

APPENDIX E – PUBLIC COMMENTS

From: Sandra Beyak [<mailto:>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2017 4:39 PM
To: Hefferton, Mark
Subject: Saxony

I wish to comment on the above's request for additional height to its building. The City of Burlington has an Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw and it would seem to me that the City should stick to its own rules and regulations. There are too many variances allowed and there are getting to be too many high buildings in downtown Burlington. Perhaps one should take a stroll along the Lakeshore in Oakville and see what a pleasure it is. Along the Lakeshore our City is getting to look more and more like the City of Toronto.

From: Mozelle [<mailto:>]
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 11:13 AM
To: Hefferton, Mark
Subject: File: 505-05/17 and 520-03/17 = Saxony

Hi Mark,

Thanks you for your Notice of Planning Application undated....

I am at a loss. I have been attending more meetings (along with hundreds of other residents) and offering the feedback that the City is requesting of the residents, but that does not seem to make any difference. It appears that the City has already made its decision and is just going through the motions = and wasting my time.

Correct me if I'm wrong. Did we not all vote on the subject property already? So, it was approved and zoned, etc. Why are we now re-addressing this issue? Why does it appear to me that we all go around in circles? Especially, those that work full-time and cannot possibly attend all the meetings. The City is now proposing to double the amount of residential units at the subject property. Why?

I have personally brought it to the City's attention time and time again that there is no **CONTRACTOR** parking anywhere in the area. There is no point having commercial units when you cannot park to service them or shop.

I live across the street at Harbourview. It has now reached the point that contractors are actually not accepting work at our location as the parking tickets/fines outweigh their interest in the job.

What about the poor residents who live in the townhouses and St. Luke's Close in terms of sunlight?

I would like a response to this email.

Thank you,

Mozelle Cole

From: Ian Brayshaw [mailto:]

Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2017 9:38 AM

To: Hefferton, Mark

Cc: Morgan, Melissa

Subject: 452-454 Locust Street Official Plan and Rezoning Application

File Numbers: 505-05/17, 520-03/17 Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Application for 452-454 Locust Street

Hello Mark,

Up on review of the Notice of Planning Application and the information provided on the City of Burlington Website I do not see any justifiable reason to increase the height of the intended building from four stories to six and therefore request that the application be denied.

The main reasons are as follows:

- I. The City of Burlington's guiding principle in approving such amendments (Part 111 Land Use Policies; 2.5.2 General Policies a)(v) states" New infill development shall be compatible with the surrounding development interns of height, scale, massing, sitting setback, coverage and amount of open space"
- II. I do not see suitable efforts in the amendment as posted to follow principles outlined in the Land Use Policies. Can you or others provide this information if it has been submitted.
- III. The information provided does not show any proposed measures to reduce the issues related to traffic in the area namely; adequate onsite parking for the commercial elements, traffic calming measures in an already congested downtown core especially during rush hour times, and safety issues related to the increased traffic from the property within the immediate residential and cultural areas.
- IV. The Noise Study Update Letter does not provide any quantifiable information on the dBA levels produced by the building and installed equipment. There is no background information provided on the anticipated noise impact at the four story level, therefore no conclusion can be determined by an increase in the number of levels. This letter is baseless opinion provided by somebody without suitable designation to provide an opinion. I suggest that it be removed from the submission package.
- V. 452-454 is approximately 1 block north of Lakeshore road in close proximity to the lake. Adding levels to the building will add to the "wind tunnel Effect" that is created when high level buildings are constructed I do not see any data provided to show that this building will not add to or create this type of occurrence.

Mark,

Please acknowledge receipt of these comments and provide a timeline for the next steps for public input.

Best Regards,

Ian

From: Vera Vandenbosch [[mailto:](#)]
Sent: Friday, December 08, 2017 1:40 PM
To: Hefferton, Mark
Subject: Rezoning Application Comments - File 505-05/17 and 520-03/17

Hello Mr. Hefferton,

I received a Notice of Planning Application and am writing in response to a rezoning application for the Saxony condo development at 452-454 Locust St.

My husband and I own a townhouse at 467 Blathwayte Lane. We have attended previous meetings held by the City as well as councillor Meed-Ward. It is our recollection that previous meetings confirmed that Saxony's application for a 5-storey building was rejected, and that 4 storeys was the maximum approved height. We have received marketing information from Saxony, advertising 2 additional storeys. We are opposed to this height increase for obvious reasons: Blocking of sunlight, traffic congestion, privacy, overall look of the neighbourhood West of City Hall, but most importantly, congestion in an area of small square footage (.62 acres).

We cannot understand why this request is being considered by the City as we understand a decision was arrived at over a year ago to keep the maximum height at 4 storeys.

We would like to be involved in any future discussions/meetings to voice our concern and oppose approval of Saxony's application. Please advise as to next steps. Thank you,

Vera Vandenbosch and Rick Vascotto

[ππαανδενβοσχη≡χογεχο.χα](#)

ελλ: ☐905-308-5436 – ξερα

ελλ: ☐905-332-0468 – Ριχκ

From: Michael Timney [mailto:]
Sent: Saturday, December 23, 2017 11:01 AM
To: Morgan, Melissa; Meed Ward, Marianne
Subject: Saxony Proposed 6 story

23 Dec. 2017

I am writing to express my opposition to and disgust with Landform's proposal of an additional 2 stories to the Saxony condominium.

In a heritage district (Bates/St. Luke's precincts), an area comprised of 1 and 2 story residences and in proximity to our beautiful, low-rise Performing Arts Centre and opposite City Hall, 6 stories would completely overwhelm this neighborhood's character. The elegant 4 story Saxony blended in well.

As a neighbor living close to this site, and originally in concert with the 4 story Saxony concept, I now am of the opinion that with 6 stories my privacy will be totally compromised and any sunlight completely blocked out. This is not a healthy situation. My expected enjoyment of my property becomes void.

I understand that with proposed rezoning the first floor of residences would become commercial space - this fronting Blathwayte Lane - a Lane! - the narrowest street in the City of Burlington! with "No Heavy Trucks" posted and "No Parking" either side! How ludicrous!

Landform will build and leave. It's not my fault that they experienced an environmental issue, but I, my neighbors and the neighborhood are being asked to "pay the long-term price" - a building and rezoning that forever changes the tenor of our historical district.

As much as I appreciate the invitation to comment and attend a meeting, has this proposal (by Landform) already received a tacit "go-ahead" from the Planning Department? [the hole for their (3) level parking garage continues to get deeper daily].

In summation:

- changed character of heritage district
- high rise overwhelming area
- loss of privacy
- loss of sunlight
- loss of enjoyment of property
- rezoning

I anticipate progress, but with sympathetic moderation.

Ruth Timney

461 Blathwayte Lane

From: John Lindley [mailto:]

Sent: Thursday, December 28, 2017 8:38 AM

To: Morgan, Melissa

Cc: Meed Ward, Marianne; Mailbox, Office of Mayor Rick Goldring

Subject: Saxony Planning Application for Locust/Elgin/Blathwayte

We are out-of-town on the January date of the proposed City Hall meeting re: the Saxony development. Our absence diminishes in no way our objection to the revised project.

This submission will we respectfully request, be aired at the meeting. Our comments follow:

1. We oppose any change to the already approved 4 storey structure being built by and known as Saxony.
2. Considerable citizen, developer, city planners and our elected representatives efforts went into the already approved development. It should not be altered.
3. The official town plan restricts height structures in the area of Locust, Elgin and Blathwayte to (4) stories. City planners and city council should not recommend or approve the revised submission. No zoning change is appropriate.
4. This heritage residential neighborhood will be significantly altered if this submission proceeds. A zoning change and approval will only invite further development in excess of current zoning restrictions.
5. The area is not conducive to retail development, Blathwayte is a narrow lane and was never intended to be a retail/commercial enclave. Keep it out.
6. We are upset with the whole process of the handling of this requested deviation. The deeper hole for additional parking was being dug before local residents received notification from the city. The marketing Posters were erected at the same time, showing (6) six stories. We believe this project has already received tacit approval from city planners, despite their insistence to the contrary.
7. There is no doubt that this request from the developer is simply to recover excess and unexpected building costs. This is no reason for planners and council to change zoning to accommodate the request. It is an unacceptable deviation for local residents to accept as it changes forever the style and beauty of the district.
8. Planners, elected councilors and city council; we expect you to do the right thing for those who elected you.

John Lindley &
Peter Defreitas

From: Peter Christie [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, January 01, 2018 1:43 PM
To: Morgan, Melissa
Subject:

Melissa

We certainly object to the proposed revision with respect to Files 505-05/17 and 520-13/17.

This is yet another move by the developer to wield power over our planning council. These are precedents that alter the initial plan. Surely a considerable amount of planning had preceded the initial approval. There must have been reason why the planning department had agreed on the formative plan.

It appears that we do not have a master plan for the downtown core of Burlington. Everything appears to be ad hoc. In other words the master plan is developed and then subject to change. We the residents end up with a mixed plan designed by exception.

COME ON FOLKS GROW A SPIN AND PLAN WITH A VISION. It appears that the downtown core will end up looking like a walled city that certainly will not entice creditable development.

Our opinion is to say no to exceptions and to the intensification of the downtown. We have sufficient intensification. Stand tall Burlington and listen to the people who seem to have a greater vision than what has recently been displaced by our city leaders.

I would be remiss not to mention the Grow Bold slogan of our city. That “Bold” references a license awarded to the Coop Restaurant which morphs into a night club on the weekends and brings with it a chaotic scene to disrupt the downtown culture. What a joke.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment

Peter C. Christie

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

From: Kathleen Whatmough [mailto:]

Sent: Sunday, January 07, 2018 3:38 PM

To: Morgan, Melissa

Subject: zoning change proposal/locust and Elgin Sts

Dear Melissa

It has not always been the case that we have had a planner, let alone two - a reassuring fact now things are becoming more complicated.

I have been here since 1980 on Ontario St. There have been many good changes Today thanks to many people, and a better economy, it has become a desirable neighbourhood.

Its layout, building heights and streets with their few taller blocks give the city an interesting sky scape, but there is a time to call a halt.

The feeling of the neighbourhood is subject to change , filling in, but we don't want

a concrete forest of tall buildings. We don't want to be Hamilton or Toronto.

In this area of lower Brant Street I object to the shade cast by buildings more than 2 stories

I am sure, most of the residents agree. I walk down to Elgin enjoying the sun, but the past few years have seen many older buildings taken down or falling down. Out thinking seems to fly to something big and new, and we tend to think of replacement in those terms.

I know there are some four and more storied buildings, apartment buildings encouraged as assets for tax and housing and allowed before we knew enough to do better.

Replace by all means but don't take away our sunlight.

We have more than enough tall buildings in down town, old town Burlington. The shade from any more makes the city dark and takes away from the joy of being here. I have considered Burlington my blue sky city.

A sincere concerned older citizen

Kathleen Whatmough

1410 Ontario St.,
Burlington

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

From: David Goodings [mailto:]

Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 2:53 PM

To: Morgan, Melissa

Subject: Re: Revised Planning Application for 452-454 Locust St. . .

To: Melissa Morgan, Planner II

From: David Goodings, 415 Locust St. unit 802, Burlington, ON L7S 2J2

Re: Revised Planning Application for 452-454 Locust St., 1437 and 1445 Elgin St.

Files: 505-05/17 and 520-13/17

While the proposed six-story mixed-use building would not be out-of-proportion with its surroundings, I believe the original four-story mixed-use building would be preferable as it would not be higher than the Burlington Performing Arts Centre directly across Elgin St., and would be more in keeping with St. Luke's Close on the other side of Blathwayte Lane.

From: Ritchard Taylor [mailto:]

Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 9:48 AM

To: Morgan, Melissa; Minaji, Rosalind

Cc: Mailbox, Office of Mayor Rick Goldring; Meed Ward, Marianne

Subject: Saxony Development

I want to express my concerns regarding the proposed changes to the Saxony Development on Elgin Street.

It appears that there are different sets of rules for the development of projects in the St. Luke's/Bates Precincts. I would point out that when **St. Luke's Close** was proposed, the limit was three stories, and when St. Luke's Anglican church rebuilt their offices and **Parish Hall**, they too were held to the guidelines set out in both the St. Luke's and Bates Precincts.

In my opinion the changes requested for Saxony are not insignificant, and are not in keeping with the Official Plan for the City of Burlington.

Why is it that St. Luke's Close and the re-design of St. Luke's Parish Hall were held to different standards than is the Saxony Development? St. Luke's Close was designed to "fit into" the streetscape and in compliance with the Official Plan, as was the re-design of St. Luke's Parish Hall, and yet it appears that the City of Burlington is willing to allow the developers of the Saxony to proceed with building a structure twice as high as St. Luke's Close. This to me is not good planning.

In addition, as a resident on Blathwayte Lane (for more than 33 years), the enjoyment of my property especially my back yard will be greatly diminished by the building of this six storey condominium. I feel the only people who will benefit from the addition of two stories would be the developer and the City of Burlington (by increased tax revenue).

I would also point out that when the initial building was proposed (being a 6 storey condominium) our concerns of having a six storey building constructed were acknowledged by both the City of Burlington and the developer, and a compromise of a four storey condominium was the outcome of all our discussions with the city and the developer. This compromise was acknowledged and supported by both the city and the developer, and was described as "an excellent example of cooperation between the community and the developer". Now it appears that all this cooperation has been swept aside for the benefit of the developer with no thought given to the residents of the area. How is this fair? This was not what the initial plan was.

Why would the City insist that a building which benefits the community at large (**St. Luke's Close** and the **Parish Hall** renovation **for St. Luke's Church**) be built according to the Official Plan, and yet the Saxony is allowed to apply for and be given consent for major variances which only benefits the developer and The City of Burlington?

I feel what the community, city and the developer initially agreed to was a solution which addressed all of our original concerns, enhancing our city streetscape and neighbourhood, and I would respectfully request that the city NOT allow the change from four to six stories.

Ritchard Taylor
463 Blathwayte Lane
Burlington, Ontario

From: Susan Goyer [mailto:]

Sent: Friday, January 12, 2018 3:23 PM

To: Morgan, Melissa

Cc: Meed Ward, Marianne; Mailbox, Office of Mayor Rick Goldring

Subject: Revised Planning Application for 452-454 Locust Street, 1437 and 1445 Elgin Street Files: 505-05/17 and 520-13/17

Dear Ms. Morgan,

We were unable to attend the neighbourhood meeting on Thursday, January 11, 2018 but we are advising you in writing that we are opposed to the request made by the land owner to change the zoning to allow another two storeys and increased density; as approvals were given to the applicant previously by the City of Burlington under good faith.

We can state all the various arguments such as increased noise, traffic, pedestrian safety, concerns as to the senior residents of St Luke's Close, etc. to no avail.

Undoubtedly Council will move ahead with granting the approval, however we would look to Council to negotiate with the land owner to compensate the residents, such as funding the extension of Elgin Promenade westwards towards Maple Avenue, or other such downtown public projects for public use.

We are holding the City of Burlington responsible for its continuous disregard for established zoning and granting variance approvals which go against the approved plan.

While we understand Council usually acts in favour of all such requests, we remind those choosing to stand in the upcoming elections, that we as citizens, have long memories.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Goyer and James Webster

1401 Elgin Street,

Burlington, ON

From: Gerry [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, January 15, 2018 1:10 PM
To: Morgan, Melissa; Minaji, Rosalind
Cc: Meed Ward, Marianne; Mailbox, Office of Mayor Rick Goldring
Subject: Saxony

Hi Melissa and Rosalind,

We wanted to followup with you post Neighbourhood Meeting, to further underline our concerns around the Saxony revision application presently before you. The reason we are taking the time to reiterate our reasons for rejecting the height increase is, simply put, because it is that important to all of us, and now is the time for ALL of us to choose to prevent the degradation of this important neighbourhood in Burlington.

Thank you again for considering the neighbourhood, and our input in all it's forms. We appreciated the forum at last week's meeting, and look forward to working with you going forward on this issue.

Intensification in development has it's place, and in this case, the initial approval for this beautiful 4 storey boutique condo was the right decision for this location. As mentioned by many, and rightly so, it was a model of productive contribution by all parties manifesting in a win/win/win for all.

Abandoning that plan on the basis of economics, the main reason given by the LDG at last week's meeting, would be a mistake. As discussed at the meeting, and clarified by Rosalind, the parameters of development intensification (mandated by both province and city) have not changed from the time the original proposal was presented and accepted to the present time, so there is no legitimate argument to justify changing the zoning and intensification of this site now, as the developer and their consultant would have us believe. The presentation given by their consultant at the meeting was misleading in this regard, and when they were forced to admit that, in fact, nothing has changed in terms of provincial and municipal requirements, their justification lost all credibility. This newest incarnation of the developer came across as quite the opposite of the original, less cynical LDG that the neighbourhood had come to know and respect (and work with).

As pointed out at the meeting, and supported by every single attendee from the community, as well as absentee submissions by letter, increasing the size of this building is unwelcome, and would permanently destroy the character of this important area of the city.

As homeowners directly north of the building, we will lose enjoyment of our property, significant sunlight, privacy and character of our neighbourhood. We'd literally be overwhelmed with a giant wall, hemming us in beyond justification, based on previous requirements of lower height buildings in this area up to this point. An attendee from the neighbouring seniors residence revealed that he may be forced to move, as he'll lose his little sliver of open sky. Surely you agree, that is unfair to the many residents surrounding this site, some of whom are

quite vulnerable (this is their last home), that bad planning like this will benefit only the developer while seriously damaging the lives of all the residents of the neighbourhood. We reiterate... How is that fair and just? No-one in the neighbourhood, not one person, wants the 6 storeys. And this opinion is not selfishly motivated; it is backed by previous planning decisions in this community.

It's very clear to all that the original design was more well thought out, and in keeping with it's surroundings. The developer received their much needed support, because at that point they'd earned it by being thoughtful of city zoning, residents and the neighbourhood in general. Not the case now. Furthermore, the 6th storey setback the developer referred to is so insignificant. When the developer made it clear at the outset of the meeting that this was strictly a "business decision", and about making more money, it became clear that their motivations were cynical, and not by any means for the benefit of the city or anyone living in the area. Approval on these grounds would be a tragic mistake, not to mention just plain wrong. And as we said at the meeting, one of the factors that made Burlington one of the better mid-sized cities in the country would be lost. What planner/planning department would want that as a legacy?

For the reasons listed above and often, we are hopeful that you will make the planning decision that considers the loyal residents of this much loved area, it's taxpayers and the people who care the most. We've been hugely supportive of LDG's original vision... a well-designed and attractive, nicely scaled boutique condo residence for many to enjoy, including new residents, and their good neighbours.

It was and can still be a very successful development for all, including LDG. Please keep this original vision on track.

Respectfully,
Melissa and Gerry Lodder

From: Gerry [mailto:]

Sent: Monday, January 15, 2018 2:19 PM

To: Morgan, Melissa; Minaji, Rosalind

Cc: Meed Ward, Marianne

Subject: Saxony (additional list missed, to be attached on letter sent earlier)

Melissa and Rosalind, this summary list was meant to be included in the last email to you, and it somehow got missed in the version I sent you. My apologies for not including it. Here it is:

To reiterate the focus in list form, of our opposition to the 6 stories as proposed, the residents of Blathwayte Lane, Burlington Street and immediate surroundings agree that a 6 story building is not viable for the following main reasons:

1. Towering wall is an overwhelming eyesore, with only an insignificant step back at story 6. We would suggest the step back on the north wall to begin at story 3 minimum.
2. Infringes on existing residents' privacy and sunlight, and enjoyment of property.
3. Elders facing the building will lose sunlight entirely.
4. As density requirements for the province have not changed since the original application, there is no planning justification for the requested increase in height and density. 4 story building was agreed upon and appreciated by planners, community and LDG.
5. Only apparent reason for increase to 6 stories is to make LDG more money, NOT improved planning.
6. Residents of the community are forced to suffer the consequences of developer's unforeseen challenges (as LDG wants us to believe).
7. No one wants 6 stories, and you have received letters and other input from the community leaving no doubt about this. The existing zoning is agreeable to all concerned. The previous planning decisions are still as sound today as they were then.
8. Just because other buildings in the area (like City Hall) are taller, does NOT make it right to build this one higher.
9. The increased height is simply unsuitable for the setting and it's immediate surroundings.
10. The character of this corner would be seriously compromised with the proposed new monolithic structure. The charming streetscape of the original proposal would be lost to a glaringly out of scale structure dwarfing everything around it.

As mentioned in our earlier letter today, we are supportive of this development, just not it's most recent reincarnation.

We look forward to helping with the solution.

Thanks again,
Melissa & Gerry

From: Vera Vandenbosch [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, January 15, 2018 8:50 PM
To: Morgan, Melissa; Hefferton, Mark; Meed Ward, Marianne
Subject: Saxony Development Application - 452-454 Locust

Hello Melissa,

My husband and I own one of the townhouses on Blathwayte Lane, adjacent to the new Saxony condo development. We would like to voice our concern to the builder's application for an additional 2 storeys. We attended City meetings several years ago, when the developer proposed several versions (4 and 5 storeys), and whereby the 4-storey construction was approved. This approval was granted based on community input as well as other considerations relating to property size, set back from street, increased traffic, as well as impact to neighbouring properties. We were pleased with the outcome, realizing that intensification will occur, and that the developer's plans appeared to placate the community's concerns, most especially relating to size and height.

Now, the developer is actively promoting 2 additional storeys. My husband, Rick Vascotto, attended last week's meeting. Our concerns echo the messages sent via email to Mark Hefferton and councillor Marianne Meed-Ward in late 2017:

The City approved 4 storeys based on numerous considerations, and should not be re-considering a developer's request to increase the size once again. We can accept the need for intensification of downtown residential areas, but don't wish to see an even taller building so close to our small townhouse complex, especially butting up so close to those at the southernmost end.

Our fear is that we will be having another meeting in the near future, when the developer requests 8 storeys. This will pave the way and set a precedent for future high rise building applications on Locust (directly behind Blathwayte), to the point where the Blathwayte townhouses will be completely hemmed in by tall buildings.

4 storeys is tall enough on such a small parcel of land and will already create the effect of a prison wall for Blathwayte residents, anytime they walk to their back deck or out their front door to look South towards Lake Ontario. Please do not let developers sway the City's earlier decision. One prison wall is enough! We don't need it to be any taller!

Please do not hesitate to call if you have any questions or need clarification regarding our concerns. Thank you,

Vera Vandenbosch
vvandenbosch@cityoftoronto.ca
ελλ: ☐905-308-5436

Рιχκ ςασχοττο – 905-332-0468. ☐

From: Michael Timney [mailto:]
Sent: Wednesday, January 17, 2018 12:55 PM
To: Meed Ward, Marianne; Morgan, Melissa;
Subject: Saxony proposal

Marianne, Melissa:

I would appreciate clarification on the terminology "Downtown Precinct" - have never heard it used before. What are the parameters? What streets are included? "Downtown Precinct" cannot be compared to nor confused with Bates/St. Luke's Heritage Precincts, nor should one (Downtown Precinct) overlap the other.

I also find Landform's comparison of "tall" buildings to be spurious. All mentioned, except the far West portion of BPAC, are fully commercial spaces and a goodly distance away from Saxony site.

Too, Wigsville, originally at the corner of Elgin St./ Blathwayte Ln. was given Heritage designation which applied as much to location as building and that Blathwayte House (cor. Blathwayte Ln./ Ontario St.) and Paroisse St. Phillipe (cor. Ontario St./ Locust St.) also have the same Heritage designations. This, to me, signifies this whole block as heritage/ historical. Six stories does not qualify nor fit in. It also potentially sets a precedent for future development in this Heritage district.

Respectfully,
Ruth Timney
461 Blathwayte Lane.

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

From: [mailto:]

Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2018 10:54 AM

Subject: The Saxony 452-454 Locust Street, 1437 Elgin Street, 1445 Elgin Street Letter

This is regarding the April 4 meeting notice for The Saxony Condo Development. We do not wish to speak at this meeting, however we do plan on attending. We were out of town for the January meeting and as a result were unable to attend.

COMMENT

Our comments on the proposed 6 story building are that we are very much in favour of such a development. A structure of this height does not overwhelm the surrounding neighbourhood such as some of the proposed buildings for Brant Street and the downtown area will.

We would certainly have preferred four stories but six stories in our opinion does not present a problem.

Thanks for your interest and we would appreciate receiving information on the recommendations to Council flowing from this meeting.

Thanks

John and Evangeline Clarke