

Janice Appleby

From: Derek Reimer [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, Apr 16, 2014 10:34 AM
To: Janice Appleby
Subject: Inaccurate petitions for 62 Cambridge small lot rezoning

The developer's claim of 79% support from neighbouring properties is completely inaccurate. He has used multiple strategies to come up with that number:

- Multiple counting for addresses that support the development while single counting addresses that are opposed even when more than one name and signature appear on the petitions
- Completing ignoring residents at addresses that oppose the development
- Allowing opposing petitions to "stale date" while carefully refreshing those in support (3 cases)
- Soliciting support by misrepresenting our position, telling neighbours that we are "pleased" with his proposed development when we have always been opposed

Here is the accurate picture:

Summary of petitions for 62 Cambridge

<i>Address</i>	<i>Supporters</i>	<i>Opposed</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Notes</i>
1147 Faithful		2		Petition was allowed to go stale dated by the developer; see letter of Feb 24, 2014, restating opposition
1149 Faithful		2		Counted as one vote by the developer despite two names and signatures on the petition; since been resubmitted as two petitions
85 Cambridge	2	1		
81 Cambridge		1		Developer allowed petition allowed to stale date but refreshed earlier this week and resubmitted
77 Cambridge		2		One petition allowed to stale date by the developer
57 Cambridge	2			
50 Cambridge		2		Recently changed from support to oppose
48			1	Not an adjacent

Cambridge				property
1145 Woodstock	5			
1150 Woodstock		4		Completely ignored by the developer in his report
Totals	9	14	1	
Percent	37.5%	58.3%	4.2%	
Property owners	3 (18.8% of owners)	13 (82.2% of owners)		

Using an alternate method of counting (one vote per adjacent property) the level of support is even lower, only 25% with 75% opposed.

- Derek Reimer

Janice Appleby

From: Derek Reimer [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, Apr 16, 2014 10:39 AM
To: Janice Appleby
Subject: Fw: 62 Cambridge

More information regarding this proposal.

- DR

From: Mary
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2014 10:17 AM
To: [Chris Coleman \(Councillor\)](#)
Subject: 62 Cambridge

Good morning Chris,

I was at a meeting about two years ago (Sept 19, 2012 to be exact) at the Fairfield Community Centre to hear a proposal to rezone the property at 62 Cambridge. There were about 25-30 people there and the developer was the ONLY one who spoke in favour of the proposal. Many of those in attendance spoke eloquently against the proposal. Many petitions were signed against the proposal and now the proposal is about (tomorrow I believe) to be presented to the city Planning Committee.

By city policy (Small Lot Rezoning policy) the rezoning proposal is supposed to have 75% support from adjacent properties and "community consensus" **before a small lot rezoning goes to a public hearing.**

Many of these petitions are now stale dated, but the developer has visited those few in support and ensured that their petitions are now up to date. These petitions have now been submitted by the developer and show 79% support. However, as we know, statistics can be fun to play with and in this case, there has been a lot of play. The developer has counted up to five votes per supporting household, counting no more than one vote for opposed households despite more than one name and signature on the petition. He allowed opposing petitions to go stale dated (over 6 months old) and, in one instance with a four person household all opposed, ignored them completely. The actual numbers are 39% support using the head count method and 25% using a one vote per property method. This is far below 50% which ever method is used and miles from the required 75%. 80% of the owners of properties are opposed.

One neighbour, Derek Reimer, has ensured that other petitions are now up to date and has submitted these to the Planning Department. However, the Planning Department refuses to amend their report, to reflect the true neighbourhood stance on this rezoning proposal. They have based their report on the figures supplied by the developer and they refuse to change their report and/or their recommendation which is based on the notion that support of more than 75% exists. They say it is now "impossible" to change the report or to even defer it until the next meeting when it could be re-written using the true information rather than that supplied by the contractor.

We would really appreciate it if the Planning Committee were made aware of this statistical inaccuracy (to put it kindly) and that a decision by them be based on fact and not manufactured statistics.

Hope you can help,

Regards,
Mary Virtue
78 Linden Ave