

---

**Opposition to Proposed APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT (ZBA-12-2024)**

---

From Adam Redmond <[REDACTED]>

Date Tue 2025-01-14 11:32 PM

To Clerk <Clerk@middlesexcentre.ca>

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the Middlesex Centre email system. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you are 100% sure that the email is safe.

Dear Clerk of the Municipality of Middlesex Centre,

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed application for zoning by-law amendment (ZBA-12-2024) at 108 Caverhill Crescent, currently zoned for single-family dwellings. This development raises significant concerns about its impact on our community's character, infrastructure, and future planning, as well as its alignment with previously approved plans.

One key issue is the future connection of Caverhill Crescent to Arthur Street, as intended in municipal planning. The development site in question is not large enough to accommodate meaningful development while supporting this critical road connection. Additionally, the current proposal places three townhome units with their rear facades facing Arthur Street, creating an undesirable and unsightly outcome for a local roadway. Good planning principles discourage having residential units back onto streets, as it undermines the aesthetics and functionality of the neighborhood.

Moreover, when Caverhill Crescent is connected to Arthur Street as shown in the approved final revised draft plan, this parcel should ideally align with the community's expectations and commitments made to current residents. Purchasers of lots on Caverhill Crescent were assured that this connection would be implemented, and lot 16 on Plan 33M-715 would be subject to a 38-meter building setback from the southerly property line. This setback was specifically intended to allow the lot to be subdivided into three single-family lots, each with proper frontage onto Arthur Street and/or Caverhill Crescent.

The proposal accounts for 2 parking spaces/unit with only 2 visitor parking stalls. Given the lack of yard/storage space for personal items and distance to amenities, it seems unreasonable that 22 parking spaces would be enough for this development. When we first moved to the neighbourhood, my father-in-law received a parking ticket for parking on the road overnight. I would ask how the overflow parking will be handled?

Additionally, the entry road to the development is extremely close to our property line. Given the young kids that play in our yard/neighbourhood, I would request that trees are added to account for privacy and safety.

The proposed plan does not appear to address emergency vehicle access adequately. Given the lack of parking, it does not seem unlikely that vehicles could be double parked. In these instances, what impact would that have to the safety of residents if emergency vehicles are not able to access all areas of the property?

The proposed development disregards this understanding and deviates from the plans that shaped the neighborhood's formation. It fails to uphold the community's expectation for

thoughtful, cohesive, and appropriately scaled development.

I urge the council and decision-makers to reject the current proposal and prioritize development that aligns with the current zoning regulations and the expectations of residents in the neighborhood. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. I look forward to continuing the discussion.

Sincerely,

Adam Redmond

