

To: CityClerk

Subject: Fwd: Re: New Planning Application Open for Feedback; Other Feedback Reminder

Date: Monday, November 4, 2024 11:28:25 AM

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Do not click on any link, open any attachments, or action a QR code unless you recognize the sender and have confirmed that the content is valid. If you are suspicious of the message use the Report a Phish button to report it.

read on please.

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Re: New Planning Application Open for Feedback; Other Feedback

Reminder

Date: 2024-11-04 11:20 AM

To: engage@stjohns.ca

Protocols for answering messages make it difficult for this dinosaur to properly get online and officially opine

That said, and being an "old fart" myself, I see a taller building as (1) a visual eyesore in this city and (2) incompatible with old farts having to climb or descend stairs in an emergency. A broader footprint, with underground parking may allow a developer to generate a lower elevation building which may, in an emergency, save a few lives.

Common sense.

Theresa K. Walsh

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2024 7:28 PM
To: CityClerk
Subject: proposal on 26 Alexander

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Do not click on any link, open any attachments, or action a QR code unless you recognize the sender and have confirmed that the content is valid. If you are suspicious of the message use the Report a Phish button to report it.

hello,

I have left a feedback when I first received it in the mail and then amended my comment because the graphic online and the one received in the mail differed (regarding the parking lot) so I was a bit confused... The first proposal received in the mail was showing the parking lot in the area where the house (number 29 patrick) is located (which implied that the house would have to be demolished) but the one I received today shows the parking lot in the vacant area next to the house (number 25...which makes more sense). Which one is right? If the use of the vacant lot is right, then my first feedback would be the correct one.

thank you,

[REDACTED]

Theresa K. Walsh

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2024 1:41 PM
To: CityClerk
Subject: Comments: 26 Alexander St

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Do not click on any link, open any attachments, or action a QR code unless you recognize the sender and have confirmed that the content is valid. If you are suspicious of the message use the **Report a Phish** button to report it.

[REDACTED]

The Office of the Municipal Clerk,

I support the diverse housing needs and requirements of the residents of this city.

Accessible housing is important.

My only concern with this project, which the city highlights as well, is the lack of available parking spaces for a proposed 60 single-unit apartment building for seniors.

Accessibility should not only be interpreted economically but also in the literal sense. This building is being proposed for those who are likely to have real accessibility challenges.

Although the proposed building seems reasonable should the area be rezoned and the project built without a reasonable amount of space for those looking to access its premises.

[REDACTED]

Theresa K. Walsh

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2024 9:17 PM
To: Engage
Subject: Re: Thank you for completing Comments

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Do not click on any link, open any attachments, or action a QR code unless you recognize the sender and have confirmed that the content is valid. If you are suspicious of the message use the **Report a Phish** button to report it.

Just a modification to my comment...when I first read the proposal, I thought that the parking lot would be on the lot adjacent to the house (# 29 Patrick) but I now realize that it would be the entire lot i.e. that the beautiful old house would have to be demolished and all the mature trees and bushes removed...and the view from [REDACTED] would now be a parking lot ([REDACTED]). I still really do not like the increase of traffic and car noises that would come with that change but I really do not like the idea of the entire property being used and the house demolished...

On Oct 31, 2024, at 5:43 PM, Engage St John's <notifications@engagementhq.com> wrote:

Hi,

Thanks for completing the survey.

Your responses are listed below.

Your comments

my issue is not so much the apartment building since the existing building looks so neglected as it stands now but the parking lot does not sound great. It would be so bad for the poor people living at numbers 29, [REDACTED] g [REDACTED] t a parking lot day and night, not to mention the noise and pollution they would have to put up with. Also, the fact that the access to the parking lot would be on patrick street would definitely increase the traffic and noise for all of us in that section of the street. I understand that a parking lot is needed but that location is not something that would improve the quality life in our area, that's for sure.

What is your overall feedback of this application?

Mixed

Thanks again

City Of St John's