

**Glebe Community Association General Meeting on Lansdowne Park Development
October 20, 2009**

- Comments submitted at the meeting
- Appendix: Comments e-mailed to the GCA

Comments submitted at the meeting

Section A: The Overall Plan:

a. Parkland, green space, farmers market, health and environment

1. Since LP is equidistant between Parliament Hill & Dow's Lake & since LP is adjacent to a UNESCO World Heritage Canal & since historically a canal had ranched from the main canal to Aberdeen Pavilion – therefore a canal connecting LP to the main canal is an obvious and integral part of the process: skating in winter, canoe & paddle boats in summer.
2. We need a park with trees, recreation space and a large Farmers Market.
3. Historically LP has been a 'gathering place' and should continue to have this concept as its guiding raison d'être. Any development which does occur should aspire to Platinum level LEED & at the same time respect the heritage buildings on the site.
4. LP should remain just that: a park. A shopping centre, office space, housing have no place in a park. Windsor Park, for instance, is a gem in our neighbouring community of OOS. Imagine how different it would be with retail, office & housing.
5. Most cities, i.e. Toronto, NYC, Cambridge, have a big city park where people can bring their kids to play on structures. A jogging path, gathering spot for sports along the canal, fields where local recreational teams can play, wide open sport & family green space.
6. Public park space good; retail shops bad.
7. A park!! A place for people & families who don't need money.
8. Health & quality of life for all citizens needs to be a principle. A full health & environmental audit is req'd.
9. We need to see park space & creative space – that will be truly a meeting space which maximizes a public asset. I do not want to see a mall at LP. I see 2-3 storey retail/residential along Bank St. and on Holmwood to the Horticulture Building – make the space around the Aberdeen Pavilion true green space – with radial walkways on all sides.
10. This is a park! What's wrong with that? Why should it now be just "Prime Real estate" to be developed by developers?
11. I would like to see a real park built with green space & trees like the Arboretum. LP could be like Central Park in NYC. We have enough malls in Ottawa.
12. There should be a real pedestrian & water connection between the park & canal (illustration of a bridge). There should also be real public "common" grass area like Central Park, NC for informal, organized use by citizens. Perhaps some housing on Holmwood, maybe some small scale limited retail on Bank. Mostly free access to citizens must be maintained. It should not require a fat wallet or credit card.

b. Creative uses & the arts, heritage and community uses

1. Aberdeen Pavilion is a treasure & must be handled carefully & respectfully. It should be the centrepiece of LP from Bank & Holmwood streets. Because of its history it needs pathways & trees approaching it & surrounding it. Other features (sports fields, a band stand, a small to medium size concert hall, cafes & a tourist shop, washrooms, etc.) must not dominate the Aberdeen Pavilion.

GCA Special Meeting on Lansdowne, October 20, 2009 COMMENTS

2. The plan must be for public use for all ages, respecting the heritage at the park. It is OK if the site is not a profit centre, but brings visitors & \$\$ to the city as a whole, just as Winterlude probably does. Limited retail on Bank St. is OK by me.
3. The Farmers Market should be expanded.
4. Consider adding a concert hall. Non professional sports could be showcased, or junior leagues. A real pool, an improved skating arena. Improve recreational facilities for youth.
5. Overall plan must account for residential nature of surrounding communities. They have become family oriented – with schools, community centres, small library, small scale stores. This is the de facto heritage of the area. Lansdowne Live would change all this.
6. No to football stadium. No to hotel & big box stores. Yes to concert hall, art gallery, farmers market, swimming pool, lots of green space.
7. This is public land; keep it that way. No commercial development. Do something original. Do something original for kids.
8. The Aberdeen Pavilion should not have its view blocked by housing. Remove the professional sports stadium and replace with community space (football, soccer field for local teams). Cultural aspects will also be good – community art gallery, local crafts.

c. Housing & community

1. We need some affordable living for independent seniors.
2. Sell some land for housing & small business, so will help pay for non-profit city recreation activities
3. Small hotel could encourage shopping in the Glebe; provide accommodation for those attending exhibitions and hockey games. Certain boutiques could be part of hotel. Housing along Holmwood would be acceptable (similar to design of homes on 2nd Ave adjacent to Board of Ed. bldg. Could incorporate “Circus Bleu” as at Vincent Massey Park, also useable for outdoor concerts or plays in the summer and small skating rink in the winter.
4. This public space should not be sold. The city should build some affordable housing on Holmwood. The rest of the site should be public use – keep the farmers market. No stores, no movie theatre or professional sports events. Instead community events, live music festivals, outdoor theatre & perhaps indoor live theatre space. Grass, flowers bike paths, a branch from the Canal. Make it a people place NOT a business place.
5. The city could maintain ownership of LP as a whole, but consider selling of small portion for housing to finance a redevelopment.
6. I would like more densification. I am not against well designed high rise condominiums & apartment housing for families. An international design competition is needed to aesthetically meld location with intensified habitation.
7. The number of houses proposed is not community minded, nor practical, nor green.
8. The housing proposed (40 tacked town houses with parking) would create an ugly wall along Holmwood and would eliminate all the beautiful trees on the south side of that block.
9. Plan looks good on paper, but development on this scale does not suit itself to the location. Local businesses, mobility in the Glebe & its residents will be impacted.

d. Retail & commercial

1. Retail & commercial should be leased with proceeds to the maintenance & improvements to the common property.
2. I’m against movie theatres on site. I’m equally against restaurants in Aberdeen Pavilion. The financial plan is a ‘shell game’ at the expense of the City and taxpayers. I fear that the businesses, football stadium & the team will be “white elephants”.
3. Housing & office development is fine. Absolutely no movie theatres and only a few new stores & restaurants should be created.

4. We don't need a shopping centre I the Glebe! What about our own local small businesses? We will lose our "village" character.
5. City decisions about public land should consider quality of life over big business & not be driven by the need to make money.
6. Don't finance a sports stadium by putting a suburban shopping mall in the middle of an urban neighbourhood.
7. Having low rise retail space along the Bank St. corridor would make sense. A shopping mall is not something I would want. Aberdeen Pavilion should be home to the Farmers Market. Having such a small area allotted to the Farmers Market in the Lansdowne Live proposal including a "unique food store" as part of the plan does not make sense.

e. Process, vision

1. Above all the process must be fixed. No reasonable discussion is possible if there are no alternative ideas to be considered. Having said that, it is also true that even in its own terms, the present proposal is so deeply flawed that it must e rejected.
2. The plan is a travesty, as it is built on the assumption that the stadium is necessary and must be rebuilt. ...But Lansdowne is a bad location for a stadium, Bayview would be better. So the retail ...has no real justification.
3. Reject the whole plan based on the sole sourced initiative. Keep it as a multi-purpose park.
4. Major concerns with the City abandoning appropriate processes for development of city owned land. Also concerned that the commercial development will harm existing businesses. It doesn't seem realistic to expect patrons of football to spend several hours pre- or post-game perusing Bank St. boutique shops as has been suggested by consultant associate with this development.
5. The redevelopment of the 'park' needs more vision with a more open process to include community views. The current proposal is unacceptable.
6. An open competitive design process is essential to ensuring that the best plan can be chosen. I would hope that the City will allow sufficient time to explore a range of options for this valuable public space.
7. A study of the condition of the foundation of the Horticulture building & general structure & cost of restoration needs to be done before any decision made re: possibility of moving, retaining & restoring it.
8. An alternative would be to transfer management (and ownership?) to the NCC, which is responsible for certain Glebe streets, as well as the Canal. It should not be in the hands of private companies.
9. The proposal is a scam. The process has been a sham. Let's start over with a transparent, public process.
10. Go back to square one. Insist the city follow its own rules. Let others propose. Let democracy rule.
11. What happened to a competitive process? Commercial retail space is not needed – will small business be able to afford a start up in this location? The city should not turn over the stewardship of LP. Some housing would be acceptable.
12. The only argument I have heard in favour of this design is that it would be an improvement over the current state of the park. This is no argument and needs to be trounced soundly. We need to insist on the separation of coming up with a plan/design and then after the plan is decided on, coming up with a schedule and plan for paying for it. The design itself should not be contingent on a business plan.
13. A proper competition with world class designers will yield a worth-while plan that can put Ottawa on the international urban design map.
14. We need to avert a disaster at LP. Insist that the mayor and council reinstate the promised international competition. OSEG may resubmit their proposal along with other proposals

- from Gehry, Cardinal, offspring of Frank Lloyd Wright, etc. Toronto did this for their new city hall. Also competitive bids will allow Federal funding. Single source does NOT.
15. The city should retain LP. The problem is the city has not put forward any reasonable plan for Lansdowne over many years. Many people see the Lansdowne Live proposal as exciting. Why can the city not inspire a proposal that is equally or more exciting.
 16. A 30-year lease – renewable or not – is in fact the sale of this land. A hotel, shopping and stadium – once built – will still be standing in 30 years. The effect of this decision cannot be reversed!
 17. Where is our vision? We can do better than all of this. The Cattle Castle is the focal point. Can we bring forth the needed combination to add to it as a people place – with imagination, environmental awareness & activity? WE CAN DO BETTER for ALL of Ottawa.
 18. Until more designs/proposals are available, leave things as they are. If a football team is proposed then treat it as a business (which it is) & let those owning the team pay the costs & pocket the profit!
 19. Emphasize the corrupt process. The details are secondary. Support the legal action for an injunction should city council pass the Lansdowne proposal.
 20. Too much illustration of a plan and not enough counter illustration. John Martin's court action against sole sourcing.
 21. Obtaining consensus of opinion against this proposal within the Glebe community is both easy & of little use. However the financial risks and costs will be incurred by all residents of Ottawa, from Cumberland to Kanata. If you want to rally opposition to this proposal, that should be the focus. Other issues smack of NIMBYism, rightly or wrongly.
 22. We need to stop this proposal and work with Council members to make LP a jewel of attraction in our city.
 23. I agree with the comment that this is a mediocre plan that illustrates a poverty of imagination that is truly astounding. Backing up, this is the result of the corrupt, undemocratic & non-transparent, sole-sourced process. It's a travesty of citizenship & public responsibility. We need a properly developed Master Plan for LP.
 24. Vision does not come from closed, secret negotiations.
 25. We need a vision for a world-class space that Canadians can be proud of. As Glebe residents we can be counted on to be good stewards of it. Let's think of it as a "learning & growing" place – make these be the overarching goals & put it out to international competition so that we have exciting, leading-edge, GREEN, sustainable concepts to consider.
 26. Don't miss the point: we had no open design contest with proposals. Let the best proposal win – if it includes housing, ok; if it doesn't, ok. Don't jump to conclusions please; fight for the proper, transparent, competitive process.
 27. We should present as our over-riding principle that this process is ethically & perhaps legally wrong/flawed – flaunts the rule of law. It reflects terribly on our city. This principle should be the leading factor in bringing the entire city together – neutralizing claims that this is an elite Glebe objection. Principle 1 should be an open competitive process preceded by open consultation to determine the public vision for the park.
 28. The sole source process is profoundly undemocratic. It is unacceptable to turn over public land to private interests. It is important to find common ground with other communities in Ottawa; the vision for LP should include community based activity (amateur sport, cultural activities, park) that will be appealing to residents throughout Ottawa.
 29. Lansdowne needs a vision – an 'idea' competition or conceptual design competition is very important. Important for development of LP to be tied to its history, i.e. build on Aberdeen Pavilion and the Horticultural Bldg., e.g. leading practices on ecology, sustainability.
 30. After the "Live" plan is defeated, we should continue on to the international competition, led by Glebe.

GCA Special Meeting on Lansdowne, October 20, 2009 COMMENTS

31. No development of any kind should proceed until an honest, open, fully legal process is set in place!
32. It is a poor plan – poor design – poor finances – poor process.
33. Any 3P proposal in future should limit city's cash & land contribution leased at market rate.
34. The Aberdeen Pavilion should not have its view blocked from Adelaide St. by the proposed housing units & mall – it's only unique part of Ottawa.
35. Financial aspects are currently very fuzzy – clarity needed. This should remain a PUBLIC asset. Even fraudulent currently – should be investigated. We already owe over \$1million for a transportation system that was cancelled – ensure this doesn't happen again. Larry costs us lots. It is public property & should remain so.
36. I heard on the radio something the Citizen had on line for Lansdowne feedback called “Score a Stadium” as if it's FREE! (or at least a deal)
37. It's public space & should remain in public hands & for public uses.

f. Other

1. I think you are on track with respect to the principles. I really do strongly believe the legal challenges should be supported – sometimes it is important to show teeth - this is one of those occasions.
2. We need to get more councillors against this shameful plan – particularly those undecided. We should support legal action against LL. Need to let other Ottawa residents know it is bad for them too – not a “NIMBY” issue.
3. The GCA & partners need to have Plan B if this passes, to ensure public participation can be demanded, etc. The GCA could be more proactive, i.e. target fence-sitting councillors, etc. Should support & donate to the legal action by Maclaren etc.
4. Are there adequate resources for fire, police & emergency services that will be required?
5. Thanks you to all the people working on preventing this disaster.
6. It is symptomatic of the new world order where government sucks money from people to enrich itself, public servants, bad employers & developers...

Section B: Quality of Life, Transportation and Traffic. Parking

a. Quality of life

1. Ensure there is no light pollution that impacts on residences of Glebe, Dow's Lake and Canal areas.
2. Should be green and sustainable. Condos, offices, hotel vs public recreational area have unequal objectives in principle
3. Quality of life and health issues are very important. More traffic, more noise, more light & air pollution lead to lower quality of life for everyone – especially children & the elderly. A village atmosphere is healthy – a shopping centre is not.
4. The light, noise & air pollution created with the current proposal is unacceptable. Keep the green space as public land; increase the health & quality of life of city residents by building sports facility that ALL can use – not attend, i.e. Olympic size pool, open play areas.
5. Has a shopping mall, a Cineplex or bastardized heritage buildings ever contributed to anyone's quality of life or quality of the environment?
6. Let's make quality of life a priority.
7. Arts & cultural activities would increase the quality of life for the local & broader community.
8. Quality of life is required in this neighbourhood.

GCA Special Meeting on Lansdowne, October 20, 2009 COMMENTS

9. There is no protection against increased light & noise thrown into the area. We should be protecting the health & quality of life of citizens.
10. The whole city needs a good environment.
11. A full health & environmental audit is required. Health & quality of life for all citizens needs to be a principle.
12. A park! A place for people & families who don't need money.
13. Amount of light should be compatible with a residential neighbourhood. I am very concerned about noise & light pollution – our community will completely have its character changed for the worse.
14. Above all LP must be greened.
15. A park is a busy place; there will be noise, hopefully happy. The rumble of delivery trucks is not a happy sound. Let's welcome activities that encourage us as citizens, not as gas guzzling consumers.
16. Noise, lights, stress --- illness.
17. Pay attention to health & quality of life aspects before it's too late.

b. Transportation & traffic

1. I am very concerned about the amount of traffic that will clog up our community – the streets we live on.
2. I agree we need to get a transportation plan in place before LP can be planned properly.
3. One bus a minute for 90 minutes in not an adequate traffic plan.
4. A stadium (if desired) should be built where there is a transportation hub such as Bayview Yards. Events which bring people to LP throughout the day rather than events which draw huge crowds all at once are best.
5. Study on the effects that approx. 1000 housing units would have on traffic, schools, etc. needed in support of intensification of housing.
6. The firm/persons who did the transportation study have obviously not seen how long it takes to load people on & off a bus. 1 minute per bus – this is surely a joke.
7. Developer reps reminded me that stadium has always (effectively) been there. They need to be reminded that the city was much smaller when it was built and there was a railway along Bank St. thus good transportation. This plan is NOT good transportation. Maybe it is time to find better location if indeed we really need a stadium.
8. Recreational & sports facilities, even amateur events generate traffic (private cars) therefore public parking is necessary. I hope it can be underground & that it would generate \$ to encourage people to bike or take the bus.
9. It's hard to say how much transit on Bank can be improved. Slower trickle, softer events (folk fest?) would be great. Shopping in a mall is not done by people on buses. They bring cars.
10. Parking & transportation issues are not appropriately estimated. An independent transit study would be useful.
11. Improved transportation is critical no matter what is developed on this site, since development assumes groups of people trying to come & go safely & in as “green” a way as possible.
12. Will the Bank St. redevelopment be altered to facilitate traffic to and from LP?
13. Proposed OSEG use far too intensive for transport infrastructure use.
14. Transportation plan is not feasible.
15. Surely there have been acceptable/professional traffic studies already. Some delivery is likely to reasonably occur.
16. Significant concern with the lack of independent traffic study.
17. No major development until we have a decent mass transit system in city.
18. Queen Elizabeth Drive should not be used as a special transitway!

c. Parking

1. I'm sure Carleton does not support parking/shuttle buses. Billings Bridge – get the mall to publicly state it will NOT allow parking/shuttles from its site.
2. Having lived in the Glebe for the past 19 years it seems ridiculous for the developers not to have more on-site parking.
3. The current proposal has unrealistically low estimates of traffic impact on the community with the lack of parking for any large events.
4. On site parking must be sufficient to handle major events. Street parking should be banned during major events – residents should be issued 1 permit per household for street parking.
5. Parking in the Glebe is largely either 1 hr or 2 hrs. Will police be rigorously patrolling and does this mean that games will be 2 hours or less – or will attendees be ticketed for parking on Glebe streets?
6. I currently have an on-street parking permit and have difficulty finding a spot on my street.
7. Glebe Centre & Eco condos tried to include underground parking in both projects which was not possible due to the water table. Beware of this proposed underground parking. This will not be possible & the neighbourhood will be flooded in traffic as it is during the Ex, only ongoing.
8. Parking to be reduced?
9. People I have spoken with (even supporters of Lansdowne Live) indicate having to drive around several blocks to find parking for LP events – particularly the former football games. Dangerous, polluting, annoying, etc.

Section C: Stadium and Civic Centre

1. Lansdowne Live is about implanting a mall & associated suburb in Glebe to finance a sports stadium for high-price professional sport.
2. Maybe [the stadium] should be on a mass transitway junction? I like the Bayview idea.
3. There should absolutely be NO stadium at LP.
4. A stadium needs to be located where there is adequate rapid transit for the huge crowds that are drawn there. Personally I don't go to sports events, but for those who do they need to be able to get there & back without facing huge delays & a parking fiasco. Lansdowne is not the place.
5. \$130m + for renovation \$??? for new. Junior hockey gets the support.
6. With no prospect for a professional sports team in the foreseeable future the stadium should be razed and if & when the right opportunity for the city comes up, research the prospect then.
7. The city needs to verify why a professional stadium is needed at all before spending tax \$ on it.
8. An arena is a good addition to a park; could be used year round. Not Frank Clair stadium; way too much space occupied for too few events.
9. I thought LP was rated at #6 as a desirable site for a stadium in this city.
10. [Regarding the choice of having minor improvements and used while a permanent solution is found] –This is a typical Canadian compromise proposal, but (judging from the status of the Ex) it could well become a semi-permanent “solution” until deterioration eventually forces a drastic move. It is an unhappy compromise that will simply postpone a decision. It should only be considered if a permanent solution has already been approved, and would need a specific amount of time to be implemented.

GCA Special Meeting on Lansdowne, October 20, 2009 COMMENTS

11. The first step must be an assessment of the need and desirability of a CFL team in Ottawa. If it is viable then the city should control the site through the zoning process but the investment and risk must be made by private industry.
12. Larry O'Brien, can we have a feasibility study on the appetite for CFL amongst the 150 km radius of this country's capital? Shouldn't this be a critical requirement for council, before any discussion can go forward?
13. It [stadium] would depend on a cost/benefit analysis – past and projected. If highly beneficial as a source of income, it could be renovated. If not, it should be razed.
14. Let's understand costs. This will end up being double what the developer is estimating.
15. The football is a mistake.
16. Decision on stadium should be deferred until City completes a thorough feasibility study to determine best location for a stadium. Proponents should pay significant share (>50%) of stadium at BEST location, i.e. accessible by rapid transit.
17. Not opposed to CFL, but opposed to use of taxpayers' \$.
18. The city should consider whether it wishes to commit \$100+ million for a CFL team.
19. City council should consider clustering of sports facilities – Scotiabank complex makes the most sense.
20. Suggest we use the football field as a soccer field – also give ice-space and green space for local Ottawa people (including children) to play sports. Participation sports not professional sports team.)
21. There should be no stadium at LP, as it is not a good location for a stadium.
22. City already did a feasibility study and it was Bayview, I thought, that was the best location.
23. The stadium should fill a niche aimed at amateur & visiting sports teams, especially soccer & hockey – outdoor fields available to children & school teams. CFL should go to Bayview where there is better public access. Any renovation or re-building of the stadium should be in tune with amateur teams.
24. A city park should not be given over to commercial interests, and not for a minority group of football fans.
25. A stadium is not needed. We need kids playing soccer & engaging in healthy alternatives.
26. GCA should take the initial position that stadium should stay & attempts should be made for minor improvements as long as CFL is viable. If CFL fails – tear it down & green the space. Civic Centre is a horrid building with little architectural merit – tear it down & rebuild it to fit the park.
27. Separate the stadium/football issue from the redevelopment of LP.
28. 24,000 seats vs 1235 parking spaces?! Stadium vs transportation.
29. If LL goes ahead, I expect the facility will be found to house an inadequate stadium before very long – and the need for a stadium will go back to the drawing board. Needing modernization, rapid transit and parking therefore plan is short-sighted.
30. I remember baseball diamond debate – now it sits empty.
31. Football does not have a long term future. Why should city provide a further subsidy to private sector investors?
32. In the past 19 years that I have lived in this community, the football franchise has not been supported by the residents. Perhaps this is because public transport is not readily available for young people to attend without a vehicle. This location seems to be a poor choice for a major sports stadium.
33. If the stadium can be used for community-amateur activities e.g. soccer, school phys ed. football (university, high school) as well as professional sports it is worth the costs of renovation.
34. Future use of stadium & arena dependent on study of best location in city for long term. Lansdowne doesn't have adequate access & transport for long term.

35. 67s hockey works, exhibit spaces work. Stadium does not work. Football has failed since 1977. Other uses for stadium site should be looked at.
36. Frank Clair Stadium site should be sold to private developers; zoning should be changed for high rise condominiums.
37. Don't finance a sports stadium by putting a suburban shopping mall in the middle of an urban neighbourhood.
38. Why have we not answered the question – do we even want a professional sports stadium at LP?
39. The civic centre should be renovated & enlarged. It may be possible to incorporate an Olympic sized swimming pool above.
40. Ottawa 67s have been at LP for a long time and I think most people want them to continue to have Lansdowne as home ice.
41. Civic Centre should be renovated only if used for trade shows and recreational purposes.

Section D: Are there any other issues that concern you about the LPP?

If two or more concerns were stated, they are listed according to the first stated.

a. The process

1. I agree that the whole process here is flawed and we should not engage in micro-managing the actual design because that validates the back-room deal that brought it forward.
2. The process which has led to this “Lansdowne Live” proposal is totally undemocratic & suggests a crooked city council & Mayor. Rather than discuss the details that arise from the “Partnership” plan, we should insist on an open and well-designed real participatory consultation prior to developing parameters for a creative design competition & then an honest call for proposals.
3. The process is corrupt. We are still playing by the rules, or trying to – the others are not. We should focus public attention on the improper behaviour and conflicts of interest that are clearly driving this. What favours and promised favours have city staff accepted to make them so active and vocal in support of the developers? We might call for city staff to sign disclosures of relationships with the developers, gifts and favours accepted, conflicts of interest etc.
4. Corrupt process – essentially a PPP where community will lose all input because the facilities will be run for pure profit. Not the right solution for the site.
5. Transparent, open & fair process
6. The process is shady. Will OSEG go to the OMB if proposal is turned down as Minto did when council rejected doubling the size of Manotick?
7. The major issue is the lack of an open competitive process.
8. Lack of proper process – lack of vision
9. If this is not illegal it should be. It points to something very wrong fundamentally with the way Ottawa is run/governed.
10. Need open procurement based on citizen-driven requirements definition. I am cautious about financing – city needs some commercial activity to help pay for redevelopment.
11. Even the title is deceiving! Who are the partners in this Partnership Plan? The process is key – the competitive process should be local-Canadian – we have many imaginative, creative people within our own country – without needing to go international. Canadians know best what is feasible – especially climate wise to include in design. Key development parts to emphasize:
 - maximize green aspects
 - maximize public use of the space for gathering

GCA Special Meeting on Lansdowne, October 20, 2009 COMMENTS

- recreation, water, field sports
 - cultural, band-shell
 - respecting historical aspects of the facility.
12. The process is terrible. Sole sourcing is problematic. Will burden the taxpayers with too much risk. Other locations for stadiums are much more appropriate – Bayview/Lebreton. Why did the negotiators for the city not require the OSEG to make commitments to maintain the team in Ottawa or lose the right to manage the other components?
 13. The process to date reeks of fraud. MPs & MPPs should be brought into this. Is there an auditor for the city? E-health has been totally mismanaged, why would a large municipality be allowed to do the same thing so soon after the bungled sole sourced E-health?
 14. I believe that the Mayor promised the OSEG partners that they would get the rights to the park if they brought a football franchise to Ottawa. He should be smoked out.
 15. Sole-sourcing; emphasis on retail & housing; housing along Holmwood Ave.; on transportation plan; etc., etc.; lack of respect for heritage factor in whole park & esp. Aberdeen Pavilion.
 16. The original process could have been good. It could have allowed for making a unique place better with suitable uses and whatever buildings were needed being architecturally excellent. This is not going to have that outcome if it is allowed to go ahead. The football is a mistake; the retail is unnecessary and will be destructive to existing retail. There is momentum to do something about the space. It could be used partly for amateur sports, a swimming pool, soccer pitch, etc. Political issue is that the Glebe is being seen as NIMBY by the rest of the city. If the divisive Glebe vs the rest is to be resolved the space needs to be made accessible to all of Ottawa – Transportation is the issue – Public Transportation. CC has to agree to buses on the QE Driveway on reg. basis.
 17. Transparency. Is a stadium really wanted? Zero cost? What is it really going to cost everyone?
 18. Process that led to the plan: single, unsolicited proposal, prolonged negotiations, city & developer behind closed doors, is NOT acceptable to public trust. Public lands must remain in public hands. (Period!) . Inadequate green space and lack of open-air facilities for public use. Retail & commerce on public land is not acceptable. Fails to address transportation issues for access to stadium events.
 19. Preferential treatment for specific businesses over others. Finances are convoluted and misleading. Destroying the opportunity to do something better with the land for public use.
 20. The summary closing of an open competition and the council's accepting of the sole-source bid.
 21. Sole source. Lack of exhibition space. Focus on retail – Public space should be used for public access, community sports, exhibits, events, etc. The full focus of the Lansdowne Live proposal is commercial & profit driven. Use of public land for shopping is unacceptable.
 22. Sole-source contract are wrong. Public land should be held in public trust. If the “offer” is so good, why not see if someone else will do better? \$230m (at least) to taxpayers doesn't sound like a good deal! Football (CFL) has failed 2X here – what could possible have changed (other than \$130m to float it for a few years before it flops too).
 23. Lansdowne Live = Community Consultation Dead = Transparency Dead = International Competition to redesign Public Land Dead = Community Dead = Rideau Centre Dead. We need to SIMPLY state the basic problem in ads in the Citizen, Sun, Metro, 24 hrs media. People outside of the Glebe do not get the details. They need an image, a basic concept that tells what is going on.
 24. I am totally against the proposal because it is a sole source proposal; because there is not sufficient transportation to support a stadium; traffic will increase – not enough parking to

- support these events. I would support a concert hall for use by festivals such as Chamber Music.
25. The degree of political influence LL has on our councillors. Having developers so closely associated invites corrupt proposals at the expense of the taxpayer.
 26. Public Private Partnerships (P3s) have been shown to be disastrous for the public and for the users and for the workers of the facility involved (a hospital, a school, a road or whatever). P3s cost more (borrowing costs, profit extraction, transaction costs), afford less flexibility (changes have to be negotiated with the private partner over the 30+ years under its control), promote commercialization, and undermine democracy. On the hospital cases, see Allyson Pollock et al in the British Medical Journal & elsewhere, and the Ontario Health Coalition or Wm. Osler Hospital (Brampton) and to a lesser extent the Royal Ottawa.
 27. I am concerned about the Lansdowne Live plan ignoring public consultation. The Rideau Canal should be accessible to all. It is a UNESCO World Heritage designation and cannot be a commercial site. Showcase local goods & fresh, healthy, local foods. Add a skateboard bowl & other recreational opportunities for youth. No public consultation. Too much BIG retail and condos that will need to be razed by 2030. No vision for the future. Be a visionary. The Champs Elysees was designed hundreds of years ago. People still go there.

b. The business plan

1. The business plan is a total sham as has been pointed out by many. One point not made is the total unfairness of subsidizing the merchants of this new facility through the free use of land while the established merchants on Bank St have paid for theirs on par through rents.
2. I agree strongly that the use of “incremental property taxes” to achieve revenue neutrality is a slippery slope to civic fiscal mismanagement. As is the (invited?) unsolicited proposal!
3. The taxpayers are being financially screwed and City Hall is instrumental in the process. The trade fair industry is being totally ignored and yet it is a good revenue earner for LP. Local businesses are being undermined by their own city council which is handing over the public’s land free of charge in effect, to private interests who will then bring in large businesses in competition with these small, independent businesses. This plan does not respect any of: -the Glebe community, -Ottawa taxpayers, - the democratic process, - our world heritage site, - the Rideau Canal.
4. This is essentially a privatization of public land, using public monies to create profits for private developers.
5. Why is my city giving our land to a business group so they can make a profit? It is totally unacceptable. Lansdowne Park not Lansdowne shopping Centre! Which would have a negative impact on existing Bank St stores in the Glebe and Old Ottawa South.
6. Revenue neutral concept is a shell game using property taxes from development to pay for stadium. In effect, it means all taxpayers pay for the developers’ share over 50 years of the city’s expenditures for schools, libraries, transit, etc. The city does not have the mandate from the citizens to subsidize a private business & CFL football which would benefit a small minority of residents. It should be the subject of a referendum to determine if the city residents want their taxes to be used to subsidize the private sector in the form of a sports facility.
7. There is no such thing as revenue neutrality. Once again our Mayor and Council are using bankrupt words to make us believe this will not cost. Bankrupt mayor, city, etc. Shame!
8. The financial plan is hugely biased in favour of OSEG with the city at a great disadvantage. The private negotiations with the city that have ousted other possibilities

for LP are outrageous. Another shopping centre, with some landscaping, may be good for private profit but should not be allowed to extinguish a public asset of Ottawa. Health & environmental issues have not been considered. They should be. Also it will kill the Glebe & OOS villages.

9. The “waterfall” concept of reimbursing OSEG ahead of the City (i.e. taxpayers) through three levels is of course a handsome gift to developers, and a heavy burden on later generation of citizens. Traffic & transportation is an overwhelming problem with OSEG’s plan. Its comments on parking are deceptively simplistic. It calls “green space” an area on which cars would be parked during major events. It could not have a “double life”.
10. The financial aspect – This is a bad deal for the city and a misuse of tax dollars. The competition with existing businesses is not fair competition. Retail at Lansdowne is subsidized. Having OSEG in charge of running LP through the MSC takes control of this precious spot out of the hands of the city & its citizens.
11. Everything! Most of their promo material are half-truths with feel good words. The city spends all the money & takes the risk. If this should by some bad luck proceed – the partnership should be made to take out a bond that would compensate the city if the football team fails. The bond should be in the amount of \$50 million not the 7 or so proposed
12. Bias to the economic benefit of OSEG. Governance.

c.. Privatization of public lands

1. The plan does not support use for & by the public.
2. This is privatization by another name. Public lands must remain public. No to privatization.
3. I am opposed to giving away 10 acres of public land to private developers be it for 30 years or for sale.

d. Greenspace, health and environmental concerns

1. The city has too few parks and land that could be developed as a park would be preferable for the future of the city. All cities as they grow become dense. This aids in making the city hotter in the summer and colder in the winter. Having green space balances these effects.
2. I find the green space in this plan insulting. It will not be a park with pavers that children cannot play on, and is really only overflow parking.
3. We should start from the premise that this is a core area park and build from there. We need to think of the ramifications of densification. Where will the additional population go for recreational space? Go back to design process. We may not get the best option, but at least the process can be honest. Stop, think, get it right! In the meantime we need to be well-versed about legal options for the community.
4. The total omission of environmental health considerations.
5. Health & quality of life issues.
6. Food sustainability & local food availability needs to be taken more seriously in this town. If bio-terrorism is ever successful, we’ll be grateful for the think-ahead planning of accommodating getting our local food supply into the hands of our people.
7. A traditional farmers [market] & more related with nature area should continue with this spirit, specially now that ecological & environmental issues are so important – what about the horticultural building transformed into a Botanical Garden; pool, galleries. Integrate Lansdowne to the Rideau Canal – UNESCO site in neighbourhood.

e. Other

1. Emergency services to the site, emergency evacuation of the site. Emergency services & evacuation of homes in the neighbourhood during times of high traffic density or gridlock

GCA Special Meeting on Lansdowne, October 20, 2009 COMMENTS

- due to Lansdowne events plus runs for charity etc., sidewalk sales, community events, weddings, traffic accidents etc. all at the same time. We should meet with the emergency services (police, ambulance & paramedics, fire, bomb disposal, Medevac helicopters etc) to get their input. Plus, there is no reason to reinvent the wheel b/c studies on emergency services & crowds/gridlock have been published all over the world.
2. With 400k sq ft it is hard to see how Bank St. businesses can survive – except by leasing space in the development. The sole-sourcing aspect reminds of eHealth mess.
 3. No grandfathering of deficient parking requirements! The City and its staff/councillors are supposed to be neutral parties evaluating an unsolicited bid. Since when, and on whose direction, has the City become a “partner” with a private sector group?! An unholy, distasteful alliance. The city has become a facilitator/enabler and cheerleader for the flawed process. Design excellence should be a priority! We must, for current and future generations, aspire to more than another strip mall. Think big, not with small minded parochialism, have a true ideas and vision competition that gets the best & brightest to propose. This leads to a MASTER PLAN for the site; only then can the City parcel out the site to individual entities and developers/builders. Sustainable Design (in the truest sense of the words – see Bruntland Report for good definition) must be a priority. We must move beyond the same old, same old consumptive ways.
 4. I am very concerned about noise & light pollution – our community will completely have its character changed for the worse. I am very concerned about the amount of traffic that will clog up our community – both the streets we live on and am also concerned that the mall will force the uniqueness of our business community to go bankrupt. Bottom Line: Why have we not answered the question – do we even want a professional sports stadium at Lansdowne? The whole design proposal is twisted towards trying to pay for it – that is not a “vision” for such a unique part of the capital city of Ottawa. Let’s reopen the design competition.
 5. Shipping & receiving for retail. Store size & tenant mix. What is the immediate trading area? Would the developers operate a football team without retail? Not a chance.
 6. The NCC owns ¼ of the space of Lansdowne Park. There should be full consultation with the NCC to determine their role in the development of Lansdowne green space (canal inlet, funding). Also the prov. should be involved at this time – Prov. Funding & partnership would help eliminate some of the commercial aspects of the park being proposed by developers. This does not have to be as revenue neutral with prov. & fed. support.
 7. The GCA should be a partner in the process, not responding after the fact to proposals. The GCA if not a partner at the table will have to accept a proposal eventually that will certainly not satisfy the residents. The Bloomfield Group in Halifax is an organization that halted a city initiative and worked in partnership with the city to develop a project for the community.
 8. What action could we take in case council votes for this proposal? How could we amalgamate the interests of rural and suburban councillors with urban councillors?
 9. Ottawa is a Capital City and needs a Capital Idea for Lansdowne.

APPENDIX: Comments e-mailed to the GCA

1. We want to affirm our overall agreement with elements of the Lansdowne Partnership Plan. The points raised within the plan are extremely important. We believe that they contain the

components of sound development, while protecting and in fact enhancing public accessibility, and expanding the variety of uses to which the site might be put.

We believe that Lansdowne Park needs attention paid to it, and money invested, but we have been appalled at the lack of vision in the current proposal, Lansdowne Live.

2. I want to make a point about the lack of information provided on truck traffic involved in the Lansdowne Live (LL) proposal. A lot has been discussed on the vehicular traffic, but has anyone reviewed the numbers of loading spaces, truck routes, noise, idling, frequency etc. that will be required to feed the proposed retail space of LL?

I want to use an existing example in our neighbourhood of a commercial development that was passed by the City's Planning dept. yet completely ignored the City's bylaws re: loading and truck deliveries. I live near Glebe Ave. and Bank St., so when I heard that a Shoppers was going to be replacing the Phase 2 retail, I became interested in the the outcome of the Site Plan Approval, specifically where they were going to locate their loading dock and how they planned to deal with the unloading of products. As this project did not require a public consultation, there was no place for public input and I relied on the City Planning Dept. to do their job.

Shoppers was built and the entry to their loading area was located on Glebe Ave., 75 feet from Bank St. As it is a one way street, all delivery trucks heading to Shoppers drive east on Glebe and park illegally in the car spaces or behind them in a non-parking space. I am assuming that the City thought they would park on Bank and walk their trolleys down to the loading area as Glebe is designated a 'no truck' street on the City's official map. There are no ramifications however, for these trucks driving on Glebe- when the police have been called, they are unable to ticket as there is no 'no trucks' sign located on the street. We have not been successful in fining trucks for legal parking in a non- loading zone and idling as is often the case. The city does not want to enforce their own bylaws in this situation. We have no control over a bad decision by the Planners and I fear that this will occur at a much larger scale with LL.

More importantly, I am concerned with the sheer number of trucks that will be needed to supply the proposed retail space of LL. Shoppers is approx.9000 sq.ft. and I would say there are a min. of 10-12 trucks a day, with deliveries starting at 8am, just at the peak time that hundreds of children are crossing that intersection to head to one of the five area schools. Idling trucks in the morning are also a regular occurrence.

All this to say, if we look at this small scale sample, I am very concerned of the lack of proper review by the City on this subject. Perhaps some points to make at the November meeting with the City are the following:

- how can we rely on the City to review loading issues properly and not make concessions?
- do some calc of number of truck deliveries/day per sq.ft. of various types of proposed retail- it may be very shocking specifically with the 41,000 sq.ft. proposed grocery retail store!
- number of required loading spaces on the site itself - loading spaces are typ. 2 1/2 x longer than a typical car space which I propose will eat up more space than they are letting on in the current proposal.
- what is the route they will be taking through the neighbourhood that is riddled with school children?

I really thought that traffic study would be the 'show stopper' for this proposal. Now that the same traffic consultants are in bed with the LL, we need to do our own traffic study using the City's own by-laws to show how ridiculous the numbers are.

3. First I note that Councillor Glenn Brooks has called for the Auditor General to review the current proposal - this can only be a good thing. We need a fair and open competition. Second. Why is there no development along the canal? It is an ideal location for restaurants (Canal Ritz needs some competition) and the public space and should be merged with the

park. This would probably require the removal/re-routing of the Queen Elizabeth Drive - which would not be a bad thing anyway as it is a major barrier to canal access.

Third. I have no issue with development along Bank Street. 3 to 4 storey buildings would help to define the road there. Bank Street should probably be narrowed too (this may help reduce speeds).

Finally the junction at Bank Street Bridge and Wilton should be closed. Don't worry about the traffic there have been many studies done on this kind of thing and it works.

4. i) Lansdowne is the wrong place for a stadium and the Glebe and Old Ottawa South roadways (and those in Ottawa East and in Centertown) will be swamped with traffic parking on neighbourhood streets - going to football games, soccer games, university football games and the concerts and other activities that OSEG wants to bring in to make the stadium busier. The City's own planners selected Bayview as the best city location. Law suits should start flying if councillors ignore all reason and just want to see change at Lansdowne.
- ii) The stadium MUST be on mass transit as Bank Street any day/any time has heavy traffic. Residents will be trapped in their neighbourhoods every game day and during all other activities. Such a location for a stadium will also help to ensure that the football, soccer and other activities fail because people will not want to face the traffic congestion (one of the many reasons why football has failed over and over again). Buses are a very poor alternative but a flashy new train service would attract ridership.
- iii) Residential development on Holmwood will not/not act as a "buffer" between the neighbourhood and the massive new retail development. Landscaping in place now is much better than adding new residential traffic to very narrow Holmwood and O'Connor up to 5th Avenue. These specific streets are already the most impacted by whatever happens at Lansdowne whether it be heavy traffic trying to avoid the \$5 cost of parking on Lansdowne or the flood of people on the sidewalks going to and from any event at Lansdowne.
- iv) In addition to it being ridiculous that the City must spend tax dollars to get the stadium into shape, it is completely surprising that the OSEG wants tax revenue from the retail development to pay them back for the franchise costs for football and soccer. Why - they should be taking the risk that these sports will succeed (and I predict that football will fail again). Tax revenue is for the general fund to pay for all city services and not to pay back the developers.
- v) Not only will most of the retail fail at Lansdowne without major roadway access like all the other shopping centers in Ottawa (using Queensway, Carling, St. Laurent, etc.), but this development will kill many of the stores trying to succeed on Bank Street now.
- vi) Lansdowne should be developed with some retail along Bank Street (including space for the Farmers Market that should not be buried back toward the Canal), and mostly spaces and fields for amateur sports. This would make it a more useful park for the citizens of Ottawa than retail, offices and a hotel (and please no residential).

I have spent much time working with the Lansdowne Consultation website and the point must be made that the City tried to frustrate our comments by using a completely inadequate server. It takes much extra time to await the site and then the speed of the site is very poor and accessing comments is very slow, etc. The City has had a campaign to frustrate and control as much as possible the negative comments from citizens opposed to this proposal.

5. I live in the Glebe and I am very opposed to more housing or shops. On CFRA last Friday they interviewed a man who did a study on what impact would shops at Lansdowne Park have on the shops already in the Glebe and his reply was that it would take away a fair bit of their business. I believe that could lead to some having to close.
We have enough residences, restaurants and shops. Traffic is already quite congested in the Glebe. Surely we can be more creative than shops, condos and a ball stadium.

Football has not done well in Ottawa. The approximately 8 games they play a year does not warrant a whole new stadium.

This is the Capital of Canada and Lansdowne is a lovely spot. I would like to see the City Library go there, and a park, and perhaps an aquarium and maybe a permanent craft market.

6. **Vision** The vision lacks vision. We are looking at prime public parkland, alongside the Rideau Canal that is designated a UNESCO World Heritage site, and we come up with renovating an old stadium, building a very large shopping mall, and installing a 'front lawn' that doubles as overflow parking space? Incredible!

There could be open-air facilities for seasonal festivals and cultural events, and/or enhanced uses of heritage buildings that reflect their history, and/or sports fields for soccer leagues, and/or landscaping and water features that complement the adjacent scenic pathways and Rideau Canal and/or... many, many possibilities.

To truly bring together Ottawa residents, the City, and partners (NCC, Parks Canada) to develop a new vision for Lansdowne Park, we need both a forum for ideas and citizen involvement, through a competitive and transparent planning process from concept to design that is independent of development privileges.

Heritage / Patrimoine Preserving our architectural heritage is certainly not contingent on the proposed partnership plan. The idea of subdividing the Aberdeen Pavillion into small, glass enclosed climate controlled structures for restaurants would work directly against the "immense column-free interior space" that is characteristic of this building. Likewise, moving part of the Farmer's Market into the horticulture building would do very little to bring attention to the building's corner piers, stylized brick and glazing patterns! There may be alternative ways to preserve and encourage public use of heritage buildings, in ways that complement their historical value.

Green Space and Sustainability / Espace vert et durabilité

The proposed green space / 'front yard' at the east of the site would attempt to:

- integrate landscaping with adjacent NCC scenic recreational pathways, and
- feature pedestrian and cycling paths, and
- offer connections to boat access from the Rideau Canal, and
- provide a setting for staging events with an outdoor concert hall, and
- be unique open space for festivals and art shows, and
- include storm water management ponds, and
- use Grasspave to accommodate extra parking for large events at the stadium.

This is a rather long wish list of objectives or expectations for a piece of land that is just 5 acres in area, i.e. less than 15% of the site! Even if this small parcel of land could have multiple attributes, there are likely to be scheduling issues – for example, extra parking for stadium events conflicting with timing of outdoor festivals. Targeted uses and design attributes for green space, water features, outdoor events and links to the Rideau Canal have not been thought through with due care. How much new green space (gardens, grass, trees) would be created? How much area would be in water ponds? What facilities would be needed for outdoor art shows and open-air concerts? Would pedestrian paths cross Queen Elizabeth Driveway to connect to boat moorings on the canal? The plan lacks credibility and clear purpose; the 'front yard' would need to be much larger to wear so many noble hats.

If my response seems critical, it is toward a poster presentation that would portray many 'green' benefits of a front lawn that would quite simply be too small. So allow me to be clear: green space, water features and open areas for public gatherings are essential on this site. Any proposed development of Lansdowne Park should first define clear purpose(s) for green space, and then determine the area requirements and specific attributes that would fulfill those purposes.

Just as an aside, with basic knowledge of agronomy and hydraulics, I do not respond favourably to glossy brochures that would sell us soil erosion control benefits of "eco-

friendly systems like *Turfstone* or *Grasspave*” where the land is essentially 0% grade! Flat land and natural grass cover do a fine job of minimizing soil erosion.

On a good note: sustainable design through LEED certification and ‘green’ systems for storm water management -- great guiding principles. These should be part of any proposed development of Lansdowne Park.

Stadium & Arena / Stade et arena “If you build it, they will come?”

It worked for Shoeless Joe and the boys in a Field of Dreams!

The idea of bringing a CFL team back to Ottawa is fine. I have fond memories of watching the Ottawa Rough Riders in the late 1960’s, even while sitting in the cold, western end-zone stands. I also enjoyed being in a corporate suite at the Grey Cup game in 2004. There is nothing wrong with building an innovative, state of the art, open-air stadium to enhance spectators’ enjoyment of professional sports events. The questions are: where should the stadium be built and who should be paying to build it?

Retail and Commerce / Espaces commerciaux There are many, many problems with the proposed retail and commercial uses at Lansdowne. Following are just two points.

The retail plan claims to be sustainable based on market demand, to reinforce the uniqueness, strength and diversity of commercial uses along Bank Street, and to be compatible with, even in support of, the existing Glebe Business Improvement Area (BIA). That’s odd. For the Glebe BIA state that the retail and commerce component of the plan would be as big as all of Glebe’s businesses combined, six times larger than what a consultant established as the maximum growth in capacity that could be sustained in the Glebe over the same five years. So whose market analysis is right?

Phase 1 would propose 255,000 sq. ft. for retail and services of unique boutique and specialty dining, 47,000 sq. ft. for a multi-screen cinema complex, and 77,000 sq. ft. for office space; Phase 2 optional components would include more office space, a hotel, condominium units and townhouses. How would this extensive retail, commerce and residential use of public land be of benefit to Ottawa residents? To make it worse, public land would be leased at no cost to the OSEG private sector. How does this act in the best interests of the people of Ottawa? It begins to feel like a steal of a deal, in a very bad way.

Governance / Gouvernance Public lands should remain in public hands. Period.

So, No! to the proposed arms-length management corporation (MSC) that would not be directly accountable to elected members of City Council.

And No! to the proposed long-term lease to OSEG, a private interest group, for use (let alone control) of the entire park.

Transportation / Transports The elaborate transportation strategy and traffic analysis shows inconsistencies and deficiencies that undermine the credibility of the plan. Here are a few examples.

The plan would provide onsite underground parking for 1100 vehicles to minimize interference with pedestrian movement, but is unclear on access to the parkade. With existing entrance points from Bank Street, would vehicles drive across pedestrian gathering areas and along the “open air pedestrian village” corridor?

For CFL games and large concerts, 3200 extra vehicles would be parked in neighbouring areas. This would take up roughly 65% of the on-street parking spots in those communities (Glebe and Old Ottawa South), rather crowding the space for normal residential and commercial needs.

Day to day traffic analysis compares new vehicle traffic on Bank Street (and Queen Elizabeth Drive) during the busiest periods at Lansdowne against existing traffic during commuter peak hours. This is misleading, since busiest times at Lansdowne need not coincide with commuter hours – let us compare apples vs. apples please!

Aggressive Transportation Demand Management to encourage transit or shuttle use is an excellent strategy; this might be instituted for events attracting over 15,000 people to an

open-air stadium at any suitable location in the City. However, for the proposed Lansdowne plan, this will not be enough to avoid traffic gridlock and parking shortages in the surrounding neighbourhoods, given a lack of rapid transit to the site and the existing commercial uses along Bank Street.

Transportation analysis suggests that 3600 people might drive-park-ride a shuttle from City Hall, Carleton University and Confederation Heights for CFL football and large concerts, yet shuttle service levels from these points are N/A for these events. Have the owners of those lands agreed to the proposed offsite parking lots? The analysis further suggests that transit levels for Routes 1 and 7 for a typical day (peak hours) would be one bus every 3-4 minutes, which would be very nice, but difficult to accept just on faith, given the current service level for these routes.

Queen Elizabeth Drive is a scenic parkway under federal government jurisdiction, via the National Capital Commission (NCC). Use of this route by transit vehicles to stadium events may or may not be in the interest of NCC objectives.

Simply stated: this is not a good location for a stadium, given the existing constraints and limitations on transportation to the site. We are looking at trying to pack more people onto already full buses on Route #1 for 10-20 minute rides from rapid transit stations, trying to park more cars onto side streets that are already heavily parked, and trying to pack more vehicles onto Bank Street which is already backed up with traffic on weekends and in rush hours, just to try to make the proposed plan seem feasible. Common sense is that this does not make sense.

Business Model / Modèle opérationnel The sheer amount of financial analyses, flow diagrams and number crunching around the business model, presented on assorted fact sheets and posters, by the proposed partnership and by grassroots organizations, is formidable!

Aiming to simplify where possible, here are the biggest red flags that I see.

The City's investment to renovate the stadium / arena is significant, at \$129 million (present value), which would be spread between \$12 million up front and a debt to be retired at a charge of \$7 million/year for the next 40 years. Just for comparison, what would be the cost (investment) to build a new stadium at a better location? The portion of the City's contribution that is deemed equity in the business plan is \$20 million. Yet, alternative estimates of the value of land that would be made available to developers, at no cost, for mixed use (retail/commerce) vary between \$50 million and \$100 million.

The "waterfall" for distribution of net cash flow gives unusual preference to OSEG's portion of equity, whereby, after contributing to the reserve fund for lifecycle capital maintenance, OSEG would begin receiving returns on investment (second and third shares) well before the City would receive any returns (fourth share) ca. 2030.

By the very nature of risk, the financial benefit-cost breakdown of the proposed partnership plan is far from crystal clear. However, from a citizen's viewpoint:

- the City, via all Ottawa residents, would pay a significant cost (notably, the entire cost of rebuilding the stadium / arena complex); and
- a private partner, via OSEG, would receive first dibs at most of the benefits (notably, from retail and commerce development on loaned public land).

All this would be the result of an unsolicited, sole-sourced proposal and negotiation process that is dubious on many fronts. This does not seem to work out right.

Summary / Sommaire

The Lansdowne Partnership Plan would be shameful stewardship of public land and blatant betrayal of public trust.

7. I wish to register my support for the Lansdowne Live proposal. I feel that it is a good and balanced proposal that will enhance existing facilities and add considerable vitality to our neighbourhood. I think the track record of neglect and decay at Lansdowne speak for themselves (and if the GCA truly feels the property is a jewel, then it must share some of the

blame for the neglect over the years). Regardless of the process chosen, I think it is very unlikely another proposal with this much to offer will be made, and the most likely result of defeating Lansdowne Live will be continued neglect of the property.

To address some of the issues you mention, I would start with traffic. Traffic concerns are cited in opposition to every major development project everywhere in the world. In this case, I do not think the additional traffic would be overly detrimental to our neighbourhood. Yes major events would cause congestion, but anyone buying houses near a stadium has to expect congestion at times. On a day to day basis, I think the change would be more than manageable.

The same goes for parking. The reduced size of parking is only an issue during major events at the stadium/arena. If the owners of the sports teams think they can make do with less parking, I am all for that. The more we can reduce the focus on car travel, the better in my view. People will adapt as time goes by and I think you will see more people finding other ways to get to Lansdowne.

Perhaps the most important issue to me is housing. In my view, any redevelopment of Lansdowne must include a housing component, some of which is affordable housing, as that is critical to a true mixed development (for that reason I also support the inclusion of office space). If we claim to be an environmentally conscious neighbourhood, we need to recognize that we need to accept our share of intensification, in accordance with the official plan. The Glebe can accommodate more population density. It will make the neighbourhood more vital. Using part of Lansdowne to achieve that intensification is about the least painful way possible to work towards that goal. Those opposing housing should ask themselves if they are prepared to accept intensification elsewhere in the neighbourhood, because that is the trade-off smart growth demands.

Finally I would point out that the GCA absolutely needs to take a position on the stadium complex. We have a \$50 million civic facility in the middle of our neighbourhood. It is dishonest for the GCA to take positions on the redevelopment of Lansdowne and to ignore the stadium issue. Your survey indicated that the majority wants the stadium to remain at Lansdowne. If you are advocating a process which may not preserve the stadium, then you have to address the implications of that position - the waste of the current facility and/or the cost of replacing it elsewhere.

8. It is the job of the GCA to represent the views of the community. However, I am concerned that if the GCA takes this approach with its presentation, it will not be heard. To be blunt, the proponents of the OSEG plan are not listening to most of the objections raised by the opponents of the plan. If we want people to listen to us, we can't talk about what is important for us - we need to talk about what is important for them.

This means that the following concerns should not be the focus of the presentation: the process, the impact on residential streets, noise, traffic disruption to the community, heritage, consultation ... it goes on. These are very important but focusing on these would not be the strongest approach. (Or at least save them for later.)

I recommend starting the presentation with "Why the proposal is bad for Kanata" ... or Orleans, Alta Vista, Barrhaven, Stittsville ...; take your pick. Then focus on the following:

- This proposal is about a football stadium for Ottawa. Does it deliver?

- Do you want to go to a nice stadium? You won't get it. -- It won't be a new stadium. It will be a refurbished old stadium. And let's face it - the current stadium is an ugly hunk of concrete. -- The refurbishment includes state-of-the-art broadcast facilities - this does nothing for spectators. There will be a new roof. And new tiles in the bathrooms. -- In other words, we would be putting lipstick and a new hat on a pig.

- Do you want to be able to get to the stadium? You won't. -- Football games lead to huge amounts of traffic. You'll be jamming this into an area that just won't be able to handle it. -- Think about the horrible traffic problems with 67s games, or at Scotiabank Place. One is a

small event at Lansdowne; the other is a large event at a facility with good traffic infrastructure. In both cases, traffic is a nightmare. With football, a large event, at Lansdowne, you'll be combining these factors. And congestion increases exponentially with the number of cars. -- Do you want your legacy to be a bunch of people stuck in traffic jams fuming about the stupid location of this stadium? -- The irony is that the people you see as most opposed to the plan - Glebe residents - will be the only ones who will be able to get to the stadium!

- Do you want value for money? You won't get it. - We would be paying a ton of money - over \$100 million - for this. Surely for this expense we should be able to get something better ... like a new stadium. -- We should develop a plan that is eligible for federal/provincial funding.

- At the very least, if the best option is to keep the existing stadium, we can fix it up on the cheap, like Montreal has done.

A major development like this should be a growth pole for development. But by putting the stadium in the Glebe, we won't get this (the only new development will be at Lansdowne and has been factored into the plan.) The City should put the stadium in an area that could benefit from it. Like the Bayview Yards. Or Orleans, or off the 416.

9. Tout le terrain de Lansdowne doit rester propriété publique. Donner la propriété aux développeurs : jamais.

La vocation de Lansdowne en est une de divertissement de jouissance publique

Le site doit devenir plus vert, pas moins

Il doit est connecte au canal et aux quartiers avoisinants : Glebe, Ottawa South

Le sport amateur et la récréation doivent en entre les principaux moteurs.

Un marche de légumes et de fleurs s'intègre parfaitement a ce concept. Le marche est souvent un lieu de promenade pour locaux et touristes. Il assure un achalandage qui augmente la sécurité des utilisateurs du parc.

Pas de construction majeure: condo, hôtel ou magasin. C'est évident, cela viendrait en contradiction flagrante avec la vocation d'un parc.

Voici les raisons qui justifient ma position sur le développement du parc Lansdowne :

-le terrain actuel est propriété publique, il doit le rester.

- Le manque de respect du citoyen marque par la décision du conseil de ville de court-circuiter le processus de concours, le manque de compétition et la moquerie de consultation des citoyens

-les problèmes de circulation et de stationnement automobile qui sont déjà a la limite du tolérable dans les quartiers avoisinants . Les artères très lourdes, dangereuse et bruyantes que sont devenues Bank , Queen Elizabeth, Colonel By , Main et Bronson. Les rues transversales utilisées comme raccourcis et stationnement payant ou a heures limitées de stationnement rendent la qualité de vie moins bonne.

-les commerces, déjà en danger sur la rue Bank, nous en avons perdu plusieurs dans les dernières années. Or, ces petits commerces qui ont pignon sur rue sont ce qui fait l'attraction de nos quartiers, que ce soit pour les résidents ou pou les visiteurs.

-Ou sont les espaces verts dans tout le centre d'Ottawa ? Est-ce que les bandes de terrain qui longent le canal et les rivières demeureront tout ce qui restera de nature au centre d'Ottawa ? Nous avons besoin dans nos villes de plus en plus grouillantes de ces endroits de détente et de tranquillité. Les espaces verts sont vitaux pour la santé mentale des citoyens.

-Une ville dont la population grandit ne doit pas perdre les espaces publics pour en faire des espaces prives, que ce soit pour la construction de condos, de magasins ou d'hôtel.

Plusieurs propriétés sur Bank ont besoin d'être revitalisées, plusieurs espaces sont vétustes en mauvais état, surtout du cote nord du Queensway. Si nous ajoutons des espaces commerciaux a Lansdowne, Bank, sur toute sa longueur, risque de ressembler a la rue Rideau, dévitalisée, pauvre et peu invitante.

- Je suis donc fortement opposée a Lansdowne Live pour les raisons évoquées plus haut.
10. I think that the proposal for the site is great for ourselves and the community. There are some main topics that I clearly do not understand.
I do not understand the argument of property values decreasing, in my opinion with more stores, restaurants and services it would in fact increase my property value.
Next- losing green space- the last time I looked it was a paved parking lot! The proposal looks like it will add to green space between the new proposed buildings. We don't use the greenspace now, if you ever go to the park next to the lot (with the baseball diamonds) it is never close to capacity.
It would also create a huge revenue base for the city with the new retail and commercial building.
11. I am in favour of this imperfect but improvable project. Consider other Cities' approach to preservation/exploitation of heritage areas-Whyte Ave in Edmonton, Old Montreal, Old Quebec City, St Lawrence Market in Toronto, the Brewery district in Halifax, the Distillery development in Toronto, Georgetown in DC, Alexandria Virginia--all mixed use developments. This applies to sport venues as well: The Verizon Centre in DC, the sport venues in the Golden triangle of Pittsburgh, the Molson Centre near the re-developed Windsor Station in Montreal, Soldier Field in Chicago. An open, can-do attitude would serve our area well--otherwise we lose all leverage.
For years the paved over area around the stadium and the latter itself has sat quietly rotting away and the GCA did nothing. The 2007 recommendations were simply weak and unrealistic. Get over it, this area has been used commercially and for profit sports since the 20's. Harking back to some unsupportable elysian era is silly. The Glebe Report articles on this issue, like the incredibly biased survey questions last Spring simply represent the committed anti development gang that runs the show at the GCA (paradoxically they play directly into the hands of some of the well rooted local businesses/land owners who cannot tolerate real competition). A map in the last Report which refers to the "Mall" speaks eloquently to this.
The City ran a competition--one other scheme was proposed. Where is the flood of alternative developments to challenge the present one? Where would these other pie in the sky projects come from? How many would simply appear from foreign sources in response to the further expenditure of public funds, unfeeling about Ottawa/Canadian sensibilities--to wit the Big O--designed by someone who had no idea of North American uses.
Of course the landlords and business people on Bank St are against this development--it is competition and a dilution of their market power. The Farmer's Market - why is it deserving of some protected niche to continue, as the Citizen pointed out, its rip-off pricing and collusive attitudes in "serving" the urban gentry.

12. **Lansdowne Live - Overall**

I am not in favour of scrapping LL in the hopes that some ideas contest will present the perfect option. I agree the process is flawed and multiple proposals would be preferable. However, Lansdowne has sat as a sea of asphalt peppered with decaying buildings with no one having any interest in bettering it. Now in 2009 no one was blocked from presenting other proposals, and none have been forthcoming. I suspect that if Lansdowne Live is killed, Lansdowne will sit in its decaying state for another decade. This would be a shame and would really be cutting off our noses to spite our faces. I am not willing to focus on achieving the perfect process at the expense of positive progress.

Amount of Green Space

I was disappointed with the amount of green space in the proposal. While overall there may be a fair amount, due to its fragmentation there is no one large space. I would prefer to see a larger green space which is not going to be used as parking on event weekends.

Heritage Buildings

I am happy with the plan's use of the heritage buildings, particularly since one of them has been boarded up for years.

Traffic, Transit and Parking

It is obvious Lansdowne is not on rapid transit. That in my view does not justify scrapping an existing stadium as that would be irresponsible for both financial and environmental reasons. It would also be a great loss to the neighbourhood, as supported by the 51% of respondents to the GCA's poll who want a stadium at Lansdowne. Many other stadiums, including the new BMO soccer stadium in Toronto, are not on rapid transit. The plan calls for a decrease of 400 parking spaces. My view is that revised transit routes and more responsible transit choices by participants should address this issue. Yes, there will be more people parking on our streets during large events. That's just something you deal with when you live in an urban neighbourhood.

Shopping Mall - Vitality of Bank Street

I am definitely opposed to any sort of big box development. However, I think the new retail (especially scaled back) could help the vitality of the neighbourhood. Done properly, the new retail could be a destination that leads shoppers out to the rest of Bank Street, or that shoppers make it to after wandering the rest of the Glebe. Having thousands in the neighbourhood for football and hockey also brings vitality.

Housing Along Holmwood

There is already housing on Holmwood. I see absolutely no rational basis for any opposition on this issue.

13. That professional football can have a future seems doubtful, but what is important is that the space be a centre for amateur sport.

Green space must be preserved.

The question of parking must be given more consideration. We have to avoid the days when there are large events at Lansdowne when we plan invitations to friends. Visitors have to park several blocks from our home. The current plan will make this only worse.

14. I strongly endorse the GCA Principles on Lansdowne Park, 2007. In particular I think the ownership of the Park should remain in public hands. It is unthinkable that ownership of this piece of public property which has been preserved as such for a century and a quarter should be turned over in part to entrepreneurs.

I also strongly believe that a portion of the park should be available for amateur, but not professional, sports. I know of no other public park in Ottawa dedicated to professional sports. If taxpayer subsidies, direct or indirect, are to be provided through the Park to sports, it should be amateur sports.

15. One point missing from the debate - whether it would be better to have a smaller and more polyvalent stadium than the one proposed, because it would be better for the City to lose money on a smaller scale.

16. Traffic, transportation and parking

Bank Street is already over congested. It is now a rare occasion when one can drive along the street without waiting endlessly in traffic. Whether or not OC transpo can provide extra buses for large events is a moot point, since they too would be sitting in traffic. As for parking, this proposal does not add up. First of all, if they plan to sell 25,000 seats for sport events and provide 1300 parking spaces there is a serious gap. Although the proposal says that the rest of the spots can be made up through parking on surrounding streets -- there is NO extra parking on surrounding streets. Our streets are already full of people parking. Moreover in my experience of over 30 years of living here when people are cruising looking for parking, they drive the wrong way on one way streets, they drive too quickly, they block driveways, they put at risk our children and our pets.

Retail, condos and hotel

Condos: Lansdowne is public space. It should not be turned over to private "owners. (who will be the elite, as they will be the only ones who will be able to afford the prices). LeBreton Flats has been ruined by this approach - it could have been wonderful parkland beside the river, but now the only ones with access are the people who own the over-priced condos there. Let's not let the same thing happen to Lansdowne. Condos are going up all over the city. More are not needed in a public space.

Hotel: The proposed hotel is four storeys. This does not seem to me to be useful. It would not be large enough to accommodate trade show attendees, etc. It would also add to the traffic congestion and the need for more parking spaces. There are plenty of hotels downtown.

Retail and Restaurants. Bank Street already has many retail stores and restaurants. Many of them don't last very long because they cannot afford the rents. Would more retail space make this better? Who would be able to afford the rents other than exclusive stores or big box stores?

Green and recreation space. I understand that the childrens' wading pools are in jeopardy and that the Farmer's Market would only be allotted HALF the space they now have. This is not acceptable. Also, what would happen to the playing fields?

Cattle Castle and other buildings. The Cattle Castle was not designed to be a heated space. I greatly fear that enclosing it, heating and having food preparation going on would damage this heritage building. The other buildings are not attractive nor very much used. I have no opinion on potential use, other than that perhaps they could be used to house recreational facilities, the long-awaited concert hall and perhaps even a storied parking building,

Sports stadium. I don't mind if they rebuild it, as long as it is not with my tax dollars. Although it does seem that there are other locations elsewhere in the city which would be more viable in terms of access, transport, parking, etc.

In short, I greatly fear that the current development will make the developer rich, ruin our neighbourhood and send municipal taxes sky high for all residents, no matter where they live in the city.

17. I want the City to restart an open & fair search for proposals & meaningful consultation with citizens of Ottawa. Esp. now that the Mayfair theatre has been revived, I don't want the unfair competition (to all local businesses) which would be posed by the Lansdowne Live project.
18. I am not in favour of Lansdowne Live proposal for two main reasons:
 1. The process the city went through for the solicitation of bids was a bad one and can be seen as a model for how not to do development.
 2. I concur strongly with the assessment of the situation: that the proposed redevelopment of Lansdowne Park strongly favours "private commercial interests". The lack of imaginative space for non-consumers is startling.
Cities that create and maintain spaces for residents who are least likely to represent themselves such as children, or the elderly, are cities that people want to live in.
City officials need to consult with and listen to local institutions and residents before imposing an expensive development on the neighbourhood.

19. LANSDOWNE PARK – FUTURE

Much has been stated, presented and discussed concerning the future of Lansdowne Park. The flawed process, which may be declared unlawful, but if past experience is an indicator the Courts do not like to become embroiled in local and municipal affairs as there are other avenues available, i.e. the OMB which is another torturous for of Municipal governance and bureaucracy.

The Plans as presented have all concluded that this is a “Redevelopment”. This is not really the case as the site is basically undeveloped with the exception of the Stadium/Civic centre and the Aberdeen Pavilion. There are other facilities also included on the site, namely the baseball diamonds and a small park.

The majority of the Park is paved asphalt!

A Capital City

Ottawa is probably the only Capital City in the world that lacks a vision of the future. I have travelled much of the world during my time with the federal government and I have never encountered city politicians that truly lack the oversight and concern to itself. Washington DC would NEVER contemplate what this city is now undertaking – the changes to the Redskin’s Stadium and the development of the Capitals Arena were painstakingly made and the impact on the surrounding communities was fully assessed. While not a Capital City, the reconstruction of the Seattle Seahawk’s Stadium had to be made based on a mass transportation plan that worked and included the extension of the subway system and regional transportation system were integrated into the plan and the developers shared a portion of the costs – where is that here. IF the City really cared, beyond the short term, it would extend the underground LRT from downtown to pass under Lansdowne to surface at Billings Bridge and connect into a regional system.

Ottawa is a good 30 to 40 years behind most other major cities in its transportation plan!!

City Political Involvement

One issue that will always cloud the issue of Lansdowne is the fact that the fate of the site rests with Municipal politicians, all of whom have their own agendas. To ensure that correct decisions are made the process should be handed over to an independent Board of Governors – it should be made up of knowledge based individuals who have NO stake in the end results – there are many within the community of Ottawa who would serve and could access the services of land planners, environmental specialists and financial experts.

Provincial Political Involvement

The Provincial Government has always expressed and shown a reluctance to become embroiled in Municipal matters and concerns – it is a very dangerous place to go as the MPP’s seek the “good offices” of the locals to form the base to their re/election. Again, they see that other avenues are available to resolve municipal issues.

As long as the City is able to make decisions without accountability it will be difficult to stop the actions now in motion. We in the Glebe and South Ottawa are the most directly affected and impacted by the decisions now being contemplated, and while hope can be maintained that a rational decision will be made, a Contingency Plan should be formulated for the ‘next step’ – the challenge of the “unlawful process” in that public funds will be expended to support a project that will be a tax burden for all tax payers in Ottawa. I think that this is a point that has NOT been driven home to the members of City Council – but again, they do not care about the long term affect only the now – resolve the issue of Lansdowne.

With the failure of three CFL teams the proponents of the return of the “team” must provide a large guarantee to the City in the form of a \$50 mill. bond, for once the Stadium is renovated for CFL it will require additional public funds to change its use – soccer could be accommodated but public funds will have to be expended. Once the Stadium is renovated it will be impossible to generate support to have another sports complex, i.e. and aquatic complex similar to Edmonton’s.

20. We want to affirm our overall agreement with elements of the Lansdowne Partnership Plan. The points raised within the plan are extremely important. We believe that they contain the components of sound development, while protecting and in fact enhancing public accessibility, and expanding the variety of uses to which the site might be put.

We believe that Lansdowne Park needs attention paid to it, and money invested, but we have been appalled at the lack of vision in the current proposal, Lansdowne Live.

21. I am an Association member who is deeply concerned about the issues and the flawed process.
22. - Public use should be used to measure all aspects of the initiative -- housing or hotels do not meet this test
- Access for all should also be used to measure all aspects of the initiative -- current plan is overwhelmingly geared towards middle-high income earners
 - More emphasis should be placed on the environment and the need to green the city core -- further to the city's current initiative (giving away unlimited trees)
 - Plan should accommodate cultural events with an open air theatre/amphitheatre