in OUR neighbourhood? Can't have it both ways. Densification is the key to making Ottawa a great city.	View
2006987	I do support additional residential development/zoning as part of the Lansdowne Park redevelopment. Urban sprawl needs to be slowed down and increasing core density is the only solution. I am tired of humans encroaching on wildlife habitat. If I hear of another stupid family that lives south of the city complain about a coyote sighting and worrying about their pet poodle that is tied up in the backyard, I am going to scream!! We need to get rid of these people, not the coyotes!!	View
2016031	Limit current development to paved area along bankstreet. Keep to small shops and residential. Move the stadium to bayswater.	View
2016395	Residential units should have a component for affordable housing and perhaps complement the seniors housing across the street, since the boomers are hitting this age cohort. As to location, Holmwood is likely preferable (with height restrictions).	View
2022311	Not opposed to intensification through residential units. In fact, this is likely in line with the city's sustainable development plan.	View
2022398	See comments on Q3, above	View
2024724	No residential component -- see comments under #3: this is, and should remain, a park.	View

Question 5

1995282	We do not need or want a large regional shopping center on this city owned parkland. Will probably hurt the current small stores on Bank, which are pleasant to shop in, while introducing increased traffic, which cannot be handled by the neighbourhood.	View
1995449	Having a large grocery store would be great - current Loblaws is useless and McKeens lack variety. I would have thought that 250,000 sq. ft. with residential could be made to work.	View
1995469	Should be small retail - restaurants, gift shops, etc. tastefully integrated into an urban park setting.	View
1995662	The BIA report was deemed unreliable by the peer review. You cannot base the GCA position on a report that has no real credibility. Also, the current proposal has restrictions (e.g. no big box), but this survey tries to imply it doesn't. You really shouldn't resort to this kind of misrepresentation of the facts.	View
1995774	see above ; this is public land; dont mess with it ie. commercialize it in any way. A single grand park on this land would actually increase density alongside and thruout the neighboring communities and thus the tax base !	View
1995822	Really, how much more retail space does Ottawa need? Are there not enough places where we can buy whatever it is that we want?	View
1995849	It is a public park.	View
1996448	No more than 60,000 sq. feet new retail in order to leave space for 2 new schools, one run by the Public French Schoolboard and one by the Public English Schoolboard or at minimum one run by the Public French Schoolboard: a new French school in centre of city has been recognised by the CEPEO as a priority given the surpopulation. This area would be perfect and certainly would benefit far more from a school than additional retail space.	View
1996899	No need for a hotel at Lansdowne. No cineplex. Retail needs to be in scale with the rest of the Glebe. A parking garage is essential.	View
1996910	Greater than 60,000 sq ft restriction on size of stores except for allowance for one big box foodstore	View
1996946	i am concerned about the Mayfair and any other components that will hurt existing Glebe businesses like the meat market, McKeens, etc	View
1996956	This is the last chance to preserve the public nature of the land. No commercial component is necessary or appropriate other than as city leases along Bank Street or in the park to serve the public use of the park with cafes, resaurants or facilities to serve the public activities in the park.	View
1997163	Commercial should be developed along Bank St. only.	View
1997415	- limited revenue-producing activities in city-owned facilities like the Market Bldg at Byward	View
1997662	Also restrict size of stores.	View
2003423	We are not opposed to new retail but we would like to see it reflect the neighbourhood	View
2006523	Bring it on! Ottawa is currently without a first run downtown movie theatre that can handle the modern movie going experience. It is about time. And don't give me the 'That is the end of the Mayfair' argument. I love the Mayfair. I am a member. It is not a first run movie theatre. It will survive. Different product, people.	View
2006897	Some commercial is OK but we will not attract people to the site with a shopping mall. We need unique businesses that will make the site an attractive destination without harming existing small Glebe businesses.	View
2006987	Focus of the Lansdowne redevelopment plan should be on multi-purpose recreational facilities and residential housing. We do not need a significant increase in retail space in the Glebe. Certainly not big box stores.	View
2009110	commercial on ground and second floor of residential units only	View
2010862	No commercial except for the Farmer's Market	View
2016031	I feel this in conjunction with the ideals of the Glebe BIA would be welcomed	View
2016395	Essentially no commercial component because once a commercial component gains a foothold regarding basic approval, it will be difficult to control	View
2024724	Let us develop a vision and then proceed to location-appropriate commercial aspects (e.g. farmers' market, perhaps some art/gallery/display aspects, refreshments/cafes appropriate to a park -- open-air?).	View

Question 6

1995088	As described above, keep half the North stands for varsity. South comes down. Keep arena.	View
1995217	Put A big facility elsewhere near good public transit!	View
1995449	Ottawa has demonstrated no capacity to financially support a football team on an ongoing basis. Therefore recognize the fact and give up or get the developers to provide an irrevocable 5-10 financial guarantee to justify City expenditures on Stadium. If they are so sure it will work, put the money up.	View
1995588	the long-term viability of the CFL is a not a premise upon which such a significant amount of public funds should be spent.	View
1995662	Again, it is very misleading to put forth options (with no details) that have not been accepted as real possibilities. For example, there is no way anyone would start up a new football team without rebuilding the south side stands. You can't claim you are proving the viability of anything if you try to cripple it with an inadequate facility. This is just another example of the underlying desire of the vocal members of the GCA to get rid of the stadium - it's not going to work.	View
1995774	move stadium and civic center to Bayview . area where there is adequate public transit already and there could be / should be more coming ..eg. use of POW rail-bridge to connect with Gatineau from present O- Line and into the possible east west lite rail	View
1995822	First choice on stadium would be to have it somewhere on rapid transit - not Lansdowne Park. However, it is questionable that a large new stadium would be financially viable, given that the CFL has failed twice in Ottawa. If OSEG wants to test the CFL concept, let it make very minor renovations to try the viability of the CFL here. If it turns out that people are turned off by the experiences of struggling through traffic coming to and departing from the games, then maybe OSEG and City Council will draw some conclusions.	View
1995849	It is ugly and falling down. Removing it is what all the other cities do.	View
1996112	I really think the stadium in the long run needs to be at a transportation hub. Spending so much money on a state of the art stadium where there is very limited transportation is ridiculous. It is also at the crossroads of the Queensway so the Queensway would become even more of a gridlock than it is now; one consequence would be that our fire and ambulances would have a nightmare responding to emergencies.	View
1996261	What is the cost to remove stadium only?	View
1996448	REMOVE STADIUM and build instead a new school to be run by the CEPEO, the French public schoolboard. A second school, this one to be run by the English public schoolboard could also be build with that space, and the current park would be extended to reflect increasing needs for additional space for school age children and for younger kids as well.	View
1996603	This is impossible to really answer at this time. City of Ottawa residents should first be asked if they want a major outdoor stadium in the city. If the answer to this question is yes, then the second question is where should the stadium be located - this issue has already been included in the GCA motions. Only then can we answer the question above.	View
1996899	No need for the flashy wooden screen. The stadium doesn't look that bad from QED. I pass it several times a day, and quite like it. It would be better with the occasional cleaning of rust stains.	View
1996946	trade shows can be placed where there is better infrastructure	View
1997163	If a good case can be made for a stadium (perhaps soccer) it should be built along rapid transit and light rail lines at Bayview.	View
1997662	I don't think Ottawa wants football. That has been proven from previous attempts to revive it. Forget football. Renovate and perhaps have soccer fields instead.	View
1999820	Stadium better at Bayview lands - Transportation transportation transportation	View
2002361	Professional sports facilities are fine as long as the site can support the number of people coming for each game or match. Football games with 30,000 are not in this category (not for this site).	View
2003423	We are not opposed to a new arena which should incorporate indoor and outdoor facilities	View
2006523	I don't even like the CFL. Never been to a game, but why not give Ottawa a top notch facility? If this is the chance, make it happen.	View
2006897	I am not against a stadium, but the city reports did not list Lansdowne as a preferred site. We could renovate Frank Claire to serve soccer and football, but mostly for the use of amateur, school and recreational sports.	View
2006987	Remove the stadium and expand the civic center into a multi-purpose athletic center. Ottawa could become a training hub for our future Olympians, while the community at large benefits with access to fitness facilities.	View
2011903	If stadium is shown not to be viable in 5 years, remove it.	View
2016031	Wait until the city can set aside the 230 million required to build a new stadium for soccer/football at bayswater rather than rush for this ill advised option here.	View

2016372	Contrary to what is being said in the media by the proposal's detractors, this is actually a reasonable cost to the city.	View
2022311	Spend the least possible on the stadium and have the football team prove viability. Let's not have a repeat of the baseball stadium...	View
2022398	It makes absolutely no sense to retain a stadium in this location, which is a transportation bottleneck with no link to the proposed rapid transit system. The city needs to take a strong leadership position in strategically integrating transportation and development, rather than reacting in a piecemeal fashion to individual development proposals.	View
2024724	I think the concept of a stadium needs to be considered in the context of the vision: does it fit within the vision for our great city park? -- and feasibility from a traffic point of view. Other locations should be assessed in the broader context of a part of the vision for City of Ottawa relating to sports & entertainment. What else -- in addition to, or other than, football -- should be accommodated?	View

Question 7

1995217	How about a real pool for the Glebe Indoor with an option to open it up partailly in the summer time. There is no swimming facility that can accommodate adults and older people anywhere in the community. I do not see the dog park as essential as there are so many other places to walk and animal....put the pool there!	View
1995282	The present park works well, and is very popular with the locals. Why change it? Cannot get better, only worse.	View
1995662	It makes no sense to view the community park as separate from the larger park (and, as we learned on Monday night, it never was separated by the city). Putting up fences or doing other things to separate the two areas is just silly. As long as the final design has all the important facilities, and some improvements, then the only valid complaint is that it will cost money to do the changes.	View
1995774	since this park is the most used park in Ottawa the city ought ot be thinking about re investing and upgrading this park , even enlarging it ... rather than diminishing it / swamping it with retail surroundings ...especially if the City wants to increase its density thus the demand ON such parks by increased population	View
1995822	I am not familiar enough with the uses of Sylvia Holden Park to make this judgement.	View
1995849	The Glebe has only about 60% of the green/park space allocated to other communities. We need to keep what we have.	View
1996112	Design B was hard to read both on your website and at the Glebe Community Centre. It showed lots and lots of trees which I don't think is safe in a City Park. I am in favor of trees generally, but I think safety is also important in a park. Also I wonder about the liability insurance of a skateboard rink. Will that something to add to taxpayers' costs? Also, why replace a perfectly functional and quite new park?	View
1996448	The community park and the wading pool and playground would have to be expanded to reflect increasing pressure on existing space from current population (more families, more kids) and from any additional population that would come from new residential development. Various security aspects for children would have to be included: better protection against traffic, especially at major intersections (Queen Elisabeth Dr. and 5fth for instance); a fence around the park to stop young children from running into the street; a well delimited and enclosed area for dogs to keep them away from children (THEY are more important than dogs) at all times.	View
1996603	This is fundamental. Sylvia Holden Park is a community park and not part of Lansdowne. There shoud be no question about this.	View
1997415	- concerned about viability of design B given cost to city	View
1999820	Redevelop to improve but Lansdowne community park and any parkland there should remain under parks & Rec control not the municipal services corp.	View
2003423	As long as components of the existing park are integrated	View
2006523	Looks great to me.	View
2006812	If we have to proceed with the plan, I would like to see the park remain as a public community park, but understand that we could possibly benefit from additional or improved facilities.	View
2006897	If it cannot be retained as is, we must ensure that the recreational facilities are protected since these are the only ones we have in the Glebe.	View
2015096	The dog park is the ONLY fully fenced dog park in the whole city and is used by people from far outside the Glebe. It should be retained and enlarged if possible.	View
2016031	If lansdowne is not sold off for commercial interests there would be more than adequate space for a park at lasdowne which would complement rather than usurp Sylvia Holden Park.	View
2016372	The park needs to blend in with a new Lansdowne no doubt. We need to work WITH OSEG, not against them. We need to be	View

	more cooperative.	
2024724	I am not familiar enough with the current Sylvia Holden Park to comment in detail. As a principal, we should seek to retain current services/recreational facilities, and perhaps even enhance the offering through a "connection" to the bigger park. How this might happen should again depend on the vision for the park.	View

Question 8

1995088	Retail sublet in Horticulture, Coliseum and Civic Centre.	View
1995186	Current Glebe small business should receive tax breaks, etc so their viability is not negatively impacted by external new businesses.	View
1995212	I think the Farmer's Market is highly over-rated. Most of those people aren't real farmers and they are being subsidized with my taxes. I'm not at all impressed with the Farmers' Market. Let's not treat it as a sacred cow. This survey has a negative tone against Lansdowne Live development.	View
1995214	Indoor public pool	View
1995290	New sports facilities for community health activities (swimming pool, gymnasium, fitness centre, etc...)	View
1995469	water features - either a tributary of the canal and/or separate ponds, fountains, etc.	View
1995578	Soccer Fields	View
1995583	I think Lansdowne would be a great spot to put a city operated equestrian riding school, or other community oriented recreational infrastructures, such as a sports facility with swimming pool. These things could be used by the entire city with a focus on use by the downtown and Ottawa South.	View
1995662	The potential for more (and interesting) events being held on the site is also of interest to me.	View
1995774	perhaps a proper athletic facility and public grounds with canal intrusion into their beautiful space	View
1995822	The main concept should be a space that will be a destination for people from all over Ottawa and visitors to the city. The Aberdeen Pavilion and the Horticulture Building, whose sitelines must be protected, would be major components. Some more retail stores are not going to be such a destination.	View
1995849	Additional recreational and event (show, concert) space.	View
1996029	beyond mental ability	View
1996077	A comprehensive plan which looks at the entire site and seeks to maximize recreational and cultural uses.	View
1996112	I am interested in keeping the greenspace we have and using the whole area as a recreational facility. Things I would like to see there are a soccer pitch for kids, (there are almost none in the area), a skating rink, even plots for planting. We have a beautiful location in Dows Lake for fine restaurants, but the City has never gotten a decent tenant, so what faith do I have that new retail would be anything special. Don't want the stadium there due to traffic, and residential should be considered carefully in regard to services (schools and traffic). I am not against residential but just need to know how much the area can support.	View
1996261	pedestrian bridge across the canal and access to the canal via docks	View
1996448	A new French public school due to surcapacity in the closest one (Osgoode).	View
1996603	This is a trick question. For example, I am very "interested" in any proposed new retail for Lansdowne Park because I am opposed to it. In reality however my concern is only to keep Lansdowne Park as a park (all major world city have a major park - Ottawa can not afford to be an exception).	View
1996899	What an opportunity for new arts facilities: a new concert hall, art gallery, museum - why aren't people demanding this?? Why do we need shops and high end condos more than a new concert hall? And keep the arena.	View
1997163	municipal art gallery	View
1997415	- potentially some "retail" like city-controlled ones at Byward Market plus limited income-tested residential as described above	View
1998216	Use of Lansdowne Park for trade shows, sporting events, etc of a local and regional interest with a reasonable capacity for these events.	View
1999820	Retain all future greenspace under parks and rec control not municipal services corp	View
2001989	minimal impact on traffic volume in the area.	View
2002361	community sports and arts facilities (like Granville Island)	View

2003423	We would like to see park space, outdoor facilities like a skating rink and bandshell, reflecting ponds and more trees	View
2006523	The proposal is great. It will be great for our neighbourhood and for our city.	View
2006812	I would like to see more regarding participatory sports included. Have a pool, a skating rink, a football and soccer field for regular people to play sports rather than just watch it.	View
2006987	Of greatest interest to me would be a multi-purpose athletic and fitness center which could be attached to the existing Civic Center, while demolishing the existing stadium for additional greenspace and residential space.	View
2011903	Recreational facilities or areas for young people and older persons.	View
2015096	I think the site should be used for public facilities that benefit both the local community and the city and are appropriate given the site's unique location near the centre of the nation's capital. I envision this as a combination of a national museum (e.g., portrait gallery), community sports facilities, the farmer's market, and green space.	View
2016031	Development which complements rather than contrasts with the two historical buildings present. Small scale which allows them the focus they deserve	View
2016372	You forgot the arena. We need to repair the arena where the 67's play.	View
2016395	A few restaurants along the canal would not be a bad addition to the area	View
2017967	New Ottawa Art Gallery building	View
2024185	Underground parking. Please get rid of the hideous expanse of asphalt. It is environmentally and visually bad.	View
2024724	Our vision for the park might include other natural features such as the water feature & meadow of Design A, with tourist interpretation centre and gardens with outdoor cafes (as an example). These "park" attributes should be considered in preference to any typical commercial/office space/retail/residential development (that exists already elsewhere in the city), which I think has no real place in the park.	View

Question 9

1995212	Why doesn't this survey ask what aspects of the Lansdowne proposal will BENEFIT the community. This survey has a negative bias against Lansdowne Live. I also resent our councillor and the GCA giving the false impression that everybody in the Glebe is against Lansdowne Live. Such is not the case. Many are in favour. The GCA and councillor disgracefully allowed Lansdowne Park to rot over the years. Now when somebody takes positive action to fix it the GCA does nothing but criticize.	View
1995469	I have an overall sense of enormous loss/sadness/frustration that this incredible public space, with so much potential to become a world class destinaiotn cum commmunity jewel is being so ruthlessly squandered. Our very naive mayor has been talked into thinking he will be remembered for something great by a group of snake oil salesmen who stand to make millions of dollars.	View
1995662	I would not say that any of these issues are of greatest concern to me. They all will be handled in an acceptable manner.	View
1996029	see comment to 8. above	View
1996112	Unfortunately the way this pops up on my screen I can only access 6 options while you have eight things to rank.	View
1996899	The threat to the arena is a big concern.	View
1996946	i do not want the view of the Aberdeen blocked from Adelaide Street	View
1996956	Especially concerned that these decisions were made with no preceding public discussion.	View
1997415	- procurement battle lost, now issues are cost and bad vs good planning	View
2006523	"Use Each Ranking Only Once?" Give me a break. That is a very transparent way to compile balony statistics. I have done so above so that my comments are registered, but NONE OF THE ISSUES ABOVE WORRY ME IN THE SLIGHTEST. IF I COULD, I WOULD MARK ALL OF THEM AS AN "8". This is a world class development proposal. Please don't screw it up. I moved to Ottawa from a much bigger city a few years ago, and could not understand the attitude of my neighbours toward this project. The Glebe will not be broken. Bringing vibrancy and life to an already great neighbourhood will just make it better. I am not anti-green space, but we are surrounded in it. Ottawa absolutely NEEDS Lansdowne. As a fellow Glebite, I implore you to stop being such luddites and embrace this development project. The whole city will benefit. The city will be held in higher esteem, and our quality of life will improve. And finally, just so you don't discount my opinion as biased (which you may do anyway due to the militancy with which you have taken your position), I have no connection whatsoever with the process or with any of the stakeholders. I am just a relatively new and young resident of the Glebe who wants to make my community and city a better place to live.	View
2012221	These ALL rate as major concerns for us. It was very difficult to rank them and the ranking isn't that important.	View

2015096	Another major concern is the completely inappropriate streetscape along Bank Street. IF there is going to be commercial development it should be in the "Main Street" style (small independent shops and businesses) that is already in existence and working well in the Glebe and OOS.	View
2016031	Appart from the loss of the tradeshow space I would say each of the remainder are of utmost importance to me and their failings are all interconnected. .	View
2016372	I cannot answer this as all of the studies and CORRECT information coming from legitimate sources have already put my concerns to rest.	View
2016395	This was a difficult one to answer in terms of being restricted to using each ranking only once. Not really a fair reflection of my concerns.	View
2024724	I am most concerned at the loss of green space (together with heritage sites of long-standing), and the notion that land may be declared surplus (under the currently-proposed agreement), with first right of refusal going to the private partner. This private partner stands to have an amazing deal (rather than being a partner in the risk), at taxpayers' expense.	View