

Subject: Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment

Application by 1254349 Ontario Ltd.

CN: 3-5-02-02 PLOPA20190032, CN: 3-5-02-03 PLZBA20180151

To: Planning & Economic Development Committee

**From: Chris Juzda - Cherry Hill Homeowners Association**

**Having read the report from the Planning and Development committee, we find the report in question to be highly problematic in that it essentially ignores existing zoning bylaws and does not take into consideration the strong opposition from hundreds of voting residents to this development.**

**In addition, it attempts to mitigate residents concerns by commenting that the Planning Department will somehow protect the interests of adjoining property owners through site plan inspections, etc. Once this application is approved, the Planning Department has absolutely zero accountability to residents. If the Planning Department is willing to overlook multiple issues with the application in question in order to approve it, we have no confidence in their ability or willingness to exert any control over the development going forward.**

**Council need to keep in mind that this is INFILL housing which,**

According to the report:

“The creation of new freehold infill lots or vacant condominium developments through the consent process or condominium process, for ground-oriented units, may be permitted provided the proposed lot and unit type and building height is similar to and compatible with the established character of the street or neighbourhood where it is proposed; “

**The proposed development bears not even the slightest resemblance to any residential building within 10 kilometres of the proposed site, never mind the immediately surrounding area.**

According to the report:

“Intensification opportunities will be encouraged if proponents demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Town, through the provision of detailed site plans and elevation plans, that such proposals will be respectful of, compatible with and designed to be integrated with the existing character of the community or neighbourhood where they are proposed.”

**Again, it is ludicrous to propose the building type, size and design adhere to this requirement**

According to the report:

“The development will be characterized by quality design and landscaping,

will implement suitable building setbacks to preserve the existing character of the neighbourhood, shall meet current parking standards and meet or improve traffic movements so as not to negatively impact the surrounding neighbourhood from the perspectives of safety or neighbourhood character”

**Once again, there is no actual landscaping in the proposal. In fact, green space surrounding the building is so limited, the proposal is virtually a large building and a large parking lot occupying over ninety percent of the property. This lack of green space is both aesthetically and environmentally unsound.**

According to the report:

“The applicants have indicated that architectural details such as brick, stucco, composite cladding, glass balconies, cornices, and larger window design are all being considered at this stage.”

**So in actuality, nothing is certain at this stage and “anything goes” with no accountability to neighbouring properties**

According to the report:

“the traffic study submitted by the applicant demonstrates that the forecasted traffic movements will not negatively impact the surrounding neighbourhood from the perspectives of safety or neighbourhood character.”

**There is no indication this traffic study has been properly vetted by anyone. What methodology was used? The applicant has consistently refused to disclose the intended use of the building in terms of residence type, proposed demographics, etc., so any traffic study not taking proposed occupant demographics into consideration is completely unreliable. For example if all 66 parking spots are utilized by people working full time, families, etc. the result will be far different than if the the occupants are primarily older retired people. Simply, this area is a problem now for school children and general traffic flow due to the placement of the intersections and adding significantly higher traffic flow will only worsen the situation and increase the possibility of serious accidents. These accidents are likely to include school children walking on the sidewalk which will cross the roadway exit to the building**

From the report:

“Minimum Lot Frontage Required 30 metres Proposed 19 metres”

**This represents a 37% deviation from the required standard. In addition the building violates other provisions of even the proposed standard in terms of density, lot area per unit and minimum interior side yard. In effect, the applicant is not just proposing to change the zoning, they are also proposing to exceed the requirements of the zoning they are asking for.**

From the report:

“In consideration of height, although four stories is provided when three is permitted as of right in the Official Plan, staff highlight that the actual measured height is 13 m, whereas

12.5 m is currently permitted by the Town Zoning By-law. As such, the proposed development does not represent a built form that is much higher than could be implemented as of right.” now?

**This has come up in previous discussions - the fact is it DOES exceed the requirements. In addition, 13m is not the same for different construction types. Almost all residential construction in the area utilizes peaked roofs, so the high point of the building is significantly further away from adjoining properties. In this case we are faced with what is basically a 13m WALL per the illustration below:**



From the report: “The proposed development will add a maximum of 48 units that would be located within a five to 10-minute walk of the Vineland Central Business Area,”

**The “central business area” is mainly comprised of a convenience store, a drug store and a grocery store. The grocery store is more like a 15 minute walk and will not be walked to by people shopping for groceries. Once again the report seems to be favouring the development by citing impractical benefits.**

From the report:

“In the event that Council’s decision regarding the application is appealed to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT), legal costs could be incurred by the Town.”

**It is difficult to accept the fact that the town might possibly some incur legal fees as a result of turning down this application as a valid reason for approving it. If that is the case, we are essentially giving a green light to any and all applications of this nature, regardless of the consequences**

From the report:

“This plan numerically shows the extent that the ground is lit throughout the site and when staff review, they look for a value of “0” outside the property line to make sure light is not escaping from the site. Standard practice when considering developments like this is also to make sure the lights themselves are downward firing to further minimize general light pollution both to adjacent properties and into the sky.

**This statement appears to assume that light is invisible when viewed against a backdrop. It is not. Lights from this building will be seen from a distance. In addition all 48 units have windows that will emit light and be seen with high visibility from surrounding properties.**

From the report: "Furthermore, improvements on Rittenhouse Road that will urbanize the corridor and improve safety for pedestrians has been moved up in the capital projects list and is tentatively identified to start in 2020.

**This statement has absolutely nothing to do with the proposal. The sidewalks were supposedly planned anyway.**

From the report: "The proposed building will provide a type of housing unit that is not well represented within the Town. As such, it will add to potential options for residents and will likely be priced at more affordable level than typical single-detached and townhouse style developments.

**This is pure speculation. Once again, since the developer refuses to provide any information at all with respect to type of building, proposed rents and fees, target demographics, etc.**

**Conclusion:**

**Intensification seems to be the primary selling point of this development. The fact that Vineland is largely in the Greenbelt is the reason many people live here. What is the value of intensification if it lowers the quality of life and property values for those living in the community?**

**We are dealing with a developer who has refused on several occasions to disclose his actual plans for this site, targeted demographics, etc.**

**The Cherry Hill Homeowners association presented a petition to the town with 247 signatures. Please note that there was no door to door campaign involved. Residents came in to the Community Centre to view the plan and sign it entirely of their own volition. An aggressive door to door campaign would have resulted in a minimum of 400 signatures. We also note that at no time in this process has a single resident of the surrounding community spoken in favour of this project, ever.**