

Elaine Clark

From: Suni Ball [suni.j.ball@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 12, 2010 11:33 PM
To: eclark@ingersoll.ca
Subject: Fwd: Len Reeves application

Third try. Last time. I promise.

Sent from my iPod

Begin forwarded message:

From: Suni Ball <suni.j.ball@gmail.com>
Date: July 12, 2010 11:15:23 PM EDT
To: eclark@ingersoll.ca
Subject: Fwd: Len Reeves application

Please note I sent my I intial email in error befor I was finished. Below I have completed it.

Sent from my iPod

Begin forwarded message:

From: Suni Ball <suni.j.ball@gmail.com>
Date: July 12, 2010 11:04:59 PM EDT
To: "eclark@ingersoll.ca" <eclark@ingersoll.ca>
Subject: Len Reeves application

Dear Council,

Iam writing in response to the public meeting tonight regarding Len Reeves application for increased density for the development off mcKeand. This is written before I was aware of your decisicion on the property as I left after recognizing that my contribution was not recognized as legitimate or welcome for consideration.

My attempt to clarify councillor McLeods statement regarding the portion of Garnet Elliott being sold was, what I believe to be a factual statement. Councillor McCleod stated that it was only 1/16th of the park being sold when it is in fact closer to 1/4 of the par being sold. I was not challenging the footprint of the building in the park.

Councillor Hunts response (loudly stating point of order and patting me on the shoulder to tell me I can't change the subject as he walked out away from his chair), which appeared to happen before I finished my first sentence was surprising. Mr Dejong and Councillor McLeod brought the park size up before me. I was only correcting a statement from councillor McLeod which did not appear accurate.

My entire statement took no more than 2-3 minutes and had council let me finish I

C 8/9/10

would have been better able to explain my statement on density being that the south side of Ingersoll has approx 106 acres of parkland vs 30.5 acres in the North. After the sale of more than 5 acres of land in the north the ratio of parkland would be 4 times greater in the south. The PPS states that recreational parkland should be evenly distributed. A 2004 recreation study indicates that more play equipment and walking/hiking areas are needed. Neither of these has increased since 2004 in the north end so it's reasonable to expect this is still accurate.

Had you let me finish without interruption you would have understood that my interest was in asking council to consider that an addition of 50% of housing to this development may be too much for an area to support that already has a higher ratio of medium density residences and lower ratio of parkland vs the south end of town. Density and available services are legitimate considerations in this decision.

The fact that council chose to point me out in violation of the public meeting was surprising because the public meeting regarding Garnett Elliott many people were offered extensive leeway in talking about everything from water quality to leaking roofs at a zoning / OP change meeting. I don't recall any councillors standing up and walking away at that meeting.

I was also at the Oxford County meeting where councillor Vankooten-Bossense spoke on behalf of town council where she identified a lack of grass on the playground of Princess Elizabeth as a reason to support the OP change. Once again no councillors walked away from their chair.

If my contribution was inaccurate or not relevant please let me know what parts you consider I inaccurate or irrelevant to the zoning issue. Based on previous public meeting I felt my comments were more accurate and relevant than some comments pertaining to those other meetings.

I was not included in the zoning mailings up until this point for the McKeand St application. By the time I became aware of the application it was too late to submit comments in a written form to be included in the report. The public meeting was the only opportunity I had to contribute to this change and can't help feeling somewhat denied an opportunity to contribute to this consideration by council.

Suni Ball

Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 5274 (20100713)

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>