

Attachment 4 – Comments from members of the public

Public Meeting, August 2021

- I have recently learned of the resubmission of the plan for medium density development on the property between the Home Hardware and our condo complex at 9 Dausett Drive. My unit backs onto the field and will be directly impacted by the proposed units. I submitted my concerns at the time of the initial meeting, and have the same concerns at this time. I am astounded to learn that the plan could be resubmitted without notification to impacted property owners.

I echo the concerns and questions outlined in the correspondence from our Board of Directors - Kilworth Heights Mews

- I would like to state opposition to the re- application.

My understanding is that there have not been any changes made to the plans with the previous application.

1. With the height of the proposed building with rooftop balconies, there will be little privacy to our community yards due to the proximity to the back yards and because of the increase in density, it will negatively affect our property values. We are concerned these units will all be rentals but need confirmation on this issue.

2. The proposed development does not allot space for visitor parking or snow removal storage and with the lack of space the overflow of cars and snow will appear in our visitor parking located at the only entrance of both communities.

3. Due to the proposed 1.5 minimum parking allotment, it is not adequate for parking as there is no public transit here. Our concern is there will be parking on roadways and poor access for fire, ambulance and garbage removal.

4. My concerns also include the planned intention for access through the community along Dausett Drive, including construction access. There should be access in and out at Jeffreies or Glendon Drive.

5. Our concerns also are the trees planted on the swale towards the lot lines of the new development. The concerns that trees will be damaged and that the drainage systems for the new development ensure adequate drainage to ensure no flooding of the Dausett Drive community.

- Given the footprint of the proposed development area is similarly sized to 9 Dausett Drive, but with at least 20 more units - my key concern is an over-concentration of vehicles and traffic. As a former resident of downtown Toronto I have experienced first-hand how a pocket of residential/vehicle concentration like that can significantly impact traffic flow and noise - particularly being so close to a high-volume intersection.

The plan also leads me to think there will be insufficient parking allotment for the

Attachment 4 – Comments from members of the public

Public Meeting, August 2021

occupants and visitors of the 54 units. This causes me concern that surrounding streets - and even our own visitor parking - will become parking overflow for the proposed complex.

While I am not adverse to the idea of residential development on that particular property - the proposed plan strikes me as far too over-concentrated, which will inevitably impact the neighbourhood negatively.

- I have reviewed the development plans for Middlesex Centre and have been impressed with the care taken to make this a desirable place to live for all. When I see the request to amend the plan for the addition of an apartment building of 3 stories and which does not meet the plan in parking and exterior facing I am extremely concerned that it will affect property values and popularity of the area. This will also ultimately reduce property tax revenue.

The result of the amendment and zoning by-law changes will open the door to a different type of living in not only this area but ultimately all of Middlesex centre. The current infrastructure cannot support the additional traffic from the recent developments on Glendon Drive. I have heard many complaints from those who work on London and have witnessed that the traffic at rush hour is very heavy. This will be a future expense worsened by the size of this building.

- I have done some research since I sent that email and realized it will be a 2 story building. My apologies.

As long as it is faced to match the neighbourhood that would remove my basic objection.

I am still concerned about the lack of visitor parking and ask that it be seriously considered when approving the development. This is a problem because the probability that the existing condo development will have illegally parked visitors is quite high.

- The Board is opposed to the following:
The Board is opposed to the height of the planned buildings and the plan for roof top balconies. These buildings will be in very close proximity to our community offering very little privacy for our community members who would be backing onto this new development.

The Board is opposed to the unit density of the new development. The concern is that this increase in density in the small area will negatively affect our property values.

The requested UPH (50) is almost double what the current zoning allows (30), this is excessive for this small an area

Attachment 4 – Comments from members of the public

Public Meeting, August 2021

The Board is opposed to the layout of this new development. The layout has no space planned for visitor parking or snow removal storage. The Board's concern regarding the lack of visitor parking/snow storage space is that the overflow of cars and snow will appear in our visitor parking area located close to the main entrance of both communities.

The Board has questions/concerns to the following:

- 1) The Board has concerns regarding the planned purpose of this new development. The Board's concern is that these units will be managed by a rental property agency instead of individually purchased and owned units. We are requesting clarification on this matter.
 - 2) The Board has concerns regarding the planned storm water drainage system location. We have concerns that our community members who back onto this new development will have flooded backyards if the drainage system is not planned with our community in mind.
 - 3) The Board has concerns regarding the trees located on our swale towards the lot lines of the new development. The Board is concerned that the trees will be damaged during construction.
 - 4) The Board has concerns regarding the planned intention for construction access. The Board does not want construction access through our community along Dausett Drive and would prefer access off of Jeffries/Glendon.
 - 5) The Board has concerns over no visitor parking. With 54 units, visitors should be expected. Concern is that there will be parking within our condominium complex and /or on Dausett Drive. If significant parking on Dausett Drive, have the impact on sight lines for entry/exit been considered? Has a traffic study been completed?
 - 6) The Board has concerns regarding the proposed 1.5 minimum parking allotment for apartments as inadequate as there is no public transit and we are a rural community requiring transportation
 - 7) The Board has concerns regarding access for large Emergency Vehicles or Municipal garbage collection vehicles is adequate.
- Changing from Commercial to Residential Zoning is a loss for the Municipality tax base and there is plenty of new Residential going on in our community already.
Please do not allow Zoning Change

COVID has created an unusual circumstance for Commercial ventures and time will allow them to adapt to continue

Attachment 4 – Comments from members of the public

Public Meeting, August 2021

If allowed to proceed, we are opposed to the density of this project and are concerned this will have a negative impact on our property values.

The zoning being asked for (UR3) has a maximum density of 30UPH, while the applicant wants to increase this by almost double to (50) Seems excessive to allow such a dramatic increase in density, should the zoning be allowed to change.

Along with the frontage requirements being one third of required number by Zoning

The fact that No Visitor parking is supplied, whether in Zoning or not, is ridiculous as we are a rural community and vehicles are required to get here to visit.

The fact that there is only 1.5 parking spaces per stacked townhouse, again we are a rural community and vehicles are required.

The proposed entrance into the Development is in a poor location as far as site lines to Dausett Dr and Development beside it are concerned.

Add the parking, which will surely fill up Dausett Dr, this area becomes extremely congested and dangerous for families with young children.

The existing Condo Corp at 9 Dausett already has problems with other people parking in our visitor parking and this will only increase, as not enough parking will be supplied in the new Development.

This will force us to implement a towing policy to protect our community from insurance liabilities, allow for our snow storage and also ensure adequate visitor parking for our residents.

We have been informed that, because this was a Re-application, there was no requirement to notify the Public of this.

This is concerning to all as it could negatively affect their property values and lifestyle.

I suggest in future the Municipality notify all that have shown concern regarding this "re-application"

- We would like to express our opposition to the re-application of proposed zoning amendment on Dausett Drive from "Settlement Commercial" to "Medium Density Residential".

While not opposed to rezoning to residential, we have serious concerns regarding the maximum density for this amendment. We understand that the current maximum density is 30 units per hectare. The proposal states 50 units per hectare. There is the concern of lack of infrastructure to support such an immense

Attachment 4 – Comments from members of the public

Public Meeting, August 2021

increase. The location of the storm water draining system should be considered for the homes who back onto this new development to ensure they are protected from flooded backyards.

With 54 units, visitors should be expected, and the parking allotment does not seem to take this into account. Concern is that there will be parking within our condominium complex and/or on Dausett Drive. If significant parking on Dausett Drive, has the impact on sight lines for entry/exit been considered?

With such a narrow/awkward angled entrance we have concerns regarding access for large Emergency Vehicles, Municipal Garbage collection vehicles would be inadequate.

- It has been brought to my attention that an application that was previously rejected by municipal council has been resubmitted.

When I purchased my condo I was informed that I would have commercial development behind my home. It is much to my dismay to find out that stacked housing could potentially be built quite close to my lot line WITH a rooftop patio. This infringes on the privacy of all the condos lining the property.

It also creates issues with the visitor parking we already have trouble with as the proposed housing will not have enough parking on its own.

Furthermore, the Fire Marshall had stated that the layout of the parking lot as well as the number of residents in this proposed building is hazardous as the area does not have enough space for traffic movement.

I feel that this proposal is not in keeping with the environment, noise wise or visually with our beautiful and quaint little town.

- We are opposed to the following:
 - 1) The height of the planned buildings and the plan for roof top balconies. These buildings will be in very close proximity to our home and neighbours homes offering very little privacy for us.
 - 2) We are opposed to the unit density of the new development. The concern is that this increase in density in the small area will negatively affect our property values.
 - 3) We are opposed to the layout of this new development. The layout has no space planned for visitor parking or snow removal storage. We have concerns regarding the lack of visitor parking/snow storage space in that the overflow of cars and snow will end up on Dausett Drive causing visibility problems for those of us trying to get out of our driveways.

Attachment 4 – Comments from members of the public

Public Meeting, August 2021

The proposed 1.5 minimum parking allotment for apartments is inadequate. Additionally, the overflow of cars and/or snow would reduce visibility of young children and pedestrians crossing to use the sidewalk on Dausett.

Other concerns:

1) Concerns regarding the planned purpose of this new development. The concern is that these units will be managed by a rental property agency instead of individually purchased and owned units. We are requesting clarification on this matter.

2) Also there are concerns regarding the planned storm water drainage system location. We have concerns that the Condo community members who back onto this new development will have flooded backyards if the drainage system is not planned with that community in mind. This may not directly affect us but these are still concerns for our neighbours.

3) We have concerns regarding the planned intention for construction access. We do not want construction access along Dausett Drive and would prefer access off of Jeffries/Glendon. Many families walk their children along Dausett to access the school bus stops on Jefferies. An increase of truck traffic could lead to safety concerns for these families.

4) We have big concerns over no visitor parking. With 54 units, visitors should be expected. Concern is that there will be visitors parking on Dausett Drive creating difficulties when we back out of our driveways if vehicles are parked on both sides.

5) We have concerns regarding that the access for large Emergency Vehicles or Municipal garbage collection vehicles is inadequate.