Consultation Report

1. Introduction

In addition to the engagement that was part of the development of the Corydon-Osborne Area Plan from 2011- 2014, the Public Service offered additional opportunity for engagement in this follow-up initiative, which was focused on implementation of the Plan. The goal was to provide stakeholders and residents with the chance to have their say on the following zoning adjustments:

- A proposed Planned Development Overlay (PDO) and design review for new development,
- Proposed property rezonings to align with the Plan
- A proposed Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zoning District

These zoning adjustments are components of the implementation of the Corydon-Osborne Area Plan (Section 4), which was adopted by Council on December 10, 2014.

The initial phases of engagement for the Corydon-Osborne Area Plan (2011- 2014), serve as a backdrop to the present implementation engagement process. Those earlier phases of engagement led to the creation of the policies of the Corydon-Osborne Area Plan, which the present initiative is intended to align with. The following are some key highlights of those earlier phases:

2. Corydon-Osborne Area Plan Engagement 2011-2014

More than 500 stakeholders, participants and groups were engaged, through a wide range of engagement events. These included:

➔ 2011-2012: Community Planning Advisory Committee, Public Design Workshop (May 2011), Public Open House (June 2011), Public Open House (February 2012), Self-guided Walking Tour with staff (August 2011), two meetings with Technical Advisory Committee Transportation Subgroup, as well as the following external stakeholder meetings:

- City Water and Waste Department
- Winnipeg Arts Council
- Manitoba Liquor Control Commission
- Active Transportation Advisory Committee
- Winnipeg Police Service
- Manitoba Hydro
- Access Advisory Committee
- Shindico (property management)
- City Real Estate Division
- City Parks Planning and Urban Design
- Heritage Winnipeg
- Environmental Groups
- Terracon (developers)
- River Osborne Community Garden
- Winnipeg School Division #1

➔ 2013-2014: Local Residents Focus Group (November 2013), Local Business and Real Estate Development Focus Group (November 2013), Transportation Focus Group

(November 2013), two public meetings (November 2013 and February 2014), one public open house (May 2014).

The image below chronicles the engagements held from 2011-2014:



The following were the main themes that were derived from the 2011-2014 engagements. More information can be found in the Appendix of the Corydon-Osborne Area Plan, available on winnipeg.ca.

Key Themes of Participation	How Themes are Addressed
Appreciation for Corydon-Osborne • Desirable Lifestyle • Social Destination • Neighbourly • Mixed-use • Diverse People & Places • Walkable and Accessible • Active Transportation	Specific policies and design recommendations to enhance the existing quality of Corydon-Osborne that provides its distinct character.
Need for Circulation Improvements • Sidewalk Conditions (size & quality) • Bicycle Routes & Facilities • Confusion Corner Impedes Connectivity / Potential for Pedestrian Space • Better Connectivity • Parking Concerns	The development of a long term master plan that includes circulation and streetscape improvement recommendations.
Development and Preservation of the Study Area • Need to Increase Development Potential of the Area • Need to Maintain the Character and Scale of the Residential Neighbourhood	Recommendations for targeting primary areas of intensification only in specific locations within the study area.

Feedback gathered was used to develop the content of the Plan, including land uses, context-appropriate built form & development, design guidelines, pedestrian & cycling connections, public spaces, streetscaping, and other elements.

The Corydon-Osborne Area Plan is a vision to guide future growth and change in the area while applying principles from OurWinnipeg, the City's long range development plan. The Plan also outlines the City's commitments and priorities over next 20 years for land use, transportation, services and parks and open space in the area.

3. Corydon-Osborne Area Plan Implementation - Engagement 2016

The Corydon-Osborne Area Plan identified zoning adjustments needed to help implement the Plan. As noted above, these include:

- Planned Development Overlay (PDO) and design review
- Property rezonings to align with the Plan
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD) zoning district

The following is a summary of the engagement process conducted for the recommended zoning adjustments.

a. Approach

The engagement process for the Corydon-Osborne Area Plan implementation combined in-person and online opportunities.

Invitations to participate in the open house, workshop and at winnipeg.ca were emailed to stakeholders, sent by mail to property owners impacted by the proposed rezoning, sent by Twitter through the City's Office of Public Engagement, and published in the Winnipeg Metro and the Sou-Wester on February 24, 2016.

Corydon-Osborne Neighbourhood Plan Emails
- 1382 groups and individuals

Office of Public Engagement Emails
- 4609 groups and individuals

City of Winnipeg Twitter
- 50,550 followers

b. Key engagement opportunities

Public Open House
Who: 49 recorded attendees
What: Display Boards, face to face discussions, maps & images, detailed information, surveys, note pads, email lists.
Where: Gladstone School
When: March 9, 4:30pm – 8:30pm

Public Workshop
Who: 115 attendees (estimated)

What: Presentation, open commenting, surveys, note pads, email lists.
Where: Earl Grey Community Centre
When: June 21, 2016, 6:30pm – 8:30pm

Surveys
Who: 164 respondents: 137 online (Survey Monkey); 27 hard copy
What: Level of support and open comments regarding proposed amendments
Where: Public open house, winnipeg.ca/ppd/corydon/
When: February 23 – March 30, 2016

E-mails
Who: 30 respondents
What: Level of support and open comments regarding the August 2016 proposal
When: August 31-September 16, 2016

c. Key Messages: 'What We Heard'

Common themes from surveys, open house & workshop, emails

Surveys	
Supportive of the initial proposal	
Message	Response
Like the design guidelines	Comment noted
Increase density further	The zoning adjustments align with the Corydon-Osborne Area Plan, which sets target densities for each area contained within the Plan. The City recommends that the densities should remain within the proposed limits. Note that higher densities can be employed close to Pembina Highway and Osborne Rapid Transit Station, and at Wellington Crescent.
Like the proposed densities	Comment noted
Concerns about the initial proposal	
Parking is an issue	The PDO provides enhanced parking through the ability to share parking spaces between lots, with an approved parking management plan, in the High Rise and Mid Rise TOD Mixed Use Areas; and the Mid Rise Mixed Use area and Low Rise Mixed Use Area A. In the residential districts, there is no change from the parking requirement in the Zoning By-Law.
Leave density as is	The zoning adjustments align with the Corydon-Osborne Area Plan, which sets target densities for

	each area contained within the Plan. The City is no longer recommending that residential properties in the neighbourhood be rezoned to “R2”.
Height is an issue	There is no change proposed to the existing maximum building height in the Lower Density Residential Area. In the Medium and Higher Density Residential Areas, a modest increase in height will be permitted on corners, which is already common in the neighbourhood.
Absentee landlords are an issue	The most common concern with absentee landlords is that the property they own is not being properly maintained and is negatively impacting surrounding properties. The Neighbourhood Livability By-law (By-law 1/2008) has specific standards for the maintenance of properties. Residents are encouraged to contact the City via 311 within any concerns about the maintenance of specific properties. The City will investigate if they are notified of a potential violation.
Need green space	The Corydon Osborne Plan includes recommendations to develop more public green space within the neighbourhood. For individual lots, building setbacks are required and in the PDO, a maximum lot coverage (45%) is required for all single-family, two-family, and multi-family development in the Lower Density Residential Area and for all single-family and two-family development in the Medium Density Residential Area. In neighbourhoods without a PDO, there is no lot coverage maximum for two-family and multi-family development.
Small lots an issue	The PDO includes a minimum lot size of 2,500 sq. ft. for any two-family development. In addition, the PDO includes a maximum lot coverage of 45% for buildings in the following cases: In the Medium Density Residential Area, the maximum applies to single-family and two-family development; and in the Lowed Density Residential Area, it applies to Single family, two-family, and multiple family development. In neighbourhoods without a PDO, there is no lot coverage maximum for two-family and multi-family development.
No to “R2” rezoning	The City is no longer recommending that residential properties in the neighbourhood be rezoned to “R2”.
Against rentals	OurWinnipeg supports diverse housing options in every neighbourhood in the city. The zoning

	recommendations do not deal with tenure of housing. The proposed design guidelines help ensure that regardless of tenure, housing designs are sensitive to the community context.

Open house and workshop	
Message	Response
Need senior housing	The proposed zoning options do not have a direct positive or negative impact on the provision of senior housing. Dedicated housing for older adults may be accommodated at a small multifamily scale on lots that accommodate multifamily.
Like the pedestrian bridge	Comment noted
Support the retention of private trees	The City currently does not have a tree protection By-law for private property. However, the City will encourage the protection of existing trees through the design review process when properties are redeveloped.
Need heritage protections	Comment forwarded to City's Heritage Branch
Community needs to be involved	The City is now recommending that a public hearing be required for duplexes in the Lower Density and Medium Density Residential Areas. This is in addition to the requirement for a public hearing for all multi-family development, which was in the initial proposal. The public hearing will provide an opportunity for the community to be involved in the process.
Property taxes	The City is no longer recommending that residential properties in the neighbourhood be rezoned to "R2". Because assessed value is based on market value and there is no way to accurately predict the market, there is no way to definitively state whether market values will change. Based on past experience however, the City of Winnipeg Taxation and Assessment Division indicates that they believe that there is little or no change to market value or assessed value based solely on a change from "R1" to "R2" zoning.
How is density defined	Density is the number of dwelling units per lot, or a ratio of dwelling units per square feet of lot area.
Treat north and south of Corydon the same	The City is no longer recommending that residential properties in the neighbourhood – neither north nor south of Corydon Avenue - be rezoned to "R2".

Emails	
Theme	Response
Retention of single-family	All neighbourhoods are expected to accommodate growth and change (per OurWinnipeg). Secondary suites fulfill a particular niche within a complete community but are not suited to a wide spectrum of residents and family types. The Corydon-Osborne Area Plan identifies different scales of infill for each area of the plan. In response to concerns raised, the zoning recommendation going to public hearing will be revised to ensure an opportunity for public input through a public hearing for any two-family development in the lower and medium density areas.
Do not want decisions made by unelected officials (Board of Adjustment)	The Board of Adjustment is an appointed body that holds public hearings for variances and conditional uses that are not part of a rezoning. This role is legislated in the Development Procedures By-law (By-law No. 160/2011) Decisions of the Board of Adjustment can be appealed to the Appeals Committee, on which sits a rotating group of city councilors.

d. Detailed Comments

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online

FEEDBACK	RESPONSES
Residents	73%
Business owners	4%
Property owners	24%
Single family	78%
Duplex or multi-family	22%
Community group or cultural group	95%
Institution (school, daycare, church etc.)	5%

"I have received the information that I was looking for, either at the open house or online"	Yes 66.4% No 33.6%

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NO OPINION	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
"I agree with the proposal to rezone "R1" properties within the Plan Area to 'R2'"	13.3%	12.5%	5%	10%	59.2%
	25.8%			69.2%	
"I support the creation of a Transit- Oriented Development (TOD) zoning district, that would allow greater height and density adjacent to rapid transit stations"	26%	17.9%	13%	15.4%	27.6%
	43.9%			43%	
"The Planned Development Overlay (PDO) reflects the intent of the Corydon- Osborne Plan"	12.1%	17.2%	19.8%	19%	31%
	29.3%			50%	

SOURCE	**Surveys – hard copy and online**
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation"	
Our neighbourhood needs to stay as is. TOD is another failed concept for the City.	Leave density as is
The design guidelines sound good	Like the design guidelines
Concerned about parking	Parking an issue
Concerned about implementation. Concerned that the City will not protect the neighbourhood	Maintain neighbourhood character
No rentals. No more than 2 stories. No one should dictate design.	Against rentals. Heights an issue
Both sides of Fleet Avenue should be treated the same	Expand Plan area to both sides of Fleet
Concerned about absentee landlords and poor tenants	Absentee landlords, against rentals
Too crowded, no green space	Need green space
Parking problems, loss of green space, lower property values	Parking an issue, need green space, property values
Changes are minimal. We need density.	Increase density further
No rationale why it is needed. Lack of greenspace. Like the design review.	need green space, like the design guidelines
Support for the plan is contingent upon the design review.	like the design guidelines, unsure about PDO
This will allow modest density increases without changing neighbourhood form.	Like the density, like the design guidelines,
Transportation infrastructure does not match land use densities	Transportation and density an issue
More communication necessary. Buildings should be the height of surrounding properties midblock. Parking is an issue.	Heights an issue
More density is welcome.	Like the density
Concerns about absentee landlords. Transient tenants. Feel that it doesn't fit in well with the authenticity of the neighbourhood. Wants	Absentee landlords, against rentals

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
neighbours that are responsible, respectful, and settled.	
This will make parking worse. Will lead to gentrification or absentee landlord properties	Parking an issue, Absentee landlords
Increasing density will have a negative effect. The plan does not serve the residents of the neighbourhood.	Leave density as is
Should remain single-family only. More affordable single-family needed. More green space needed. Rapid transit is a joke!	Leave density as is, affordability an issue, need green space, no to rapid transit
I like that this neighbourhood is families and homeowners	against rentals
Even more dense zoning should be considered - it is time for Winnipeg to ACTUALLY densify. The parking structures will follow by market demand.	Increase density further
Winnipeg needs to adopt a more pro-active approach to development of sites. Number of units per acre is an old way of thinking and not how we should be calculating density available. It should be considered by looking at the overall achievable density on the site, with parking, Transit, cycling and other modes of transportation being considered equal.	Calculate density on transportation factors
Land Use: Setting buildings back after three floors only adds to the cost of construction and prevents development of infill sites. The additional costs imposed on infill development by these proposed plans will continue to drive large investment dollars towards greenfield sites. With land costs per acre substantially higher, the way the current plan is drafted the City has now imposed higher construction costs, as well. The only way to bring market affordable housing online with these plans is thru subsidy or by reducing the size of units exponentially. With the current system of dividing total site square footage by 400 (or 800 sf) sf to derive at potential density, the City is subsequently shutting down development of affordable units. Only affluent people will be able to afford condos in Corydon or Osborne Village based on these cost constraints.	Corydon Plan increases construction costs
Parking: The City should take the lead and build parking structures in strategic locations to encourage density greater than what may be permissible on existing sites due to site dimensional constraints.	Need parking structures

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
Other: No CONSUMER analysis was done for this plan and it affects numerous businesses ability to serve market demands. Not surveying the consumers prior to implementing a plan is backwards thinking that only serves to impose design standards onto the development market that may not be favoured by consumers.	Need consultation with homebuyers
Density: This neighbourhood is already dense	Leave density as is
Other: Where is more green space and dog parks?	Need green space, dog parks
Density: believe that the residential density guidelines when applied rigidly, will curtail development which is vital for the area. Low density zoning for the majority of the neighbourhood in the presence of several multifamily dwellings on every block is impractical and does not reflect the costs of the land on the market. The principals here are sound, but the application cannot be rigid.	Increase density further
Residential Density: Consider encouraging Cooperative Housing development opportunities within the study area.	Co-op housing needed
Other: maximize safe biking routes and secure bike lock-up sites.	Cycling infrastructure needed
Small lots, parking, too many garbage bins on back lane, my property value.	Parking an issue, small lots an issue
Land Use: Lots too small for "R2 zoning	small lots an issue
Building Placement & Height: Size and height restricts sunlight and air movement	Heights an issue Size an issue
Parking: Adding R2 adds more cars parking on street	Parking an issue
These changes will destroy the social fabric of our community and negatively impact the health of residents and our housing values.	Social health impacted
It depends on your definition of TOD zoning district, I think the area is currently too large	TOD area too large
Land Use: maintain all green space, no variances that reduce green space, limit size of garages so that they do not take up most of the yard area.	Need green space, Garage size an issue
Building Placement & Height: Residential height that fits in with housing	Heights an issue

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
next door and higher than 30 feet	
Parking: Lots should be open for visitors in evenings and not sitting empty, a return to parking passes for the block and not a city area	Shared parking should be permitted
Signage: Signs on Corydon and not on residential streets, avenues	Restrict signage in residential areas
Design: Want the 2011 design principles and not the 2014 developer friendly principles in the current plan	Design guidelines too lax
Residential Density: Want diversity, family homes, a safe community, more long term residents	More longer term residents
Other: Create a community that supports active transportation, The bus system should be a part of an active transportation system, not the focus	Active transportation focus needed
Apartment blocks should not be "dumped" into the middle of character streets like McMillan Ave	Apartment blocks should not be mid-block
Building Placement & Height: don't build high rises on streets lined with character homes	No high rises on lower density streets
Parking: there is not enough parking as it is, it is a real issue	Parking an issue
Signage: speed limit signs should be clear and placed in areas like McMillan to stop the many trucks (that want to avoid Corydon traffic) from speeding the streets	Speed limit signage an issue
Design: buildings were supposed to be designed to fit in with the neighbourhood. That was not the case on McMillan. They were going to build a plain box condo in the middle of the street. We were assured that this was not going to happen.	Previous designs not acceptable
There is already the option for individual property owners to pursue rezoning, on a case-by-case basis.	No to R2
As long as it does not risk of single-family homes with a R1 designation in the neighbourhood. I do not want my home rezoned.	No to R2
Land Use: Strongly object to rezoning 950 homes from R1 to R2	No to R2
Residential Density: We have a limited stock of affordable single-family homes in Winnipeg. Rezoning from R1 to R2 will put this at risk.	No to R2
Increased density without impacting these homes may be appropriate if	like the density, like the

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
design guidelines are followed.	design guidelines
Building Placement & Height: No set backs of buildings from the front street please	Small front setbacks
Parking: No back lane parking please	No rear parking
more people please	like the density
Parking: having car share vehicles available has reduced the demand for vehicle parking by residents.	Car shares help, parking an issue
Residential Density: This is a great neighbourhood that can accommodate many more people. Bring on the density.	Like the density
Other: A little more emphasis on active transportation infrastructure would be nice	Active transportation focus needed, Cycling infrastructure needed
Design Guidelines: The document references Design Guidelines / Controls, but section 3.5 is just called Design Guidelines. Are the "guidelines" or "Controls"? Happy to see that the type of material in the design guidelines has been removed. I still believe it is limiting to state that roof need to be pitched in residential area. Beautiful house being built in mature neighborhoods can have flat roofs.	like the design guidelines
Other: I strongly disagree with the statement that "Confusion Corner stands as a barricade between Osborne Station and the surrounding community." on page 44 of the plan. Confusion Corner was there first and the transit station should have been planned better so as to not separate itself from Confusion corner. Although I agree that accessibility and pedestrian access and across confusion corner needs to be improved, I am very concerned that the 'Appendix' document references the creation of roundabouts and this is not mentioned in the plan. Confusion Corner is an iconic part of Winnipeg Lore and creating roundabouts is going to ruin this and not improve the pedestrian realm. I have never seen a roundabout that pedestrians can cross. This area needs to be reviewed and studied very carefully taking all things into consideration similar to the thought and discussion surrounding portage and main. Has this been approved?	No to roundabouts
Make Mulvey Ave into greenspace	Need green space,
Land Use: more parks, greenspace, and playgrounds	Need green space, playgrounds

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
Building Placement: keep the higher density close to main through fares	Target density to major streets
Parking: come up with a better plan for parking in the Corydon patio zone	Parking near patios an issue
Design Guidelines: more green space	Need green space
Rezoning the area south of Corydon Ave to R2 does not reflect the "low density" nature of the neighborhood as outlined in the plan. That area should remain as R1 to reflect the low-density nature of the plan.	No to R2
Increased rental properties will adversely affect property value. On-street parking is already an issue with residents.	Parking an issue, against rentals
higher rental property devalues single dwelling homes, resale value, less community oriented people, increase transient population, less safe,	Against rentals, property values
I don't understand why you want to destroy a beautiful and distinct community. This hasn't worked in other cities. The developers will not adhere to any building code standards - they'll overbuild and then abandon the area for current residents to try and handle. We have a multi-family condo that was built by us - it's huge, an eye sore, doesn't fit the area and it sits empty - no one is living in it (no one purchased any of the condos). These places will be rented out - we have a rental house beside us and it's been horrible - the renters don't care about the area (they consider it a party area - they have no buy-in). Please don't destroy this area of the city - it's different and that's why people like it and bought houses here. There are many families living here and all you want to do it push them out of the area. Too many empty condos and store fronts already exist - you are over developing the area in the wrong direction.	Against rentals, overdevelopment a concern
Our single-family house on McMillan is next to a multi-family dwelling in which the landlord isn't present. The three families who live in the multi-family dwelling are responsible for everything bad that happens on the street - crime, garbage, noise, etc. It's not hyperbole to say that more homes like this one will ultimately ruin the neighborhood. Homeowners care more than renters, right?	Absentee landlords, against rentals
This is already a high density, congested area with poor parking availability. We enjoy the treed and old stock housing.	Leave density as is, parking an issue, Maintain neighbourhood character, support retention of private trees
Rezoning will allow absent owners to cut down the size of residences for	Absentee landlords,

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
apartment living. There will be no room for families. The neighbourhood will be populated with renters, not homeowners. Homeowners are likely to interact with their neighbours, renters are not, as they are more transitory. Drug dealers and gang members are not likely to be the type of people who own home, but the type of people who rent houses. We have a lot of schools in the area which will be wasted on transitory renters. Don't do this!	against rentals
Why is this needed? It doesn't seem part of the Corydon-Osborne neighbourhood plan. Too crowded, not enough consultation with residents.	Leave density as is, Community needs to be involved
I would consider a transitional step whereby small areas get re-zoned. Those areas would be assessed on a block by block, and half-block by half-block basis, to identify likely and reasonable targets for reconstruction, especially for blocks where the housing has significantly deteriorated, or where significant areas are already effectively multi-unit rooming houses, or poor quality rental housing.	Phase increased density
1) Infrastructure concerns such as: parking, sewer capacity, road capacity, and water service (2) Maintaining the historic character of the neighbourhood (3) The effect of absentee landlords, and potential property neglect (4) Historically this neighbourhood degenerated when it was previously zoned R2, and recovered its health, viability, livability and community when zoned to R1; residents feel a sense of ownership and investment (5) including a community investment in the urban forest through tree banding (6) if only 2 - 4 properties a year request re-zoning in this area, what is the motivation behind rezoning 950 properties? (5) waste management the increase of garbage and recycling boxes would make the lanes even more difficult to transit	Infrastructure concerns, Maintain neighbourhood character, Absentee landlords, No to R2, support retention of private trees, waste management
Parking is already a big problem (family and friends can't find space on the street to park and small back yards are becoming parking lots)	Parking an issue
A considerable increase of the population in the area is not acceptable. Nor are numerous absentee landlord properties which was the situation twenty years ago before the rezoning to R1.	Absentee landlords, Leave density as is
The re-zoning is in opposition to the stated Corydon-Osborne Plan's to "maintain the character and scale of the residential neighbourhood."	No to R2
I agree with higher density in new and infill development. But subdividing existing one-family homes into two-family homes will only create a derelict, junky, shanty-town atmosphere. It is a huge negative.	No to R2

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
will destroy the neighbourhood	
This will result in the elimination of affordable centrally located single family housing in favor of higher priced condominiums and/or absentee-landlord rental properties. The percentage of rental dwellings in this neighbourhood is already 50% higher than the City average. The existing balance needs to be maintained.	Need housing for families, absentee landlords
There is no justification for this in the Plan. It seems to have been dropped in at the end without any rationale. This will have serious negative impacts on the neighbourhood.	No rationale for change
no towers	No towers
The goal of the proposed rezoning and its potential impacts need to be clearly understood. If the goal is it to merely promote or facilitate (what may appear to be reasonable) densification, then residents need to understand the impact this will have on housing affordability, especially for young families. From recent experience, single family homes have been replaced by 2-3 storey, 1-2 bedroom condos, not geared to families with children. This type of development did not appear to be well received by neighbouring residents. While some of the conceptual renderings show more neighbourhood-friendly 2.5 storey replacement housing, greater assurance is needed as to how the traditional nature of the neighbourhood will be maintained.	Need more information on rationale, maintain neighbourhood character
I can only see detrimental effects for the current residents, many of whom have been working to improve their homes and the neighbourhood. There has been a marked improvement in the last 20 years I have lived in my home. The problem houses on the street are those owned and neglected by absentee landlords. We've had our share of drug squad raids... all in the rentals. We don't need or want any crack houses in the area. We want to see young families enjoying a pleasant stable neighbourhood.	Need housing for families, absentee landlords
unless it costs anything	
We want single dwelling homes. Not multiple family homes with landlords living off site. We want community of families that care and maintain there property. We want residents that are likely to be invested in the community and programs in area (schools, community clubs etc.)	Need housing for families, absentee landlords
Your map is a work in progress and not final and the devil is in the	

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
details. Given the proposed boundary area, which may or may not expand, is too close to River Heights area and in time will influence this current neighbourhood in a negative way.	
Honestly, i wish that someone would listen to me. I do not want all the single family homes to be turned into apartment blocks and multi plexes. We don't need greater density in this neighbourhood. Many of the redeveloped units do not sell and are rented out to people who pass through the neighbourhood. This is not a good way to build and strengthen a neighbourhood.	Leave density as is, against rentals
The City needs even greater density than just this	Increase density further
I am concerned that the area will turn into mostly rentals, rather than a family neighbourhood.	against rentals
One must learn from past mistakes in order to progress through life. Under previous R2 designation, this neighborhood was in a noticeable state of decline.	No to R2
What makes this neighbourhood great is all the amenities nearby. This requires a substantial residential population -- and that means more housing!	Like the density
It was changed from R2 to R1 in the 90's, and the area improved, now developers want to make money here, and they don't care about the character of the neighbourhood.	No to R2
it will destroy the historical character of the area	Main
It's going to ruin the neighbourhood. You've already seen the ugly buildings going up with tin siding and they don't fit in the neighbourhood. Instead of improving and putting actual work into old homes developers will just come in, tear down and build a new.	maintain neighbourhood character
I attended most of the meetings to come up with a neighbourhood plan, and rezoning was not an issue. The PDO map shows the residential district as #8 (lower density residential). Rezoning to R2 would change increase the density to a level not suitable for the lot size and character of the neighbourhood.	No to R2
I have a list of concerns I would like to discuss. Please follow up and contact me by e-mail. Thanks.	Request for contact

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
I received the rezoning letter in the mail but am outside (just north of) of the Project Area. This is confusing as it assumes my area is also being rezoned?	
Rezoning R2 on Jessie has some logic, extending to Mulvey and Fleet seems arbitrary, and unnecessary. The 5 minute walk from Corydon rationale seems insufficient to justify such a major change.	Rezoning map question
Would love to see more density!	Increase density further
Blanket rezoning is wrong. I am one of the early victims of the unforeseen aspects of the Plan, having had a triplex rental unit built next to my single family home into which I just sank $200k in renovation work. I saw for myself how easy it is for developers to get a zoning variance beyond R2 and how eager the Property & Planning people are to give them the variances. I saw how trees and gardens were removed to be replaced by a 30 by 30 foot concrete parking lot. I am *going* to see a diminution in my property value when we sell (we were going to retire here but now? Forget it.) I can see how the visual character of the neighbourhood will change forever. Blanket rezoning is *wrong*, it only encourages developers to treat our neighbourhood like an amusement park for their benefit, and their interests are not aligned with current home owners. I have gone from being a propent of the Area Plan to being one opposed to it, out of bitter experience. It made a loser out of me and my family. There will be many more to come. I received zero assistance from the City, either the PP&D people or my so-called councillor, Jenny Gerbasi. I have no faith in the City to make good decisions when it comes to working with developers.	No to R2
Secondary Suites are still conditional in R2 zones... This should change too.	Secondary Suites allowed in R2
We need to maintain the rich historic value of this area and this proposal paves the way for its destruction.	maintain neighbourhood character
Developers should still have to apply for variances to build up and out beyond current limits (i.e. too close to sidewalk or back lane etc.)	Variances should be required
I will disagree until I receive the detailed assurances requested in the prior question.	
Sounds like this rezoning will make the process more efficient without sacrificing anything to current single-family dwellings. It also might add	Like the density, like the design guidelines

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
to the aesthetic of the neighbourhood, with the new regulations for incorporating a duplex scenario.	
It does not need to be rezoned - it could be a permitted use.	
Over 65 %of residences in this area are already apartments or duplexes. We need more!	Increase density further
apartment blocks should not be "dumped" into the middle of character streets like McMillan ave	No mid blocks apartments
Small lots, parking, too many garbage bins on backlane, my property value.	Parking an issue, property values, waste management
I don't believe we are close to the rapid transit to make this worth while	TOD district too large
Right now - I don't agree with any of the plans for this area. Wrong direction.	Don't agree
The footprint of the neighborhood should remain the same. Building housing from sidewalk to back lane will destroy the green space and the symmetry of our neighbourhood.	Against overbuilding of lots
Key TOD areas are set aside as parks/greenspace in the conceptual plan. This should be reconsidered.	Need greenspace in TOD area
Transit oriented development and "walkable neighbourhoods," appear to be different things in the planning documents. Plunking a patch of mid-rise to high-rise condo projects on deeply set-back sites on Pembina Highway won't actually make a walkable neighbourhood. It will still have the flavour of a left-over site along a crummy heavy-transport corridor unless there are strong and enforceable design guidelines that tell developers how they can develop. Without guidelines, this will effectively be a suburban experience (like the South end of Pembina), where a handful of ugly towers have been plunged into the middle of their lots, with acres of surface parking around them.	TOD needs good design guidelines
Please re-read above comments.	
Our streets are used as parking spaces for people working downtown and in the village area, some homes may be suitable for this idea but the majority are not. I never purchased my house hoping one day I'd have an apartment block overlooking my back yard, blocking out the sun, and	Parking an issue, leave density as is

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
further congesting traffic.	
What constitutes "adjacent"... One block? Ten blocks?	
like my neighbourhood the way it is	Leave as is
bad program altogether - not enough buses not frequent enough - don't need to glue new condos to improve bus service	No to TOD
I do not want our area re-zoned	No to R2
Does city council have any ideas on affordable transit instead of what we now have.	Affordable transit
Your plan does not provide the required details to understand the true impact for the area, and surrounding areas.	Need more info
Well, it depends on where the transit stations will actually be built, if they are ever going to be built. I am okay with greater height and density close to Pembina Highway for instance, but not along the less busy streets of Corydon and Stafford.	TOD density should be close to Pembina
It should not just be limited to near the transit stations. Corydon, Osborne, Pembina, should all be the highest density possible and the first street off these roads should be high density, as well...this city needs density and parking structures.	Increase TOD density further, building parking structures
There are very few areas in the city that you can very easily live without a car. This is one of them, and more needs to be done to build that up.	Increase density further
I don't like these large apartments, I would prefer a garden in the area	No to large apartments
very ugly idea	TOD ugly
Yes, height and density near RT stations make sense, but what about running the lines where there already exists much need for transit, as opposed to empty land which will only expand the built footprint instead of densifying our city.	Building TOD where transit need exists
I don't have sufficient information on this at this time to comment.	Need more info
I don't agree with anything in the proposals until it shows us complete details.	Need more info
The second phase of BRT is going down the wrong route... It should go	RT route is wrong

SOURCE	Surveys – hard copy and online
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
along Letellier	
So long as current rights and uses are not impacted (i.e. a business on Pembina can still expand)	TOD OK as long as uses not impacted and businesses can expand
Build the transit where the people are. TOD is backwards.	Building TOD where people are
More people please.	Increase density further
As long as it does not risk of single-family homes with a R1 designation in the neighbourhood. I do not want my home rezoned.	No to R2

SOURCE	Individual Open House and Workshop Comments
DATE	**March 8, 2016 & June 21, 2016**
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
Need more housing for seniors and low income families	Need senior and affordable housing
Like pedestrian bridge idea	Like pedestrian bridge
The process from 2011 Corydon Osborne Neighbourhood plan was stopped in July 2012 and work did not appear to be used in 2014 plan	Like older Corydon proposals
Consultation process was not clear or transparent, not sure you can make the statement you have	Issue with planning process
More public parks would be needed to make the area work with this current plan.	Need more parks
The pedestrian bridge is an excellent idea!	Like pedestrian bridge
Affordable housing for seniors would be a worthwhile addition	Need senior and affordable housing
There is not enough green space.	Need green space
The pedestrian walkway would be an excellent addition to the community, and would improve the walkability of the neighbourhood immensely.	Like pedestrian bridge
Where will people park?	Parking an issue
Has parking been accounted for, for a higher density?	Parking an issue
Need to encourage housing for seniors; supportive living complex.	Need senior and affordable housing
How does plan support a healthy community and increase green space	Need green space, walkability

SOURCE	Individual Open House and Workshop Comments
DATE	March 8, 2016 & June 21, 2016
FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
and active living spaces.	
Need plan that includes green space and connections that supports active living	Need green space, walkability
Maximum should be 35 – 40%, not 45%	Lot coverage is too high
35 ft. is too high for a mature neighbourhood where most dwellings are under 30 ft.	Height an issue
Need to consider housing next door to new developments and not block light to next door properties;	Height an issue, size an issue
Corner lots should be green space and not buildings that dwarf next door homes. No tall buildings on southwest corner;	Need green space, Height an issue,
Need to dictate more than open space ratio on lots, but also have protection and benefits to owners who protect the mature tree canopy on their street/lot. These street trees, and trees on private property, define character as much as housing styles and masonry.	Need green space, support retention of private trees
Amenity spaces that include gardens and green space need to be encouraged.	Need green space, garden options
No more drinking establishments on Corydon-Lilac-McMillan	No more bars
Needs to be well maintained access to the river for all residents of area.	River access need improvement
Will these higher density residential buildings be suitable for families with children that will attend the nearby schools?	Want homes for families
This is kind of monolithic – as some blocks right now north and south of Corydon, are in terrible shape and almost universally composed of tear-downs. Other blocks however, are composed of well-kept properties. It may make good sense to treat the different block by block condition differently and more precisely, even to the point of suggesting that the north side of one street, for example, could be more targeted 'for demolition/renewal' and the south side preserved.	Treat each side of street differently
Preserve and protect trees on private and public property. Canopy is probably more important to streetscape character than are buildings, on many blocks.	support retention of private trees

SOURCE	**Individual Open House and Workshop Comments**
DATE	**March 8, 2016 & June 21, 2016**

FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
Concern about superblock development on Corydon – i.e. large lot consolidation, long buildings lacking fine-grain. Yes – agree (on same post it note).	Support fine grained development
Why not specify a maximum setback from street of property line. Then there would be a strong streetscape.	Small front setbacks
Important to have gardens and green space that may take up more than 10 ft.	Need green space, garden options
Concerned about the 'commuter' quality of drinking established and patios already. Too many places where people come to this area to drink, get rowdy, mess up the neighbourhood then go home to their own neighbourhood.	No more bars
Need incentives to preserve existing character homes.	Need heritage protections
Would like a record of existing homes and architectural details –need it to preserve what we have.	Need heritage protections
It is unclear how the traditional character of the neighbourhood will be preserved.	Need heritage protections
Need ways to encourage visitable housing (a 2nd person wrote 'agreed')	Visitable housing
Why are you letting contactors to build those grain elevators?	
How does the community have input into proposed building? How do we track what is happening and the impact?	Community needs to be involved
How do these three 'boxes' fit into a century neighbourhood? (see house in foreground)	Design guidelines too lax
45% of lot can be taken up by housing: this may prove to be too large to protect access to sunlight and protect drainage space. Please reconsider.	Lot coverage is too high
Need to decide on indicators or criteria for evaluating how plan is working, so that evaluation can be completed at the 5 year mark.	Need to monitor implementation
Homeowners need to be involved.	Community needs to be involved

SOURCE	**Individual Open House and Workshop Comments**
DATE	**March 8, 2016 & June 21, 2016**

FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
What is the benefit to the homeowners who have lived here for 3 or 4 decades?	
Homeowners need to be informed of this process and plan.	Community needs to be involved
Population: What are expected outcomes and how will zoning achieve it/them (not answered)	Need to monitor implementation
Impact on sewer system	Sewer impacts
Rapid Transit: more people would mean more transit expansion	Support rapid transit
Impact on taxes	Property taxes
What role does Board of Adjustment play that could change all of this	Process/ approval question
How do you conserve the nature of the neighbourhood? What can be done – what mechanism can be used, i.e. heritage conservation district	Need heritage protections
Clarify population density (Response (Michael Robinson) - Density means the, number of dwelling units not the number of people.)	How is density defined
Being used to promote rapid transit	
Zoning meaning - # of taxable properties	How is density defined
Rapid Transit – lots of people along route	Support rapid transit
Zoning – property tax base being increased, not people	Property taxes
Old buildings had more people living in them	How is density defined
Residential impacts and densities - low, medium, high multifamily; what does medium MF mean?	How is density defined
R2 Rezoning: don't take much solace in the Board of Adjustment protecting the neighbourhood; there is no policy in the Plan for a radical rezoning; density around Rapid Transit Station is ok	No to R2, Process/ approval question, TOD is ok
Number of new dwelling units will be 40 – 80 over life of Plan – two dwelling units a year	

SOURCE	**Individual Open House and Workshop Comments**
DATE	**March 8, 2016 & June 21, 2016**

FEEDBACK	**KEY THEMES**
Should be minimum increase in intensity and mapped out where that should happen – North & South of Corydon	Like the density
City's #'s – two dwelling units/yr. – why would that warrant a rezoning (to R2)	No to R2
How did it get into the Plan? (Kurtis K – consultants calculations at back of plan and market assessment done (Stevenson Real Estate)	
Secondary suites – can do now without a rezoning	
North of Corydon area - is R2 still on table? Clarify parking behind building.	Is R2 proposed north of Corydon
Green space – what are you referring to? Destroy integrity of neighbourhood and investment	Need green space
Objectives of R2: green space – maintain; concern regarding parking, pay for parking on street if we rezone to R2	Need green space, parking an issue, pay for street parking if rezone
North of Corydon rezoning to R2 – off the table? Don't divide the neighbourhood.	No to R2
Rezoning to R2: who is pushing this change? Why does an already dense neighbourhood need to change - interests of property developers and investors – whose interests are being represented?	No to R2, leave density as is
Performance Measurement: What is the state of performance measurement and where are they published? What process does the public have for input on the review of the Plan? What is the status for reviewing the plan?	Need performance measurement, Community needs to be involved, when is plan reviewed
Why distinguish between north and south of Corydon areas? Should be treated the same	Treat north and south of Corydon the same
Interest in looking at higher density areas	Like the density
Consideration of migrating birds and tall buildings	Migrating birds, height an issue
Greenspace and lack of parks	Need green space
This area was R2 and it declined, then it was R1 and it recovered, if we switch it back to R2, how do you know it won't decline again?	Concern about decline from R2

SOURCE	Individual Open House and Workshop Comments
DATE	March 8, 2016 & June 21, 2016

FEEDBACK	KEY THEMES
How does this rezoning benefit homeowners? It looks like a gift to developers.	Who benefits?
Why are you now proposing to make the area north of Corydon R2, but not the area south of Corydon?	Treat north and south of Corydon the same
What are the likeliest consequences for homeowners if the R2 plan goes through?	What are outcomes from R2 for homeowners
Green space needed	Need green space
Protect trees!! Make it a bylaw!	support retention of private trees
Parking is at a premium – this sounds shallow, but it is important!	Parking an issue
It is unfair to consider south of Corydon as different from our neighbours to the north side.	Treat north and south of Corydon the same
Gertrude Avenue should be low or medium density, not 'high'. Please treat north of Corydon like south of Corydon.	Treat north and south of Corydon the same
No to transient population, crack houses and grow ops	Transient, crack houses, grow ops
Lower density south of Corydon, medium density north of Corydon	Like the density

SOURCE	Emails to August, 2016	

FEEDBACK	KEY THEMES
…should the plan boundaries run down the back lane instead of the centerline of the street?	Geographic scope
…concern about reducing the limited stock of single-family homes. If the rezoning of our neighbourhood from R2 to R1 back in 1994/5 had a positive impact, why change back to R2?	Retention of single-family
…if I were to duplex my home, what guidelines do I need to follow to ensure the home meets residential and safety codes?	Construction details for duplex
…recommend that McMillan become a neighbourhood greenway with roundabouts and curb treatments at the corners.	Right-of-way improvements
…how will it be known how many times one individual responds [to the survey]?	Public feedback process
…absentee landlords do not take pride in their properties. This type of redevelopment will change the neighbourhood.	Absentee landlords
…large numbers of residents are opposed to the many different infills	Retention of single-family

SOURCE	**Emails to August, 2016**	
FEEDBACK		**KEY THEMES**
(huge duplexes or larger structures) that proceed with no regard to the neighbours.		
A big problem with this rationale is that our existing R1 zoning already allows for the creation of a secondary suite by right (without getting a zoning variance) in our dwellings, subject to limitations on size. Developers will have an easy path to RMF(multi-family) development once the area has been zoned R2.		Retention of single-family; Proliferation of multi-family
I think the change will cause major parking and noise issues and reduction in property values. …noise levels are quite high from existing duplexes		Parking and noise
…concerns that the rezoning will excite developers to buy up properties in my neighbourhood and re-development them taking the opportunity to increase lot coverage to the full 45% allowable		Lot coverage
I imagine several scenarios where R2 would benefit us and make it possible for us to stay in the neighbourhood as we age… to have a suite to rent out, both to cover expenses and so as not to be completely alone in the building.		Aging in place
…my neighbourhood needs a renewal and revitalization that can only come from R1-R2 rezoning. In short, I see benefits in curbing urban sprawl, upgrading infrastructure and putting a check to rising property taxes by expanding our tax base.		Area reinvestment

SOURCE	**Surveys – addendum question**
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
<u>LAND USE</u>	
As much as I like my G35 I would love to see a proper dedicated bike lane on Corydon or a side street like Sherbrook St currently has.	
Let people enjoy their yards and peace	
A streamlined approval process is contrary to Plan	
I don't want to live in a medium-rise area. I didn't buy into that. Final say about the land use in our community is being given to people that don't live here (developers) and never will live here.	
Too much preference for developers over individual homeowners.	
Keep residential with green space	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
Generally good. Park area in the TOD zone should be scaled back. Dedicated residential should be allowed rather than forcing mixed use of each building.	
his is going to happen and residents of the future will love it because living here's so convenient	
I'd like some more green space around the neighbourhood, not just more and more residences.	
The holus-bolus re-zoning doesn't take into account the highly variable nature of the building stock on each block. It isn't sophisticated and refined enough to provide the actual benefit that I would believe is the goal of this, which is the overall improvement of the neighbourhood.	
Allowing up to 45%of the land to build on will increase water runoff and stress the old existing sewer system beyond its limits	
keep it R1	
Keep the status quo.	
questionable legality of any pdo in town	
pleased with most land designations	
It looks to me as if no real changes are proposed.	
Concern over the land coverage and ground drainage	
R1 is largely the intended use for the area and changing it to R2 does not follow the city guidelines to the existing area and surrounding areas.	
Need flexible zoning and density. The plan should be for all of Winnipeg's benefit not to protect NIMBY homeowners in the area.	
more gardens	
keep it R1	
Why is city prohibiting front parking? there is a shortage	
More density and diversity	
The neighbourhood will be full of multi-unit properties, beyond two units, and no consideration will be given to the effects on current owners of single unit properties.	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
It seems that the PDO intends to eliminate the entire character of the "high rise" area, as it currently has automobile focused zones, as well as restaurants and drive-throughs and surface parking lots.	
Leave zoning as is	
more parks, greenspace, and playgrounds	
Strongly object to rezoning 950 homes from R1 to R1	
Maintain all green space, no variances that reduce green space, limit size of garages so that they do not take up most of the yard area.	
Lots too small for "R2 zoning.	
Setting buildings back after three floors only adds to the cost of construction and prevents development of infill sites. The additional costs imposed on infill development by these proposed plans will continue to drive large investment dollars towards greenfield sites. With land costs per acre substantially higher, the way the current plan is drafted the City has now imposed higher construction costs, as well. The only way to bring market affordable housing online with these plans is thru subsidy or by reducing the size of units exponentially. With the current system of dividing total site square footage by 400 (or 800 sf) sf to derive at potential density, the City is subsequently shutting down development of affordable units. Only affluent people will be able to afford condos in Corydon or Osborne Village based on these cost constraints.	
<u>BUILDING PLACEMENT AND HEIGHT</u>	
Further apart than now	
Potential for destroying character/scale of neighbourhood	
Concerns over height and privacy issues	
condos can ruin our private space, darker backyards, homes adjacent to multifamily dwellings will have less privacy	
Too high and too wide - eye sore.	
Too much preference for developers over individual homeowners.	
Two story with attic	
Higher buildings seem more okay on northern sides, but NOT in areas where it would block all the	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
sunlight from a smaller building. That just looks like bullying.	
should fall within the existing neighbourhood character	
What we've seen so far, both in the documents, and in the redevelopments that have happened in the area to-date, is that there has been zero design guideline effort to protect access to natural light in the neighbouring properties to re-development sites. For example, on a number of tiny lots, there have been large 3-4 storey bldgs. Created immediately adjacent, (and hard-up to the setback lines) to neighbouring properties. Those existing properties lose all access to natural light, and sit deep in the shadow of the new buildings. It is hardly fair for existing land-holders to lose their access to natural light when a neighbour plunks a cavernous 3-4 storey wall right on the setback line. The lots are so thin that it is effectively an assault on the existing land-holder.	
keep it R1	
As above	
pleased	
This is already the way it is.	
No one wants a big box feet from their property or into their sun in their bag or front yards.	
You have already ruined parts of River Height allowing the height of 35' beside bungalows. It's appalling and the 30' height max. Should be reinstated, as the real intent was for new areas for nanny suites only.	
LOWER, LOWER, LOWER. We are not New York or Toronto.	
This should be handled on a case by case basis - building set backs are expensive and unnecessary	
There should be no height restrictions along Corydon Ave! A pedestrian feeling can be achieved with the right designs, not by limiting height.	
keep buildings two and half stories or less	
keep it R1	
The building height scares me, If someone has been living in a neighbourhood for years in their old home that they have put time and work into and someone buys the house next door tears it down and builds a monstrosity booking any view outdoors what are you going to do then?	

SOURCE	**Surveys – addendum question**
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
Why is city prohibiting car related construction/ business?	
Consider North, South, East, West position in relationship to smaller buildings nearby. Will they block the sun, invade privacy, and/or lower neighbours' property values?	
Yes, up up up.	
No higher than existing, plus-century-old two storey units.	
Minimum building heights, especially in the mid and high density areas seem completely out of sync with the existing character	
Max 2.5 stories as was the areas original intent	
LEAVE US SOME SUN IN OUR BACK YARDS!!!!	
keep the higher density close to main through fares	
No set backs of buildings from the front street please	
don't build high rises on streets lined with character homes	
Residential height that fits in with housing next door and higher than 30 feet	
Size and height restricts sunlight and air movement.	
Setting buildings back after three floors only adds to the cost of construction and prevents development of infill sites. The additional costs imposed on infill development by these proposed plans will continue to drive large investment dollars towards greenfield sites. With land costs per acre substantially higher, the way the current plan is drafted the City has now imposed higher construction costs, as well. The only way to bring market affordable housing online with these plans is thru subsidy or by reducing the size of units exponentially. With the current system of dividing total site square footage by 400 (or 800 sf) sf to derive at potential density, the City is subsequently shutting down development of affordable units. Only affluent people will be able to afford condos in Corydon or Osborne Village based on these cost constraints.	
<u>PARKING</u>	
We don't need more. The appeal of this area is that it's walkable and bikable. We're wasting space with parking lots.	
There is already insufficient parking	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
parking is already an issue w residents, increased resident population will only lead to fewer spots	
Parking doesn't work now. How are you going to make it work when you overpopulate the area? People who live here and visitors fight over spots. The large apartment buildings on our street don't have assigned parking lots - fix parking first before bringing in more cars. Find parking for people who are visiting the stores on Corydon, so they want to come to this area (easy parking means more people from outside the community will visit, shop and eat in this area).	
As it is now, we're rarely able to park in front of our house on McMillan. Greater density will exacerbate the problem.	
Higher residential density will lead to fewer street parking spots, where they're already taken up by many evening visitors to the Corydon strip.	
I would say that this area doesn't have a parking problem for most residents, as most residents have access to back-lane parking. However, many residents simply fail to use it, preferring to park on the street in front of their residence. If the number of residences increases, this will make the perception of the parking problem worse, and to solve it, would somehow require that residents park in the back lane. However, since in most cases the City never plows the back lanes, and most residents are too lazy to shovel the area behind their garages, they prefer to park on the street. An increase in residential density would require more focus on the provision of lane-clearing and maintenance, as a City-provided service; something that the City has shown little interest in to-date.	
Not enough parking now, since the parking must be "hidden" from the street view back lanes would become even more congested. Paving the back yards for parking spaces will increase the water runoff during rain events stressing the system	
With the proposed increase of the population where are all the extra cars going to park, especially during winter and street clearing?	
keep it R1	
There is already insufficient parking on many streets in the area, increasing density will only worsen situation. That said, I don't want any parking lots in the area.	
pleased	
More parking not less.	
Not enough parking right now due to Corydon. R2 Zoning will create a larger parking problem	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
Traffic and parking is a huge safety problem already and is not addressed in your report.	
Insist that new development includes enough parking and does not rely on street parking.	
The City needs to show leadership and develop a parkade in the area OR stimulate one being built	
Developers should have flexibility around parking, and parking should be metered or permitted so that people have to "put their money where their car is".	
there's enough parking	
keep it R1	
Parking is already horrid in this area, I recently moved back to my parents' house on Warsaw from an apartment I was living in on Dorchester where I had to share one stall with my roommate. Finding street parking is horrendous. The area is already so dense with apartments and condos adding more multifamily homes will only make things worse.	
There needs to be more parking. it's a problem in osborne-corydon	
Increase in R2s will put strain on existing shortage of parking	
Despicable. Once you get past two units you need hideous concrete parking lots. Absolutely deplorable -- nothing urbanist about that at *all*.	
No parking lots or private accesses should front/egress from Corydon.	
Parking remains an important part of any development, and this PDO seems to be overly aspirational in forcing less parking.	
Leave as is adequate for current zoning and would negatively be impacted by greater density	
We need more of it. It ought to be made aesthetically pleasing rather than just paved lots.	
come up with a better plan for parking in the Corydon patio zone	
Having car share vehicles available has reduced the demand for vehicle parking by residents.	
No backlane parking please	
there is not enough parking as it is, it is a real issue	
Lots should be open for visitors in evenings and not sitting empty, a return to parking passes for the	

SOURCE	**Surveys – addendum question**
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
block and not a city area	
Adding R2 adds more cars parking on streets	
The City should take the lead and build parking structures in strategic locations to encourage density greater than what may be permissible on existing sites due to site dimensional constraints.	
SIGNAGE	
The mobile signs that stores use are tacky.	
The building on Dorchester and Stafford (which now houses a nice restaurant - no complaints there) for years featured a large "trim your fat" weight-loss sign in the front yard. I'm glad it's gone; let's not encourage more commercial OOH ads near family residences.	
The guidelines should say "No LED signage; no digital signage; no visual-display signage." Those installations that are already popping up through the city are an embarrassment. I just came back from Minneapolis, for example, where such signage is not tolerated, and the city is much the better for it. Better cities have had the moxie to ban such signs. They are a nuisance; they are unsafe around roadways as they blind motorists and pedestrians, and they are wasteful of energy resources.	
No electronic / digital signage for this character neighbourhood (it would be against the plan)	
keep it R1	
As above	
I couldn't care less about signage	
Less not more. Think more about conciseness.	
Signage has been a perennial problem in Winnipeg. Good luck if you can fix it.	
keep it the way it is	
keep it R1	
Why is the city prohibiting banners and digital signs? advertising is key for business	
No more billboards of any kind on Corydon Avenue. They are hideous.	
The restrictive signage criteria will likely lead to diminished opportunities for business marketing	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
and/or variances	
Fine as is	
The "traffic calming circles" signage could possibly be made uglier but I can't imagine how.	
speed limit signs should be clear and placed in areas like McMillan to stop the many trucks (that want to avoid Corydon traffic) from speeding the streets	
Signs on Corydon and not on residential streets, avenues	
<u>DESIGN GUIDELINES/ DESIGN REVIEW</u>	
Preference is given to developers and not people who currently own single-family houses (R1) in the area. Shouldn't the homeowners have a choice if they want their house to go to R2? No one wants a building beside them that is one foot from their window, tears down trees, blocks the sun, and takes up the whole property. Developers are not adhering to the guidelines now - why would they adhere to guidelines when you give them free reign. You'll kill the character of this area.	
The builders/developers aren't adhering to the guidelines now. They won't get better when properties get rezoned to R2 (check out everyone's favorite example on Jessie). Please don't give the developers a blank cheque; they've already proven that they're in it for the money, not the community.	
Keep the footprint of the housing as it is.	
Design review should be flexible in terms of the building, especially for residential, mostly limited to the key aspects like parking, main entrance. A diversity of styles should be allowed in residential and to a degree with commercial/mixed use as well. The C-O plan was prescriptive to an unrealistic degree.	
Hopefully design review will not have exceptions	
The design guidelines have been largely unmentioned in this round of presentations; I didn't see them proudly displayed, and I was at the public meeting.	
We can have that without rezoning, the current system allows non-conforming buildings currently, how would that change? Re-zoning has nothing to do with plan design review.	
Nowhere in the design chapter is there any mention of penalties for contravening the guidelines. Does this plan have any teeth and can developers be forced to rebuild if their structure is not compliant?	
keep it R1	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
Attached garages should be counted as part of unit footage	
Restricted as it is presently.	
I don't believe they will have any teeth,	
Most of these guidelines are already in effect. Why is it so important that the city take credit for what is already there.	
Neighbourhood standards have already been allowed to go away from neighbourhood standards.	
No consideration is given to the interior quality of the buildings - just the exterior...there should be a way to trade between multiple considerations	
should be R1	
keep it R1	
Why is the city prohibiting non transparent doors for business?	
This whole R2 rezoning thing came out of the blue - I don't recall it being mentioned earlier. How did this happen?	
Nice	
The developer next to me built the cheapest box money could build. That sucks.	
Reduced building setbacks to allow for garages/granny flats behind homes	
Stay in line with current historic style i.e. no metal grainery style siding	
More greenspace	
The document references Design Guidelines / Controls, but section 3.5 is just called Design Guidelines. Are the "guidelines" or "Controls"? Happy to see that the type of material in the design guidelines has been removed. I still believe it is limiting to state that roof need to be pitched in residential area. Beautiful house being built in mature neighthoods can have flat roofs.	
Buildings were supposed to be designed to fit in with the neighbourhood. That was not the case on McMillan. They were going to build a plain box condo in the middle of the street. we were assured that this was not going to happen	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
Want the 2011 design principles and not the 2014 developer friendly principles in the current plan	
Setting buildings back after three floors only adds to the cost of construction and prevents development of infill sites. The additional costs imposed on infill development by these proposed plans will continue to drive large investment dollars towards greenfield sites. With land costs per acre substantially higher, the way the current plan is drafted the City has now imposed higher construction costs, as well. The only way to bring market affordable housing online with these plans is thru subsidy or by reducing the size of units exponentially. With the current system of dividing total site square footage by 400 (or 800 sf) sf to derive at potential density, the City is subsequently shutting down development of affordable units. Only affluent people will be able to afford condos in Corydon or Osborne Village based on these cost constraints.	
RESIDENTIAL DENSITY	
Increased density isn't a bad idea as long as we don't have another ugly sky rise West of Warsaw like 800 Corydon.	
Homes are already closely spaced and the area feels densely populated already	
we are densely populated having more people will only cause problems and devalue the homes we have purchased and ruin chances of selling	
Too many buildings and people crammed into one area.	
No one wants poorly maintained, giant condos an inch from their homes. We can see some cautionary tales around the neighborhood in which this is absolutely an issue. We love the Corydon area and believe that rezoning will permanently and irreversibly damage the neighborhood's distinct character.	
The absentee landlords that result from R2 is a concern	
Already too high. Keep the same	
I like the provision for secondary suites.	
Negative effect, will not attract community minded people willing to invest as long-term residents.	
remain Zone 1	
I saw nothing in the guidelines or presentations to date on garbage clearance, and how the City would propose to accommodate the clearance of garbage from alleys when the neighbourhood was densified, when it can barely keep up with the garbage clearance already. Back lanes are chock-a-	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
block full of blue and black bins, from one end to the other, and there is simply no room for greater numbers of the things as it is.	
Keep it R1 and allow the neighbourhood to continue to grow and revitalize. R1 allows the residence to take pride of ownership of their property, this pride shows.	
If increasing the density of neighbourhoods is considered important, would not Waverly West (probably the lowest in terms of people/sq. km.) be an obvious place to start?	
I'm for increased density but not resonant to cram more people into the same space. That idea will ghetto-I've the neighbourhood.	
keep it R1	
Our roads are falling apart as it is. We don't need more traffic.	
Keep it as is	
I do not agree with re-zoning	
Are you trying to increase or decrease this? It's not obvious what is being done.	
More single family homes. Fewer empty 500-600 foot units.	
This is one of Winnipeg's crown jewels and should be densified as much as possible. The current plan aims to protect existing residents who have a NIMBY mindset and limits the real opportunity for this neighborhood. Effectively, by hindering the density for development sites the area plan limits infill development.	
I don't want to see the area turn from a family oriented neighbourhood into mostly rentals.	
Vital! There are so few actually dense areas in Winnipeg; more needs to be done to advance this in our neighbourhood!	
does not need to be increased	
keep it R1	
This is already one of Winnipeg's densest neighbourhoods.	
if there is more density in the future there has to be sufficient parking	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
Increase residential density by stopping suburban development, not by ruining this lovely area.	
The blocks affected from Hugo to Stafford are plenty dense already	
One or two R2 buildings can be absorbed, but a large increase in them cannot be sustained in a neighbourhood not designed for them. The neighbourhood is already dense as R1 buildings.	
More the better	
Back in the 60s, 70s, 80s -- when I first moved to this neighbourhood -- there were over 1000 more people living here than there are now. That was in essentially the same physical building environment we have now. You don't have to screw over existing single unit owners to achieve higher density.	
See above stay with current density area was designed for current density anymore would cause issues	
The current mix is just fine. There are empty buildings in the inner city that ought to be filled before we turn Corydon into a sardine can.	
yes	
This is a great neighbourhood that can accommodate many more people. Bring on the density.	
We have a limited stock of affordable single-family homes in Winnipeg. Rezoning from R1 to R2 will put this at risk. Increased density without impacting these homes may be appropriate if design guidelines are followed.	
Want diversity, family homes, a safe community, more long term residents	
Consider encouraging Cooperative Housing development opportunities within the study area.	
I believe that the residential density guidelines when applied rigidly, will curtail development which is vital for the area. Low density zoning for the majority of the neighbourhood in the presence of several multifamily dwellings on every block is impractical and does not reflect the costs of the land on the market. The principals here are sound, but the application cannot be rigid.	
this neighbourhood is already dense	
Setting buildings back after three floors only adds to the cost of construction and prevents development of infill sites. The additional costs imposed on infill development by these proposed plans will continue to drive large investment dollars towards greenfield sites. With land costs per acre substantially higher, the way the current plan is drafted the City has now imposed higher construction	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
costs, as well. The only way to bring market affordable housing online with these plans is thru subsidy or by reducing the size of units exponentially. With the current system of dividing total site square footage by 400 (or 800 sf) sf to derive at potential density, the City is subsequently shutting down development of affordable units. Only affluent people will be able to afford condos in Corydon or Osborne Village based on these cost constraints.	
OTHER	
My issue with "A - Mixed Use" is that by upper floors to be office space we may likely end up with empty buildings after the workday & on weekends. Having bars, restaurants, or other business on the main floor and residential above ensures some semblance of an active community throughout the week. I believe that style is sometimes referred to as "European" but it's clearly worked in Osborne so why not here?	
I'm not really sure why this is the direction chosen for the area (seems there is a preference for developers and store/restaurant owners). It's a lovely area with character - more people living in the area won't mean that the shops and restaurants will fill up. Parking may solve that problem by bringing in the outside community. I lived in Calgary and the Kensington area opened up parking lots at the end of the streets for people to come eat and shop - it worked and they didn't have to tear down the houses to do it. Once you tear down these hundred-year-old buildings, they are gone - you can't put them back. Restoration and parking may be a better goal.	
We have functioning neighbourhood. Please apply your desires for higher densities to failed neighbourhoods.	
If zoning change results in demolition of the remaining high-quality, good condition housing stock, then this process will be a failure. For example, if single family houses are bought up and demolished, while the existing low-quality rental accommodations are not similarly sold-off and/or redeveloped, the only good aspects of the neighbourhood will be effectively destroyed. Also, there hasn't been a single mention of preservation of street-trees, and mature trees on private lots, and yet despite the absolutely horrendous quality of housing on some blocks, the perception that the streets are pleasant are largely the result of the significant tree canopy. Yet, the City has done very little work on street trees here for years, and there is no protection for mature trees on private lots. So, if the tree canopy declines, then the significantly pleasant character of the neighbourhood will be lost for decades. Finally, has anyone paid any attention to either greenspace, or demand for schools and community club style services, if the neighbourhood densifies? Already, there is only a small amount of greenspace, and the community centres are well-used; as well, while some of the schools have capacity to take more students, some are already well over capacity (i.e. Ecole La Verendrye and Kelvin).	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
I believe your population projections are extremely optimistic (See Winnipeg Free Press, March 26: section D3)	
There has been no meaningful consultation to provide proper informed input on this matter.	
I want a say in future development in my neighbourhood. R2 zoning takes that wright away from me.t	
Fix the Nassau street screw up...put it back to 2 way traffic@!!	
Further to the comment above, if the intent is to support densification in the R1 Zone, perhaps a staged approach would be more acceptable. For instance, Jesse Ave btw Nassau & Daly, has already experienced the construction of 3 storey condos. Perhaps avenues immediately north and south of Corydon would be enabled to continue this trend (albeit it with the intent of attracting families and being affordable). Beyond Jesse & McMillan Avenues, R1 would remain, while enabling densification via secondary suites through the conditional use process.	
Cost Cost Cost by item please.	
Other than work for developers and the thought of more taxes for the city, we need to stop turning Corydon into high-rise city.	
The plan raises the cost of construction for development in the area, making affordable development more difficult. The plan limits density on sites where the City should be encouraging the densification of this neighborhood.	
It's not a matter of how much green space, but how high quality. There are "parks" (like at Hugo and Jessie) that are basically unused because they're so poorly conceived. Let's have fewer parks of better design and quality!	
we don't want absentee landlords	
do not change to R2	
Are there plans for bike lanes through the underpass at Osborne junction?	
Idea: keep all the design restrictions being developed but remove the R2 proposal. If that can't be done, keep R2 to Jessie only.	
Clamp down on negligent landlords who let properties get run down, or sit on vacant lots! Thinking of the Weriers, "Composit Holdings" who are really bringing the neighbourhood down. Really resent that these people have a lock on the Hugo-Cockburn block on McMillan and won't upgrade or redevelop	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
their lots, or sell them to someone who will.	
I've come to the conclusion that the City will always favour developers over residential. And I've also come to the conclusion that the City will keep raising my taxes to add further insult to the injury. We are now making plans to retire somewhere outside the City -- this is a radical departure from what we've thought for the last 30 years. It's because of the Plan.	
Narrower drive lanes and wider sidewalks along Corydon.	
Generally this plan seems to have been cut and pasted from a neighbourhood of a very different character, and that cookie cutter approach applied without consideration for the urban context of the area.	
Very disappointed that this is even being considered when single family in fill housing would be more than adequate	
I am extremely concerned about the impact of new construction in the Lower Density Residential zone on light penetration to existing properties. I am also concerned about the loss of gardens resulting in drainage issues, and the increase in family resident units resulting in parking issues. Finally I am concerned that the price of the new 2-family residences and the number of bedrooms will make them unappealing to young families.	
Make Mulvey ave into greenspace/parkland	
I strongly disagree with the statement that "Confusion Corner stands as a barricade between Osborne Station and the surrounding community." on page 44 of the plan. Confusion Corner was there first and the transit station should have been planned better so as to not separate itself from Confusion corner. Although I agree that accessibility and pedestrian access and across confusion corner needs to be improved, I am very concerned that the 'Appendix' document references the creation of roundabouts and this is not mentioned in the plan. Confusion Corner is an iconic part of Winnipeg Lore and creating roundabouts is going to ruin this and not improve the pedestrian realm. I have never seen a roundabout that pedestrians can cross. This area needs to be reviewed and studied very carefully taking all things into consideration similar to the thought and discussion surrounding portage and main. Has this been approved?	
A little more emphasis on active transportation infrastructure would be nice	
Create a community that supports active transportation, The bus system should be a part of an active transportation system, not the focus	

SOURCE	Surveys – addendum question
FEEDBACK	
"Please share any comments and ideas you may have on the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) or other aspects of the Corydon-Osborne Plan implementation."	
Maximize safe biking routes and secure bike lock-up sites.	
Where is more greenspace and dog parks?	
No CONSUMER analysis was done for this plan and it affects numerous businesses ability to serve market demands. Not surveying the consumers prior to implementing a plan is backwards thinking that only serves to impose design standards onto the development market that may not be favoured by consumers.	

SOURCE	Emails August 31 - September 16, 2016	
FEEDBACK		**KEY THEMES**
Disappointed that the City is not rezoning to R2. The City is in a precarious position with infill becoming more expensive, plus now growth fees and no ability to ensure a timely process is created for "pre-ordained" development		Supports rezoning to R2
The majority of residents are not supportive of mass rezoning of all R1 properties to R2 within the Corydon Osborne plan area		Opposed to rezoning to R2
Support the rezoning from R1 to R2. I appreciate that people want to have a say in what happens in their neighbourhoood, but there are ways to do this without holding up the building process for months. Also, what is happening with secondary suites and heritage buildings?		Supports rezoning to R2
Concerned that the Plan and PDO will not protect against developments that are incompatible with the neighbourhood. Also concerned that the plan provides fewer options for low and middle income families looking to live in the centre of the city. Would like a plan that encourages a balance of housing types, including affordable single-family housing. Would like revisions to the Plan to include language supporting the retention of single-family housing as an important component of the community.		Plan does not support affordable housing. The Plan and PDO do not protect the neighbourbood against incompatible housing.
Concerned about absentee landlords and incompatible development. Also concerned that an expedited approval process by unelected officials will make things worse, and the community will lose their voice in the process.		Too many absentee landlord properties Concern about approval by unelected officials
Concerned about unelected representative making decisions. Also, there is no reason to go back to R2 zoning. The City should be encouraging the area to continue to grow as a predominately R1 area.		Concern about approval by unelected officials Area should stay R1

SOURCE	Emails August 31 - September 16, 2016	
FEEDBACK		**KEY THEMES**
This proposal would go against complete communities, diversity of housing, and compatible development. Also, I am concerned about unelected officials making decisions. Density should be on Pembina Highway, but not on residential streets of this area.		Concern about approval by unelected officials Density should be put on major streets
Concern about the loss of affordable single-family housing. Corydon Osborne is already one of the densest areas of the city. It is counterintuitive to decrease single-family in areas that already have a low concentration of single-family, compared to the City as a whole. New development has had a detrimental effect on the 500 block of Jessie Avenue. Also, concern about unelected officials making decisions.		Concern about the loss of affordable single-family housing. Concern about incompatible development Concern about unelected officials making decisions
I am glad that the Corydon Osborne plan will have design standards. I support the change to allow duplexes. Allowing duplexes will make housing more affordable.		Support duplexes
The move to R1 played an important role in transforming the area into the vibrant, multi-use area that it is today. It is unfair that the City is only proposing this change for our neighbourhood.		Zoning changes will have a negative impact on the neighbourhood
Concern that there are not clear and concrete guidelines for new development. Concerned that the City is looking at short term financial gain with this change. Concerned about parking and green space.		Concerned about impact of density on parking and green space
There is no need for the city's proposed zoning changes. The result of such changes would damage the positive dynamic this neighbourhood currently enjoys.		Opposed to the zoning changes
The City should be encouraging the protection of the single-family housing stock so that the proportion does not decrease any further.		Protect the single-family housing stock in the neighbourhood
Don't agree with densifying our area by encouraging corner lot developments. Don't agree with making it easy to densify by having conditional use permits. Don't want decisions to be made by unelected officials. Densfication in the north Corydon area should be capped.		Concerned about the impact of density on the north of Corydon area
Full support for present densification planning in the neighbourhood. There is no reason why a neighbourhood so close to downtown and with a changing demographic profile should remain primarily single family homes. It is also good economics, as there are too many vacant storefonts and a rapid turnover of businesses; more multi-family housing will boost support for these businesses. I am in favour of any measure that will facilitate developers in investing in upgrading, renovating, and building new housing stock in our neighbourhood.		Support additional densification of the neighbourhood
Densification north of Corydon Avenue should be capped. The areas parking problem is a big problem for single family homes.		Do not support densification north of Corydon

SOURCE	Emails August 31 - September 16, 2016	
FEEDBACK		**KEY THEMES**
This proposal allows for essentially the same effect as a mass rezoning and no accountability from the review board.		Do not support the August proposal.
I oppose the rezoning proposal. We feel the need to protect the current makeup of our neighbourhood.		Do not support the rezoning proposal
Maintain and protect the current mix of housing. Treat corner lots the same as others. City councillor accountability for zoning change should not be delegated to non-elected officials. Keep R1 zoning in place. Do not allow the conditional use permit for two-family residential.		Maintain and protect the current mix of housing. Treat corner lots the same as others. City councillor accountability for zoning change should not be delegated to non-elected officials. Keep R1 zoning in place. Do not allow the conditional use permit for two-family residential.
Keep R1 zoning in place. Remove the growth focus on corner lots. Do not allow a conditional use permit for two-family residential. Keep the design guidelines but strengthen them. High need for street parking by residents and commercial customers. Commercial parking plan in needed. Need for a traffic plan. Encourage bicycle traffic into the area. Insufficient parks/green space.		Keep R1 zoning in place. Remove the growth focus on corner lots. Do not allow a conditional use permit for two-family residential. Keep the design guidelines but strengthen them. High need for street parking by residents and commercial customers. Commercial parking plan in needed. Need for a traffic plan. Encourage bicycle traffic into the area. Insufficient parks/green space.
There is already a high density in our neighbourhood. Parking is already non-existent in our area. Heritage properties are being torn down and replaced with properties that have no shelf life or architectural integrity.		Stop anything but duplexing. Offer incentives to homeowners to improve their homes. Fine derelict and absentee homeowners.
Not against infill housing if done properly. However, we have concerns about how things are moving forward. No consideration for area residents.		The Corydon Osborne Plan should be revisited and revisions made. Listen to the residents of the area.
Opposed to having land use changes decided by an appointed committee of unaccountable citizens. Density is already one of the highest in the City. The new development contributes nothing to the community. There are already enough apartments; we need more		Unaccountable citizens shouldn't make decisions. Density. Parking. Traffic. Increases in density should

SOURCE	Emails August 31 - September 16, 2016	
FEEDBACK		**KEY THEMES**
single-family dwellings. Parking is already at a premium in the neighbourhood. Traffic volume has increased and is a problem. We need an increase in greenspace. Design guidelines terminology in the PDO needs to be firmer. Sidewalk space is being widened to the detriment of parking. Massing on corner lots changes the neighbourhood in a negative way. Any proposal to change the number of residential units should require a rezoning application.		require a rezoning
Disagree with the City's proposal to permit two-family residential with a conditional use. The City has not addressed the concerns of the neighbourhood and has had a lack of consultation on this matter.		Do not support the August zoning proposal
Do not support any zoning changes that encourage the conversion of single-family housing for higher density development. These types of changes will continue to diminish the family component of this neighbourhood. Language should be included into the plan that supports retention of the existing single-family area as an integral component of a healthy, diverse, complete community.		Do not support the conversion of single-family housing for higher density development.
Unhappy with the PDO for the area and with the City's communication and consultation on this. Please slow down and do better than this.		Do not support the PDO. Poor consultation by the City.
Against allowing an expedited process with non-elected officials. More provisions needed to protect the existing character of the neighbourhood.		Do not support decisions by unelected officials. Need provisions to protect the neighbourhood.
Very concerned with the new proposal. I oppose this expedited process. I oppose any process that would allow multi-unit developments on R1 properties. I opposed amendments to the use table to make two-family dwellings conditional in the R1 district. I want all city councilors to be involved in and accountable for development decisions in their community.		Do not support the proposed zoning changes.
I do not support the continued removal of affordable housing. I would like to suggest an alternative development plan that would facilitate the rejuvenation of older family homes. This would encourage and the support the ongoing growth of an affordable family oriented and unique neighbourhood.		Do not support the proposed zoning changes. Support the protection of affordable housing and older family homes.
I am concerned about rezoning the neighbourhood. I am concerned that the present houses will be demolished and larger multiple family dwellings will fill the whole lot spaces and rise up too high for the traditional home look.		Do not support rezoning of the neighbourhood.