

October 24, 2021

Marc SanCartier/France Quirion  
2850 Bancroft Drive  
Sudbury, Ontario  
P3 1V1

City of Greater Sudbury, City Clerk  
Box 5000, Station A  
Sudbury, Ontario  
P3A 5P3

RE: File: 751-6/21-009

City Clerk:

We, Marc SanCartier and France Quirion, property owners of 2850 Bancroft Drive, Sudbury, Ontario, are writing in response to the notice dated October 7, 2021, that we received from Alderman Bill Leduc in the matter of an application under Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1999, Chapter P. 13:

**Applicant:** 2375423 Ontario Inc. & Property Holdings Inc. (Agent: Tulloch Engineering)

**Location:** PINs 73575-0374 & 73575-0430, Parcels 18885 & 4435 S.E.S., Parts 2&3, Plan 53R-11221 in Lot 9, Concession 3, Township of Neelon (95 Estelle Street, Sudbury)

**Application:** To amend By-law 2010-100Z being the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law from "I", Institutional and "FD", Future Development to "R3-1" Medium Density Residential.

**Proposal:** Application for rezoning in order to redevelop the subject lands for the following uses:

- \* Three (3) five storey multiple dwellings with a total of 120 units.
- \* Seven (7) row dwellings with a total of 31 units.
- \* Six (6) ground-oriented multiple dwellings containing 28 units.

Total number of units is 179 dwelling units. The applicant is also requesting site-specific relief for requiring parking being one (1) parking space per unit where 1.5 parking spaces per unit is required.

**This rezoning proposal will have serious consequences for our neighborhood.**

The following outlines factors which need to be considered as part your assessment and decision-making process:

- 1) There is simply no room for all the proposed buildings and allowing 1 parking space instead of 1.5 spaces per unit, as per the existing by-law, will cause significant traffic congestion. This will not leave any room for visitor parking, which will cause even more traffic and parking congestion in an already busy area, Bancroft Drive and surrounding streets.

- 2) This development will add significant noise to an established quiet single dwelling neighborhood.
- 3) Changes in the landscape will affect the water runoff not only for every home surrounding it, but for the creeks and roads leading to Ramsey Lake. The two proposed water holding tanks will not provide the necessary capacity to address water runoff.
- 4) Rezoning this area to a "R3-1" Medium Density Residential area will negatively impact the value of our homes making them harder to sell, while at the same time, impairing the enjoyment of our living environment.

**We are strongly OPPOSED to rezoning the location in question.**

Thank you for your diligent review and for due consideration for those residents who will be impacted by this potential change to our environment.

**Concerned citizens,**

*Marc SanCartier & France Quirion*

**File:751 6/21 009 Public Hearing Comments for Hearing, Monday, October 25, 2021**

heatherharris heatherharris

Fri 10/22/2021 8:18 AM

To: clerks &lt;clerks@greatersudbury.ca&gt;

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello

My name is Deborah Harris. I am the owner of the property of 2834 Bancroft Drive, Sudbury, Ontario. I moved here in July 2019 after purchasing the above mentioned property. As you probably know, there is not a great inventory for most of the time in this area and this is the case when I bought this house. My daughter lives in the Adamsdale area and this is the closest I could get to her. I love the view out my back windows!

I am concerned about this proposed project for a number of reasons. My interpretation of this proposed project sounds too large for the amount of land that would be developed. Two parking spaces should be the norm in any planning of today. Most families have two vehicles, not to mention that most vehicles are huge today. It was also proposed that some units would not have back yards. That is not appropriate. People are spending their hard earned money and no back yard?

My house has suffered from blasting in the area since I have moved here, so not overly fond. However, I would like to see the eyesore of that school gone.(Not to mention the deserted St. Joseph's Hospital on Paris Street) Traffic needs to be a concern as well. There needs to be a three way stop implemented at the corner of Levesque and Bancroft Drive. Traffic needs to slow down there. The flashing sign just doesn't cut it.

I like the quiet and the nature here, although I could do with less bears. I left a busy city to help my daughter and son-in-law with their young family. I don't need a lot of traffic and noise. I do not want to see nature destroyed. Can the infrastructure support this project?

The project may work if it is downsized. I know that there are some seniors in the area that may like to move to that type of accommodation.

Sincerely,

Deborah Harris

submission of comments re: regarding the public hearing for the matter of an application under Section 34 of The Planning Act R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13

Gina Rocca

Fri 10/22/2021 1:13 PM

To: clerks <clerks@greatersudbury.ca>

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Attention: Members of the Planning Committee and Council

This email is in response to the submission each occupant residing at 169 Donald St, Sudbury, On, P3B 3T5 would like to make regarding the public hearing for the matter of an application under Section 34 of The Planning Act R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13 for the proposal of future developments of a total of 176 dwelling units and 1.5 parking spaces per unit.

**We, the occupants residing at 169 Donald Street (Pasqualina Rocca ,Virginia Rocca and Marco Rocca) each OPPOSE the above mentioned proposal for the following reasons:**

- By building these units, there will be a substantial increase in traffic. A total of 176 units can translate to potentially having 176 more cars driving in this area (i.e. each tenant having at least one vehicle each). In addition, there is the increase of traffic that will be created from visitors coming to visit occupants of these dwellings if visitors come using their vehicles.

It doesn't matter if an engineering assessment was done as what is determined in theory, we all know doesn't always equate into actual practice the same way.

- Adding more people to live in an area can also create a greater propensity for an increase in crime. This area is already riddled with its own issues of crime such as break-ins into vehicles and homes. It's a fact, the level of care an individual has for a rental property is less than a person who owns a home and has to pay a mortgage, property taxes, etc. We are concerned with the level of upstanding and high-moral people this development would be attracting if they really don't have the same level of commitment it takes to own a house versus renting an apartment.
- We are concerned with the destruction and removal of necessary green space and the negative environmental impact this will have. It is well-known trees are essential in the production of oxygen and reducing CO2 emissions. Also, this will negatively impact the well being of wildlife in the area. This is removing their habitat. The other impact will be the salt run off into the water shed. Many people were averse to the pollution the KED would cause to the water shed in the area. This development would cause a higher level of water pollution as it's much closer to Moonlight Beach.
- Another concern is the increase in noise in the neighboring areas.
- In addition to building these units, we have apprehension there will be an increase in property taxes for residential home owners in this area as how could these additional dwelling units be supported on the current water and wastewater infrastructure if before the current infrastructure couldn't support the existing homes and dwelling?. The current infrastructure has not been changed in decades. Should there be a need to upgrade these infrastructures ,then who pays for this upgrade?

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns. **Can you please acknowledge receipt of this email?**

regards,  
the occupants at 169 Donald St  
submitted by Virginia Rocca