

## Maria Gonzalez Santos

---

**From:** Patch <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 15, 2024 3:52 PM  
**To:** clerks; Wendy Kaufman; Joscelyne Landry-Altmann  
**Cc:** Pauline Fortin; Fern Cormier; Rene Lapierre; Bill Leduc  
**Subject:** LETTER of Concerns Royal Oaks Nickledale Dalron Subdivision File #1

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Committee, Councillors, City Staff, and Representatives of Dalron Construction,

As members of our Civic community and forum, we are speaking to you from the voices of not one, but many residents of the neighborhoods that surround the proposed subdivision developments in the Nickledale 'Royal Oaks' Montrose, area.

As you well know this file has been evolving and re-iterating over decades now, and so we trust that the process can continue in a manner that is maybe a little bit more civic, in that perhaps a bit more openness to the acceptance of some wider suggestions, and perspectives could be embraced.

We have just recently been privy to see the Report from Wendy Kaufman, Senior Planner at Planning Division, as well as the some new amendments put forth by the Developer, which looks to be an addition of some natural area, but sadly refuted by leisure services department, as not adherent to their standards and guidelines.. Oh well.. maybe we can find a better mix of such interwoven green spaces, public natural areas and inter-links between them and the, roads, they offer a respite from.

We have been considering the implications of this development from many angles, over the past years, and we are continuing to try to create a bridge of this true civics by way of trying to understand all the aspects of the intentions, planning, and process that a development like this must go through before it is finally stamped out on the land.

We certainly do like developments, and just like you, believe that Sudbury must continue to look forward and grow, and in that view, hopefully grow with the very finest of plans, in order to, satisfy the potentials that this Greater City of Sudbury has.

We would also like to send out a message to the people looking to come to Sudbury, to do business, to live, to invest, and to see our wonderful City, that it is a place worth coming and settling down in. We are all for great development, but, we ask that as one evolving and growing City we begin to open up to a new way of seeing clearly what this opportunity entails.

We therefore should request the Planning Committee and Council and Developer to seriously begin to re-consider what we are reflecting in these planning applications.

Our issues and concerns are many, but they are not about standing in opposition to a Developer who has given the City many neighborhoods and communities already. We thank Dalron and the Arnold Family, and all the hard working people they have employed over the decades to build out the Sudbury we now know. And furthermore, we thank the Arnold family for granting us a soft-use community activation and access to the lands they own. We have not taken this for granted. We most certainly do appreciate this green space and we've been able to steward and make good use of it as a community, and it truly did/does benefit from the access such natural forest setting walking trails and the beautiful suchness of the interactive and healthy experience it provides and enables.

We are, however, a bit saddened to think that developments are still not yet showing a full evolution of design that they could express, but, we are hopeful that we can begin to talk more about *this*, up here in Greater Sudbury.

And maybe here we must begin to explore the many aspect of this plan, as it is, in fact, the evolving opportunity to do so.

Let us step just above what we believe the Official Plan, the PPS, N PS, and the PA say, and lets try and see some particular things that maybe in our minds will allow for a new discussion to unfold.

We accept that these policies, and principles, and by-laws, and attempts to create order and conformity, are there. No doubt we need them, and we thank all the Staff of the City for working so tirelessly, on and within them, so diligently.

But, let's step up one level, and look at this from the perspective of what is best for Sudbury.

First point.

It is best we accept the value of having the need for a comprehensive 'Concept Plans' as required in the Official Plan (OP)'s \*Site and Area Specific Policies\* 20.4 SOUTH END OF THE COMMUNITY OF SUDBURY

#### 20.4.3 Concept Plans

Where a proposal is brought forward to develop only part of a land holding, a Concept Plan for the entire land holding shall be submitted with the development proposal prior to Council considering the application. The purpose of a Concept Plan shall be to assist Council in **evaluating the proposal with respect to the long-term development of the site. It is intended that the Concept Plan will retain flexibility** in order to respond to long-term changes in market conditions and other circumstances. A Concept Plan will show:

- a. how the development is to be generally distributed on each block;
- b. the general location and character of open space;
- c. the phasing of the development; and,
- d. the manner in which linkages to adjacent developments will be enhanced or created, entrance locations, and any road network being proposed.

So, since this is stated so, let us begin to extend this to the New Sudbury area as well.

The rationale for doing so, is simple, conformity. And the fact that the City staff that held responsible for commenting on this Plan of Subdivision's Connection to Forestdale Drive's top end, in Wendy's Report, said this:

"Forestdale as currently planned and the connection of StreetA to Forestdale aligns with **section 20.4.7 of the Official Plan** which requires a connected street pattern. Development Engineering has advised that they have reviewed the design elements of the proposed cul-de-sac ('Street B') and can confirm that the *existing topography of the area necessitates the layout shown.*"

Well that section, justifying the connected street pattern for Forestdale, is from the same OP \*Site and Area Specific Policies\* section only applicable to 20.4 SOUTH END OF THE COMMUNITY OF SUDBURY

So, that applies, here in New Sudbury.. Interesting..OK

Then so too could/would/or should we then look to subsequent consultations with the public over a unified 'Concept Plan' for this Proposed Subdivision, that is broken up into three disparate plans, even though it's one contiguous property owned by the Developer.. and therefore should be requiring that 'Concept Plan' as set out in OP 20.4.3

Or, maybe let's just back up for a minute and not so fast, go up to Forestdale, and re-think that connection over there... is everything hunky dory with that Forestdale Drive Connected Street pattern... in accordance with op... hmmm...

So, let's get to this a bit later, and perhaps we can continue to look at the whole development with a keen fresh eye, on every detail..

But of you must be joking, Wendy's Report to Council is embedded between pages 49-124 of a 183 page Agenda for this Public Meeting, and notice was set to only the residents within a relatively small circle in proximity to the proposed development.

So approximately 75 pages of details outlining how this development, on the table before you, as City Councillors and Planning Committee, but more importantly voted in representatives of the Community looking out for our best interest.

So hopefully you have had the time to read the report beyond just its affirmation that it all adheres to this policy and that policy statement and what we want to see as the OP that defines our growth and development into the future...

But it might be clear that we can not say for sure we really do have all the facts right here, in this proposed Report.

And furthermore, if we were to go through it with that care and wide scoping consideration that we should go through it with, had we been given the appropriate amount of time, there would be perhaps more to it, than just a vote on what it recommends. It seemed to be a multi-year process to get this Report to you, as Council, but we are expected to digest it and comment sensibly and effectively, adding value and being good citizens as that, but we can give you a week to do that.. No rush.. lol

Look, let's get serious, there are a lot of issues here.

This is a subdivision that has been on the books for decades and frankly some of the design and aspects were better in 1990 than they perhaps are today, but things change, and things evolve. And Civic process must continue and developments must continue and let's make this all better.

But let's make this Plan a real Concept Plan, and break out Council's Planning Committee and the Developer and the Community Representatives who have a living experience and understanding of the area, to set out and walk the land, talk, share perspectives, look at opportunities, look at 'existing topography of the area' and what perhaps 'necessitates the layout' alternatives that we could explore together, and finally make this development set up for the future, successfully.

For, what has been shown so far, is not complete. *It is not complete.*

In terms of Compact and Complete communities...

Yes, it is compact, as best as a Developer with great cost and considerations must contend with, let alone all the conditions and such, and we respect that. There has to be sensibility to all these factors, and considerations.

But it is *not Complete*. Not even in the slightest, actually.

It is evolving, and we look forward to seeing it evolve even further. So, please accept that as a community of residents of the neighborhoods that surround this City land, this territory, this property owned by Dalron, has great potential. But let's not rush it. Especially as we move inwards from Montrose Ave, and downwards from Maley Dr. Ext., our lovely nearby divided highway.

As we know that it too must somehow connect.. And these connections must be very well explored.

Why?

Safety, really.

Safety of Children

Safety of Families

Safety of Seniors Walking and staying healthy.

Safety of everyone's health and well-being.

Safety of Drivers.

Safety of Residents and what this means is that we have to look at existing streets, in the existing neighborhoods. Again.

Connections, drivers, cars, traffic, people, kids at play.. Where, how, why, what... ?

**What you need to take seriously is that Forestdale Drive is not designed to connect. It never was designed to connect to a build out of 455+ semi-detached unit subdivisions.**

READ THE LETTERS FROM RESIDENTS WARNING CITY AND COUNCIL AND DEVELOPER OF THE VERY REAL RISKS AND HAZARDS THAT A CONNECTION TO FORESTDALE DRIVE AT THE TOP, HAS.

Seemingly without full and clear comment from Departments responsible for taking into deep considerations aspects of Safety in the Designs that City is endorsing with pre-approvals and acceptance, this connection *is still somehow being justified* and recommended by a wayward statement from the South End site specific section in the Official Plan... for Sudbury.

The major issue is now all about the design limitations of the already existing neighborhood of Forestdale.

This is not going to be resolved until Council, Developer, and City Staff realizes that **Forestdale Drive must only be continued in a clever new Cul de Sac design.**

Why clever, because, it needs to open up the design, but not let general subdivision through-way traffic to go upwards to the top of Forestdale from the north, or north-east direction.

But seeing as much as the City doesn't like Cul de Sacs because City plows are not able to somehow properly plow them, *let's design one that it can, and let's add a small fire access road, that acts also as a inter-link connector to a joining old and new communities, but is primarily there to add emergency access, if need be, vehicles can go through a short side link to the north east* of that rubble and slag built up extension of the Forestdale hill, which if, Geo-engineers can deem it safe and sound for a construction on the west side of it, can have some nice new homes and a little elevated parkette for the kids to play, and lovers to sit and watch.. the sunny sunset side.

Forestdale Drive really can not connect by a new main throughway ramping up to the top corner of a street that was never designed for it.

The rationale is that it is a major downgrade of SAFETY to existing residents, and there is no-need really.. THERE IS ACTUALLY NO NEED TO, and consider that it will be extra potential **liability and cost** to the City if it is allowed to.

What benefit is there in this subdivision design that connects the height, and limited existing roadway fabric design of Forestdale Drive to a new residential expansion of streets down below, with full traffic access to go through it? Please re-read **Chris B.'s, EV's, and NV's excellent letters about how a full on connection there to the subdivision is a perfect recipe for disaster.**

*A speeding southbound car is accelerating up the rampway.. another vehicle was coming from the opposite direction... It was a very ...*

***Yeah, we are telling you now. Don't ignore, this notice. And for this simple reason, which we can begin explaining further if you wish, the Plan of Subdivision from Dalron, is in need of some further community consultation, expertise, and maybe even that study Council asks for but never really got from Staff (WSP).. But whatever, eh? We already know what any City ordered Study will have in it if that's what the City thinks they need to have in it. So save the taxpayers money, and don't order more Studies, but rather draw on the pool of civic perspectives, expertise, **and consult with neighborhoods in a new renewed spirit of cooperation to find the solution sets that will make everyone smile, and feel like their concerns have been addressed and resolved with the perfect ideas.*****

Who would a thought, eh...

If you really need to read more about everything, we, as your community, thought, was thinking, re-thinking, conceptualizing, exploring as alternative designs, and all that jazz about how the old Sudbury Canoe Club should be developed into a community blue-bond backed, quaint but lovely little piano lounge bar by the waters of Sudbury's wonderful Ramsey lake, read.... oooops, sorry got the wires crossed there...

Right, um.. yeah.. go to **Re2021.com** and read that little ditty there. It's a site that has tried to express a few things.

But ok.. to re-iterate why we need to work on this plan, with the the Arnold Family and Dalron, who we really love, and appreciate. Thank you Kristi, and we trust that Ron senior, and family are all doing well, and enjoying the nice early springtime weather we are having. What a blessing.

We look forward to meeting and discussing a cool idea for the plan at the top of Forestdale, and below.

But yeah, there are certain conditions that really break down that plan of subdivision, right now, and most of it really stems from that Forestdale connection problem.

Actually, honestly, if you look at the plan from the new perspective of that Forestdale, fire access only route, and *unique new Cul de Sac*, you might notice that it opens the whole plan up to a really wonderful new design! :)

Yeah. We don't want to harp on this too much, but let it be said once more...

There is no benefit in connecting Forestdale Drive to an extensive development that connects again to Montrose Ave. and eventually to Maley Drive Ext.. It will only serve to re-route traffic, to and through, the Forestdale Drive community, and increase the risk and hazards to pedestrians, and cars already precariously managing the limited visibility, slipperiness, steepness, and sun-blinded narrow confines of the existing roadway.

These risks are even greater in the winter conditions, where the road is subject to high snow banks and those slippery conditions. In fact we see this as a very real liability of safety, and an issue, that should not be passed over, over-looked, but rather a nudge-nudge, wink wink to the City, and to the Developer. A nudge is as good as a wink to a blind bat they say.. But let's not be blind to the dangers and hazards of connecting Forestdale to a big new shiny subdivision to the north of it. It's dangerous, and a hazard.

Furthermore: At the top of Forestdale there is a major height elevation, and steep grade differential of at least ten meters between the current peak, much of which is sitting on back-fill, and the lands to built upon below. This is all subject to movements and instability for concern as the foundation for a roadway extension and building lots. The construction of the lots and roadway on this grade, level, and degree of backfill is questionable and perhaps a red flag for professional opinion that has become an inside joke and the existential question on the mind's of Geo-technical and civil (read Civil) engineers everywhere. For the punchline of the joke, ask Andrew about the rocks supporting his backyard at the end of Foresdale drive..

*Another hard Q: Why hasn't the Staff at the departments responsible for seeing these issues clearly, not commented on it in the report?*

This is not just a bunch of parents and families writing letters, stating that they know the proposed connection poses risks to kids and families walking up and down this narrow roadway. This is a direct factor that has not been addressed by City Staff in it's departmental communications and talks with the developer.

At this time it is a manageable situation, and we are a safe street. But Dalron's draft applications / City Staff recommendations/ planning approvals seeming don't not take this concern seriously enough to change the plan to mitigate the clear risks being pointed to.

This subdivision does not need to connect to Forestdale. And it should not be proposed to do so.

Dalron's plan to unnecessarily connect to Forestdale is short-sighted, and potentially 'irresponsible'; and a development that in certain ways does not adhere to the PPS.

Consider increased traffic on a narrow roadway that is not, and was not, designed to take extra traffic, as a human-made **hazard**.

The traffic from the proposed connection to a new development of the projected size, is a potential '..man-made hazard' to the residents and families of Forestdale Drive.

That fine document and policy statement we call the PPS say that development should ensure protection of people, property and community resources by directing development away from natural or *human-made hazards*, but it also clearly states in section 1.6.8.3 that Planning authorities *shall not permit development in planned corridors that could preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purpose(s) for which it was identified < intended>* . New development proposed on adjacent lands to existing or planned corridors and transportation facilities should be compatible with, and supportive of, the long-term purposes of the corridor and should be designed to **avoid, mitigate or minimize negative impacts on and from the corridor** and transportation facilities/ Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 ( Just uniquely connect by small fire-road a shiny new Cul de Sac design; problems solved)

Otherwise, read on :( if there time to ...

Don't you think we should explore all this a bit more before we say it's all hunky dory... nudge nudge wink wink...

The steepness and narrowness of Forestdale Drive, where no sidewalks are, no bike paths are, nor are any such features even feasible or practical, was not designed, as it was designed, within it's constraints and design limits to have this existing 2024 re-draft of the Plan of Dalron Subdivision work. Time of living experience here has shown to the residents that it is not designed to take an extra load of traffic from another direction. It is already at its design capacity and maintains a safety level that we as the existing community can manage, and one that we expect to continue to be safe for our children and families, far into the future.

The width\* of the Forestdale Drive roadway is only 8.7 m wide.

The width\* of the Grandview Blvd roadway is 10.3 m wide.

The width\* of the Montrose Ave S. roadway is 11.7 m wide.

Please let's admit it.. It should be left as is; the end of Forestdale as-is, should terminate at the top end with a unique new single new cul-de-sac design and fire-road access to the lower elevations of the proposed developments, that as best as we can explore, can still become the awesome design that would satisfy every developer's dream, and house lot's of Seniors and Families. Oh, that reminds us, that's why need a whole site north and south of hydro corridor

**Concept Plan**

Actually if you look at Dalron's plan with a keen eye, you see that it is very messy in the corner where it is proposed to connect. It could very well be a much more harmonious road and lot fabric if an alternative plan was drawn up that *didn't* include a connection to Forestdale, but rather took Street 'A' to a nice round-about/semi cul de sac around Street 'A's turn to the North in a continuation of a better overall 'Plan of Subdivision'. It should be seen in this view, and the plan should be expected to create the perfect balance and layout of roads and lots and public space and even some inter-woven green space (*if the Developer oughta, woulda, coulda, should so kind enough be*).

And I must add, that if you take this idea of compact and complete developments too far, don't you think that maybe then this part of Sudbury will have less appeal to new home buyers. Hmmm... What is the effect of building really compact designs.. save money, more frontage, money, costs savings, tighter infrastructure, more tax base, money, more families, more semis, more money.. oh... sorry.. i got a bit distracted there...

Insist on a perfect design here, and it will potentially make up for the noise from the new Maley Drive Ocean side hum, that is already a slight detraction force imposed on the area as a whole, mind you, people say you get used to it... personally I liked the sound of spring peeper tree frogs and whippoorwills better.

A livable community design is good urban design, and that requires the developers to get a bit more 'envisioned' as creative and up-to-date with what they could best do, on a piece of property like this. Perhaps they could also get some direction from City Planners, and City planners could get direction from better designed examples of pocket communities in other parts of the Province. But then again, why look outside the city at other cities, when we know how to design great looking stuff, just take a look at the hills above the downtown water town when you are traveling towards it from Notre Dame.. Now that's a good looking skyline.. or is it ... i forget

We want to see good, safe and livable design being expressed in plans of development in this City, and if the City doesn't start to look a bit more clearly at this issue, we are not going to be an attractive and prosperous City of the future, are we...

And since this is the point of it all, we must begin to leave it in your hands, dear Council Members, dear Staff, dear Chair and Councillor of the Planning Committee.. and dear Arnold family, Dalron, and thank you all for this wonderful civic opportunity to entertain you with this day dream.

AND Since we had little time to prepare, since we received this updated plan of subdivision and the report so recently, and since you gave us so little time to comb through it with a fine toothed comb, but can you imagine if we had time to respond to every glaring issue in the report and plan, thank goodness you didn't; this letter would have become a dusty spined novel, that on the shelves of our new Library at City hall.

So in the best of one alternative reality, we also ask that if this is a public meeting where new and previously raised, but still not fully addressed issues are being funneled in for considerations, that we deny / separate / and / or postpone the voting on any resolutions to pass approvals on this new Application at the March 18th meeting.

We should have a public meeting, but this, should be the public meeting, where we get all the details, and then, have a chance to respond.

If you just vote at that meeting, we will see it as a systemic flow of your intended procedural practices, but raise further concerns as we are really eager to help make all this information more valuable, by eliminating the effects of it not being properly timed as new information must be carefully considered and addressed.

Kindest regards, and thank you for your understanding and all your support. We look forward to all the great new designs you all decide to build Sudbury's future upon.

Patch

p.s. if you need any extra community perspectives, a know a few good men and woman, and some some wonderful young people who've got the best ideas... if only you knew what this young generation would love to see you build out in Sudbury.. WOW..What City this would be...

But let's leave that for another day, shall we...?

p.p.s. Don't we have a School of Architecture here...?

What's their feedback on this Royal Oaks Plan of Subdivision i wonder...

p.p.p.s. Why do they call it Royal Oaks,... when those succession Maples and Oaks, and splendid and *sacred little bonsai pines* are all in danger of being bulldozed as we need to clear the whole lot, and royally blast all that beautiful ecology away..

Are there gonna be any of those sacred Mother trees, Pine circle groves, and Chickadees flying in the gentle winter breeze looking for some sunflower seeds... left :(

Oh well, i guess that's just the way things are done these days...

Too bad eh...



## Maria Gonzalez Santos

---

**From:** Patch <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 17, 2024 9:25 AM  
**To:** clerks; Joscelyne Landry-Altmann; Wendy Kaufman  
**Cc:** Rene Lapierre; Fern Cormier; Pauline Fortin; Bill Leduc  
**Subject:** Re: LETTER of Concerns Royal Oaks Nickledale Dalron Subdivision Report File

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**FINAL REPORT TO COUNCIL** - from the Public Consultation Strategy and outreach for feedback to and through the existing Community of Nickledale, New Sudbury Ward 12, and Greater Sudbury.

March 2024

Dear Councillors - Planning Committee, further through and to respective City Staff, Wendy Kaufman, Alex Singbush, and, the Applicant, Dalron Construction

Serious Risks and Concerns regarding Dalron Royal Oaks Nickledale Subdivision File 751-6/21-19 & 780-6/89023

On behalf of many community members of the surrounding neighborhoods to the proposed developments the first register of this report and findings will comprise of several issues and subsequently factored objections, that may require a separation of aspects pertaining to a continuation of the Applicant's furtherance of Plans for the Royal Oaks/Nickeldale Subdivision, Sudbury, and a modification or further re-consideration of facts and material from the Planning Committee Public Open Session and Agenda for Monday, March 18, 2024, and this may include a re-scheduling of procedural procession through the Applicant's applications, pertaining to zoning amendments and resolutions and recommendation that reference existing pre-approved, or to be approved, 'Plans of Subdivision' associated with this file. The following issue(s) are still unresolved, as serious, relevant, pertinent, and standing in the counter-supportive, and detraction factors in the applications as described in the Resolution section, and the associated 'Plan of Subdivision', put forth by Dalron Construction, the Applicant, as being presented, as of March 2024

### **Issue # 1: Major Safety Concerns in regards to the existing limitations of Forestdale Drive's design and roadway**

The problematic site and road fabric as presented in the 'Plan of Subdivision' associated and attached to the Dalron Plans for this site, and any agreements to date, have a serious *potentiality for liability to the City of Greater Sudbury*, arising namely from the proposed extension and conversion of Forestdale Drive into a through-street connecting to a development that also is slated to connect to Montrose Ave. and Maley Drive Ext., a major divided highway.

This is a major glaring flaw in the previous several iterations, and, the current re-draft of the proposed site fabric for this Royal Oaks / Nickledale Dalron Development dated 2024. Regardless whether on not approvals have or would be given, these newly addressed issues, do present serious arguments, and carry with them a responsibility of civic City departmental duty, to respond properly, as a measure to protect the City from any pursuant possibility of further liability, and issues that arise in the adherence to City Departmental recommendations or lack there of, that could make further claims of liability stemming from a '*Detrimental Reliance*' within City departments. These issues further the support of a well defined civic pressure to re-draft any current pre-approved 'Plans of Subdivision' put forth by the Applicant, even if they have already derived their standing from previous plans of the proposed development, and regardless of whether they have already been the subject of recommendations and approvals from City Staff, the Departments they represent, and Planning Committee of Council in previous sessions open or closed.

Addressing this most serious issue, and then further issues, and the feedback resultant of the public outreach and concerns highlighted from that collection of data and findings will be presented in the following report here within.

We will continue to show a lack of reasonable and safe grounds upon which to base and approve the decisions that define the road and lot fabric as currently presented in the succession of Dalron "Plans of Subdivision" attached to the Applicants applications related to the file.

It has become apparently clear, that there is no benefit in connecting Forestdale Drive to the development that connects to Maley Drive Ext.. under the current plans. It will only increase the dangers to drivers and residents, and increase the potential liabilities to the City, as the connection as currently presented only serves to openly re-route traffic to and through a roadway that was not properly designed to support an increased flow of such traffic.

The Forestdale Drive community, has been instrumental in now clearly identifying this risk, as it was previously seemingly unknown to Planning Division and Departmental recommendations in the past, and the disproportionate increase in the risk and hazards to pedestrians, drivers, and cyclists sharing the limited roadway conditions that Forestdale Drive was designed for, upon, and situated in, makes the roadway unsuitable to open up to a higher traffic count.

A higher traffic count would most certainly be the resultant case, if, the 'Plan of Subdivision' continues to develop as per the recommendation and approval from Council and City Staff. This, as noted above, may lead the City toward claims of 'Detrimental Reliance', and claims of liability in the effects resultant from its process and effects, and any decisions that had been made upon such detrimental reliance from the sources the City gathered its support for any recommendation and approvals it made, may be called into question as well.

Cars already, as stated by statements by residents of the area, must precariously manage and navigate the limited visibility of roadway, in diminished and difficult conditions that include a hidden risk of head-on collisions and collisions with non-drivers using the roadway, due to limited view as result of a confluence of factors that combine to create a major argument in support of our findings, that are presented within these facts and statements from the residents of Forestdale Drive and its two existing Cul de Sacs, and others who have been surveyed as to how they perceived the suitability of the roadway to a heavier load of traffic coming from either direction.

The major factors that in and of themselves, or in totality, contribute to a very disqualifying view of its suitability to connect, and act a new through-way for traffic coming in from a new development ( that could potentially have more than 455 semi-detached residential units) are combined as follows:

1. The apex of the roadway upon this site, has created a 'hip and dip' effect by way of its design, and its topography, along with sun-blinding, steepness and the relatively narrow confines of the existing roadway, make it very dangerous to have more traffic engaged from opposing directions. These risks are even greater in the winter conditions, where the road is subject to high snow banks and slippery conditions, and accelerated ascent is required and usually is taken by driving center width to find traction, on parts of the roadway which are not so icy or snow covered (which is very common in winter conditions. Generally speaking the hill is dangerous from both directions of travel due to the unique confluences of natural and man-made factors which limit and obstruct visibility, and increase risk to the drivers and anyone else using the roadway.

To further illustrate the express and very real risks that exist as a result of the factors contributing in totality to the inappropriateness of linking a through-way of new traffic through Forestdale's existing roadway and its limited design, is to take the perspective of the orientation of vehicular traffic as it takes the westward route up the hill, where it is facing a perfect confluence of factors that increase risks and dangers to the anyone else using that roadway. As mentioned, the steep incline induces an increase in speed (especially in winter conditions, where snowfall and slippery condition require it in order to get up the hill). But this is complicated and made very dangerous by the unique 'hip and dip' in the

roadway, at it's apex. This visual effect of a hidden 'dip' just after the 'hip' completely obscures the view of any oncoming traffic, and this applies to both westward facing and eastward facing vehicular travel.

And the high snow embankments, create a further risk to and from the traffic, as it is necessitates cars in driveways to back up further into the narrow roadway, to actually sense the traffic that is proceeding along the roadway.

2. The aforementioned issues complicate it, but one more makes the road even more precarious at certain periods of the day which are generally the day's most common use period. The obstructing glare of the Sun at, both early and late in the day, in both directions, but most seriously detrimental to a clear view of the roadway as on travels westwards up the hill. This is a serious Sun blinding angle of incidence to drivers, that seems to be amplified on that specific incline and orientation that Forestdale Drive has. It occurs as residents are coming home from work, kids are playing, and people are walking the neighborhood.

For all these reasons, Forestdale Drive is not just a simply inclined roadways that requires extra speed and control in winter conditions, but at the same time, is subject to the most peculiar conditions that are as much naturally occurring, and as they are already a factor of the design that the roadway was built with.

The report must highlight the glaring obvious fact that this residential roadway is a very unsuitable to be expected to safely facilitate an increase in vehicular traffic from Sudbury to the south, or traffic from the west that would, according to current applications, have traffic ramping up a new and certainly wider and faster perceived straight-away coming in from the north via a new subdivision, that is also somehow connected to Maley Drive Ext. and by one turn directly connected to the continuance of Woodbine Ave, and by several connectors connected to Montrose Ave. (which at an absolute minimum would be two, but more likely three of four additional connections, one or two prior to the hydro corridor, and one or two after it. )

And with all this, we must keep in mind, that adding further traffic is not only serious risk, and a man-made hazard, it is a major liability concerning Safety with regards to the children and families that live and reside in the neighborhood, as well as a risk and safety concern to any drivers using it.

3. Furthermore there are issues with the top half of Forestdale Drive's supporting fill, and roadway underlay, which has been seen as weaknesses in the roadway, and shifts and compromised structural bulges in the retaining walls and stones that act to support the lot fabric and properties that are on it. The resulting support of these high embankments of rocks, slag and organic fill, upon which this man-made extension of Forestdale has been built is not suited to an extra load of traffic, or even the heavy machinery that is required for the building of future lots, and a new through-way road fabric from there. As a result of continuing erosion and cyclical thaw and freeze cycles which also have their detrimental effects on the structural integrity of this top end of Forestdale, we see this as a further supporting factor that disqualifies, and disfavors Forestdale's capacity to act as a safe and suitable roadway and foundation for such a roadway as would be connected by extended from it's back-filled height differentials between where current residential lots are built upon, to where the existing plan and its proposed lots would be built upon, as the topography and elevation as conditions to the north of there, descend rapidly.

At the top of Forestdale there is a major height elevation from the surrounding topography, and steep grade differential which is sitting on an extension that was at the time constructed according to boulder, slag, and organic matter back-fill (perhaps compliant to the standards of the day, which accepted the use of slag), but is now not compliant, and is subjecting the structures on these lots to significant risk of continuing movements resulting in damage and disturbances to the residential lot fabric (not to mention what would be resultant of any geo-technical blasting so close to these existing Forestdale (and existing cul de sac) homes) would it be allowed to develop in any inappropriate way. And it is a fact, and there is visible and documented instability and erosion in the roadway, as has shown to be too weak to even support loaded trucks accessing the fill site at this top north western extension where the proposed through-way to the

new subdivision is proposed to sit.

The construction of the lots and roadway on this grade, level, and degree of backfill is questionable and a red flag for further professional opinion as an issue that has not been properly assessed. Furthermore, see CoGS Official Plan 10.4. Further inquiry with residents like A.\* whose lot foundations and roadway have been affected by this issue, and other property owners on that portion of Forestdale Drive is warranted. They would be the sources of further measurable data as to what the longer term implications of building there may be.

The data collected so far indicates that it would be sound and legally beneficial notice to the City that for these as stated above factors, conditions, statements of fact, and experience of residents, the current plan must, and should in the best interest of the residents of Sudbury, be re-drafted on the basis of the ensuring safety in the context of construction, and safety in the context of community children and families, cyclists, pedestrians, and all drivers that make use the Forestdale Drive roadway.

Whether one is driving, walking or biking, up and down, the Forestdale roadway and hill, there is a confluence of factors that make it unsuitable (as a furtherance of connection to more traffic) and unsafe when drivers enter from either the westward or enter an eastward flow, as both directions have obscured and limited views of opposing traffic, car's backing up out of driveways (especially in winter), and the pedestrians, or cyclist already using the roadway. As it was designed in this limited design, it has no feasibility, or even the width to safely accommodate for either those walking or cycling with extra lanes or sidewalks, so adding traffic to the roadway, increases risk to walkers and cyclists.

**The data we have collected and referenced back to find a solution that best mitigates these liability issues and safety concerns and perhaps even leads to significant improvements in future outlooks on the development, is strongly supporting the following best option:**

- The steep and narrow, Forestdale Drive, subject to all these proceeding, confounding factors should be left as is, and the end of Forestdale (as-it-is), should terminate at the top end with a **single new cul-de-sac design** that is **designed in such a way as to have a fire-road access** to the northeast that is not a through-way, but can act as one if needed (to satisfy all City requirements), and that includes **a design that is plowable by City Plows**.

The currently proposed site and road fabric that is continuing to be recommended by City Staff has not addressed this liability and safety issue, which a mainstay concern pertaining to this applicants application, as this time: **Forestdale Drive is not a suitable roadway to safely function as a connection to a new build out of a subdivision and its resultant extra traffic.**

#### **Conclusion and Recommendation resultant of Issue #1**

It is the recommendation of this report to Council through Planning Committee, and through City Staff to City Departments by way of responsibilities of office, and safeguarding the health and well-being of its constituency, that Forestdale Drive is now deemed unsuitable and dis-preferenced and thereby, by all qualifying measures, disqualified as a connector through-way to connect to the approved, and/or unapproved current and standing 'Plans of Subdivision', as currently put forth as associated article(s) and documentation to the Applicant's, re-zoning and further tabled agreements, pertaining to any current or previous plans that included the currently identified and now 'suitably disqualified' connection to Forestdale Drive as a continuance and through-way to be accessed for the purpose of routing new traffic from the Subdivision to be developed between Maley Drive Ext., and the existing neighborhoods to the South of it.

Further it is recommended that since it (the existing Forestdale roadway and its design) is deemed unsuitable and not safe to connect to a significant increase in traffic that would flow from both directions towards a Forestdale's confluence of factors that present a clear and unchangeable safety liability, issue and factor, the statements made in support of its 'disqualification' as a connection to the pre-approved 'Plan of Subdivision' should and must take precedence and

priority of fact, in regards, to previous or current references to any consideration of this Plan, whether in part or not, within the current Transportation Plan, documentation, reports, and or associated findings or studies, that form in part or not, a basis or reference of future City initiative, plans or engagements outlined in the Official Plan of Greater Sudbury.

It is further recommended by the civic consultation, that Forestdale Drive be re-drafted into any subsequent plans as a terminate roadway that can satisfy City requirements for length, and access, by way of well designed, single new cul-de-sac that by way of it's design is perfectly functional through a connecting fire-access route and a plowable roadway surface.

Further metrics to support Forestdale Drive not being a suitable or safe connection to any further increases in Traffic volume, are currently being collected.

The width of the Forestdale Drive roadway is only 8.7 m wide (max. 4 season avg.)

The width of the Grandview Blvd roadway is 10.3 m wide.

The width of the Montrose Ave S. roadway is 11.7 m wide.

## **Issue #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7**

Further to the singular Issue as documented above, the following lingering and persistent issues are also still unresolved and need further consideration by City, and Developer (Applicant) :

**Issue # 2** • Major Safety issues concerning Montrose's lack of clearly defined, properly explored, suitable and effective meandering (as an exploration of it's various designs and parameters, was requested by Council, but not yet fulfilled) and further defining of traffic flow control measures, and an addressing of the Applicant's limited road allocation as it limits the perceived parameters of the design of the aforementioned roadway's layout and meander design as it approaches and eventually connects to a major divided highway at Maley Dr Ext. that will continue to funnel in traffic from the growing East, West, and North parts of the Greater Sudbury region as these areas are also slated to further develop into the future as well.

**Issue # 3** • The Villages of Montrose 1500 block, a Retiree/Seniors focused Dalron development that was promised by features described in the sales prospectus to be promoting health, and well-being, be being connected safely and by near proximity to nature, and other amenities. Therefore the loss of promised (or marketed features) that included green space and usable and accessible green corridors and trails. The Department of Leisure Services has deemed Block 93 as allocated for this purpose, and not suitable by grade and slope within the Design of Public Spaces Standard of the AODA, therefore leaving the Plan of Subdivision without an accessible Seniors friendly access to the current green space proposed, though it does state that such green space can be added to the natural green space, but it does not satisfy the PPS 2020 which draws emphasis on healthy, active communities which should be promoted by: a) planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity; b) planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publicly-accessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces, open space areas, trails and linkages, and, where practical, water-based resources;

So, the Villages of Montrose the 1500 Block of Residents, should at least then, have a new design of subdivision in this Applicant's agreements adhere to the above PPS guidelines, which the current design does not sufficiently show to have.

**Issue # 4** • New Montrose Ave. lots are being planned and constructed in a manner that has residential driveways entering and existing into the flow of an Arterial Roadway designation that is or will be active as such.

**Issue # 5** • The near complete removal of every aspect of the 'Plans of Subdivision' site that should be preserved and cherished as natural specific, and some would consider even sacred ecological features, including certain Mother Oaks, Maples, and an a number of established Pines groves on interesting and appealing geological formations of Sudbury

bedrock that offer a very unique and appealing areas for people and families to explore and enjoy. These and other 'road to nature' pathways or green space inter-links, create an opportunity for residents of the surrounding neighborhoods to have access to the spaces and places that serve community interests of health and well-being, and while some more accessible pathways should be used, certain natural paths are better for those who can still use the body in such a way as to have a healthy maintenance of finer and deeper musculature that balancing oneself when walking or running on natural forest paths and uneven bedrock, natural undulations, and natural variance of elements upon the the terrain like flora, and trees. These naturally interwoven spaces and places with a mix of natural and groomed/ or stewarded elements give our families a beautiful experience of being in and near nature and this is a highly desired element of livability that can differentiate a well planned and well designed subdivision, a poorly designed one. Integration of natural spaces, and public places where nature is near and accessible is the difference between good design, and not-so-good design.

**Issue #6** • The need for '**Complete**' design integrations that counterpart and compliment the '**Compact**' design the City calls for, in it's 'Compact and Complete' design. Complete would include features as described in *Issue # 5* and further integrations that increase the sense of community and livability, and this includes taking the opportunity to move Sudbury's new subdivision design into the next level of current thinking, that could be referred to as a responsible and adaptive 'community within community'-centric 21st century design, that exhibits good planning by way of features of bio-regionally conscious and responsible, livable residential design, as well as elements that create social cohesion, safe spaces, public commons, and multi-purpose public spaces that create a sense of a safe, healthy and harmonious community within the wider community.

If designed properly, communities within communities, can add a tremendous value to the perception of the City as a favorable and desirable City to move to, and can radically alter the appeal of a City, if design is encouraged to become more 'complete'.

As currently designed the Dalron, Plan of Subdivision, falls far short of this 21st design ethos, that serves to attract more affluence, investment, and an influx of new people wanting to live up here in a new Sudbury subdivision. Please see better design in light of more progressive design ideas. One such design modality is called the **pocket community design** <https://www.pocket-neighborhoods.net/designpatterns.html>

Other design modalities that illustrate elements of design that make a community feel and function as 'Complete' is also evidenced by other Cities in Ontario, and around N. America. It would be helpful if Planning Division, would share, promote, and incentivize such modalities, as they pay dividends to the City in ways that have yet to be factored into these designs.

- The seventh issue is simple. 'CONCEPT PLAN's are needed here too.

There are many reasons for this, some are listed in the OP, and other documentation, but another reason that adds to their necessity is that a unification of a Plan of Subdivision is the best way and perspective to design from. It opens a very real possibility of creating a new community that perfectly fits into these Planning Policies, but also and more importantly it creates the ability to gear the process and the design towards specific demographics, that have specific needs. And this is how we are able to create 'Seniors Friendly' communities, or communities that have affordable housing options, and communities that are geared to new and growing families. All of these demographics have certain key requirements that are only able to be properly planned for when there is a comprehensive and clear 'CONCEPT PLAN'. Then that can be presented and co-created through public feedback, and re-iterate right up to the point of actual development reaching certain development timelines, by way of adaptations to market demand, and signals that indicate a viability to proceed. Gearing development by clear design objectives modeled out in publicly available 'Concept Plans' ensures that only the best and most socially, economically, ecologically, and demographically conducive and appropriate communities arise. Furthermore, in order to satisfy the spirit and meaning of what the Growth Plan for Northern Ontario would outline, as well as what the OP would like to have filling development opportunities, it would be best to include 'Concept Plans' to see whether they do support and align well within that documentation.

The Official Plan already requires cohesive and comprehensive 'Concept Plans' for developments by developers who hold continuous property that is going to be phased in or developed in some sequential order, and yet, for some reason this does not seem to be required as of yet, to the Applicant, Dalron Construction, in this area, even though it seemingly should. Are there some inconsistencies that need corrections in the OP, or is this Applicant getting favorable treatment with regards to their plans in this area when the City Staff look at stipulations adhered to elsewhere in the City. This is an open question, not easily answered, and we are in no position to speculate why a 'Concept Plan' for the three parts of this contiguous property under development here, in this file, is seeming not in the public record, nor in any way able to be commented upon in that specific context. It seems that it would serve the public interest in many ways, if it were required, in this proposed series of ongoing advances in development, that are building out from three completely connected plans of subdivision, all being proposed by the Developer, the Applicant, who also has ownership of the entire site.

## **Summary of resultant considerations and recommendations**

The Community and Staff that has contributed to and provided this Report to Council, recommends re-drafting, and further re-submission of the Applicants plans, which would include the 'Concept Plan' in addition to a revised 'Plan of Subdivision' and re-iterations of the applications as described in the Resolution section on the basis that they are part of a file that at this time is seemingly not fully consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement in terms of various aspects of creating safe and healthy communities, and, does not fully conform with the Growth Plan for Northern Ontario with a well defined, and well documented, community consulted, comprehensive 'Concept Plan', and is further confounded with inconsistencies in the use of the Official Plan for the City of Greater Sudbury, as justification for an unsafe Street connection, which in totality must be considered as clear flaws and faults in the process, and the continuance of certain 'facts and statements' which are being used, and have been used to define decisions and proper assessments of recommendations put forth by CofGS Staff, have been identified as a potential sources of liability, and be it a result of professional consultancy, or internal City information flows and capacities, certain comments on possible areas that have been identified as issues within this Report, could potentially be open to claims of detrimental reliance, if the decisions remain to be hinged upon them.

The Plan of Subdivision as currently iterated and put forth before Council, does not allow the applications as described in the Resolution section to be properly and fairly processed in the light of these new considerations, and are furthermore insufficient on the basis that they do not have clear regard for matters of community safety arising from limitations and constraints in site and in place where the proposed merging of existing and future planned community linkages has been set.

Further supporting facts, and statements, add to the considerable notice of liabilities, risks, and hazards raised by the interviews, surveys, and outreach to the public, which has highlighted and made clear, the ever-standing issue of Community Safety, and the physical well-being of pedestrians, residents, children and families, alike.

Safety to residents of the existing neighborhoods to which this current plan of Subdivision is proposed to connect, is paramount. Connecting Forestdale Drive to a new through-way is undeniably, irrefutably, and clearly a hazard and potential liability, as put forth by numerous statements from community residents, and can not be resolved until the concerns are mitigated by an uptake of new perspectives and new ideas such as the terminate design of a new Cul de sac, with elements and features that allow it still serve as fire-road/route for emergency access vehicle if need be, but protect the existing community from the risks and hazards identified and presented in the finding of this Report to Council, as well as other comments as noted in previous public comment as referenced from within the Report from Wendy Kaufman of Planning Division.

The combined facts and statements made reference to in this Report have been put forth by members of the Ward 12 constituency of Councillor Joscelyne Landry-Altmann, Nickledale New Sudbury CAN12, and expertise drawn from the pool of civic capacity to functional as representative agency, working together to make Sudbury, develop, evolve, and thrive into the near, and further future. Further perspective were collected from various sources and groups, such as Greater Sudbury Citizens for Appropriate Development, and notice of issues raised on the site Re2021.com, and the

gatherings of existing CoGS describe information, notice, and recommendations, in association or response to the Applicants previous applications.

Where as provincial interest and policies favored to give decisions in this municipality support and backing, this City's development is supposed to be guided by the Official Plan and other supporting policies in the Planning Act, which are supposed to act as the statements outlining and representing good planning, and as such, the Applicant has not shown fully to be in alignment with such documentation. If what has been so far represented in the associated 'Plans of Subdivision', is to be accompanying the articles and applications as described in the Resolution section, then the following Statement of Findings will further be made:

**Enough cause and concerns have been demonstrated by this Report to warrant a further and more careful review of many issues, and their implications on, and stemming from, this Applicant's applications.**

Therefore, a deferment and reconsideration of these matters pertaining to the Dalron Royal Oaks Nickledale Subdivision File 751-6/21-19 & 780-6/89023, shall be deemed to be the recommended order and a motion to defer these matter to a further date is requested by civic authority of standing Councillors in quorum and by Community at-large representing Council-ship of the tax-paying Civic body of Greater Sudbury through which Council draws agency, from, and representative Ward and district responsibilities, to.

This Report and its recommendations are given in good faith, that process, and outcomes will be improved as a result of its findings.

Furthermore a accept a motion to adjust the OP, whereas, it states:

Where the City proposes to approve a draft plan of subdivision, a public meeting will be held no sooner than 14 days after the requirements for the giving of notice have been complied with. Where the City proposes to conditionally approve an application for Consent, the application will be considered no earlier than 14 days after notice of the application has been provided.\*A public consultation strategy, satisfying the requirements of this Plan and the Planning Act, is required for all applications for an official plan amendment, zoning by-law amendment, and/or plan of subdivision.\*

Be it adjusted to read as follows:

Where the City proposes to approve a draft plan of subdivision, a public meeting will be held no sooner than 39 days after the requirements for the giving of notice have been complied with. Where the City proposes to conditionally approve an application for Consent, the application will be considered no earlier than 21 days after notice of the application has been provided.\*And a clear account of public consultation strategy be accessible to the wider public, satisfying the requirements of this Plan and the Planning Act, as required for all applications for an official plan amendment, zoning by-law amendment, and/or plan of subdivision.\*

**\*\*The contents of this notice forms a LEGAL notice, where any risks and liabilities are existent as a letter of reservations, concerns and issues raised in the public consultations, as required by the Public Consultation Strategy are hereby been deemed to have entered into the public record, as formal notice given, as of time of the March 18th, Meeting of the Planning Committee of Council of CofGS**

The recommendations, and requests collected in these reports and findings have been compiled from several years of feedback from survey and petition of more than 2000 residents of Greater Sudbury, New Sudbury, perspectives from Re2021.com, the Greater Sudbury Citizens for Appropriate Development, CARB3, the ratepayers of Greater Sudbury,



and the represented residents of CAN12, and Ward 12 under the Councillor-ship of Joscelyne Landry-Altmann who currently sits on Planning Council and represents several Association, Board and Committee Appointments, as well as her Constituency of the Ward who have been communicating through her, to Council, Staff and the representatives of Dalron Construction, the stated Developer, and Applicant for this development file.

All names and personal information collected in these Surveys and Petitions are held in trust for responsibility to the adherence of stricter measures resultant of increased privacy concerns.

On 2024-03-15 1:59 p.m., clerks wrote:

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your email, but we can't see the content/attachment. Could you please resend?

Thank you,  
Clerk's Services

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

From: Patch <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Friday, March 15, 2024 10:41 AM

To: Wendy Kaufman <[Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca)>; clerks <[clerks@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:clerks@greatersudbury.ca)>; Joscelyne Landry-Altmann <[Joscelyne.Landry-Altmann@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Joscelyne.Landry-Altmann@greatersudbury.ca)>

Cc: Pauline Fortin <[Pauline.Fortin@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Pauline.Fortin@greatersudbury.ca)>; Fern Cormier <[Fern.Cormier@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Fern.Cormier@greatersudbury.ca)>; Rene Lapierre <[Rene.Lapierre@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Rene.Lapierre@greatersudbury.ca)>; Bill Leduc <[Bill.Leduc@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Bill.Leduc@greatersudbury.ca)>

Subject: LETTER of Concerns Royal Oaks Nickledale Dalron Subdivision File

--

See <http://Re2021.com> for the back story on the request for Community Design improvements to the subdivision being proposed by Dalron./

We advocate for all developments to exhibit 'Good Layout and Design' as it is one of the keys to any community's well-being and harmony.

## Maria Gonzalez Santos

---

**From:** Krista Cole <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 15, 2024 3:41 PM  
**To:** Wendy Kaufman; Joscelyne Landry-Altmann; Pauline Fortin; Fern Cormier; Rene Lapierre; Bill Leduc; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Montrose Avenue Dalron Nickeldale Subdivision, Notice of Public Hearing

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

Dear members of the Planning Committee and our local NDP representative,

Thank you for providing our community the chance to voice our opinions with the upcoming planned changes to our neighbourhood.

First, I would like to say that I appreciate that Dalron has made some changes to their draft plan in response to our online meeting a couple of years ago in February. I do appreciate less housing and the fact that some effort was made to provide us with some more green space.

However, I have concerns as a local citizen to the new draft and I would like city council to take these concerns into account.

1. I would like to voice my opposition to the Forestdale Drive connection. As a resident living on this street, I do not want this street connected with increased traffic for multiple safety issues. This is a very steep hill with no sidewalks and adding more traffic increases the risks for pedestrians. I have a school-aged child and I never allow her to play outside on her own in the front yard because of traffic and vehicles already driving too fast up and down this street. Please do not add more traffic for the sake of many young families living in our neighbourhood as well as many retired seniors who walk this street.

As well as the safety concern mentioned on the re2021 petition and website about blinding sunlight for drivers, I would to mention the safety risk for this street in winter for many months of the year. This is a steep hill that becomes very slippery with ice and snow. We have 3 cul-de-sacs that are only plowed sparingly compared to Forestdale itself. Living part way up the hill, we are in a position to watch the winter traffic and snow clearing and see the many safety issues. Multiple times every winter, vehicles get stuck at the entrance to a cul de sac because it is not cleared and residents and delivery people have to leave their vehicles stranded on the road until they can get help.

We have many seniors who have to walk across Forestdale to access their mail, and in the winter this is very dangerous because the cul de sacs aren't cleared or have turned to uneven ice. Please keep our street quiet, the way it is, to prevent pedestrian accidents in our neighbourhood.

Multiple times every winter, we watch vehicles that cannot make it up our street due to the poor road conditions. The vehicles only make it part way up, get stuck and have to reverse all the way down the hill and try over and over again going faster each time. These drivers have to drive quickly directly up the middle of the street in order to make it up. My young daughter watches from our window and cheers for the driver when they finally make it up the hill after 6-8 attempts. This occurs EVERY winter. Please do NOT add more traffic as you will significantly increase the risk of head on deadly collisions on our street.

I have many safety concerns about extending the street that is naturally built on a ridge of a hill and the planning committee needs to strongly consider the revised plan on the re2021 petition and website to keep Forestdale a cul de sac. The revised draft on that petition allowed for only limited reduction to lots to accommodate this.

2. I would like the planning committee to listen to local residents and please provide our community with existing multi-use trails and green space. My first question to the committee and the builder is whether a Species at Risk Study has ever been done to this natural ecological area?

I have not read anything about one in the reports to this area, and if one has not been done I would like to propose this to be done.

Local large businesses in our city must do these studies before they develop any further land on their own property, and I would like to know that this same process is being done equally across the city and for businesses.

We have a significant ecosystem here with beaver dams, water ways, wetlands, marshes, hills, rocks, blueberry fields, pine groves, and many many wildlife that co-exist with our residents.

We understand the city's need to increase housing but the committee needs to factor in the existing natural space and health of the current residents.

While we appreciate Dalron adding block 93 as a trail, it does not connect to any existing trails. The beauty of this area is that you can walk a few minutes and be completely in nature, and away from the city life. I ask the committee to please give us a connected nature trail that we already have. There is significant rock formations in this area that would require a lot of blasting for development. Please find a way to keep our interconnected trails for the health of our community. City council says it is looking to make our city green and combat global warming, as well as that the city recognizes the link between the physical design of communities, health, and quality of life as per 1.3.1 of the official plan for a healthy community.

This space let our community healthy during the pandemic. It gave us a place to be physically active, and many more residents of all ages used these trails. Many health studies have shown, being in nature significantly improves mental health. As a health care worker during the pandemic, this place gave me my sanity and a safe place to bring my family for physical activity. As a health care worker, I saw that this was the same for all residents who appreciated the area. We greatly respect this area, and we ask that you please give us the local connected green space for our community's health and to protect us from future pandemics.

This area lost a significant number of mature trees during the 2018 microburst that have never been replaced. We need to keep trees in this area as trees greatly reduce the impact of global warming and carbon emissions.

We applied for a tree one week after that microburst for the tree we lost, and it took the city 4 years to bring one! 4 years!!

Please keep green space in this area to help with the significant greenery we have already lost.

While I appreciate the extension on block 89 for green space, please look at the topological area, it is steep black rock.

We need usable, walkable green space for children and seniors. At the minimum, please find a way to connect the trail of block 93 to block 89 to give us a connected trail.

Or find a way to connect the trail of block 93 along the ridge of Forestdale to connect to block 91. Or plan for the community to have both options! Which is what we already have by local respecting citizens!

With the extension of Maley Drive behind our community, we have already lost some of the beauty and quietness of the area. We have lived here for 17 years, and for many years we had the beauty of hearing the bullfrogs sing a chorus every spring night and into summer. And many local bird songs. It was a perk of living in this neighbourhood, to be close to the city but feel like you are away from it all.

And now, the bullfrogs are mostly silent and in return we get the constant low drum of traffic with the occasional unnecessarily loud motor of a vehicle speeding down Maley drive. City council has already caused us increased traffic pollution, now please we are asking you to respect our neighbourhood and not make it any worse.

Thank you for your consideration,

Krista Clackett

(Local resident)

Sent from my iPhone

## Maria Gonzalez Santos

---

**From:** Falat, Mariah <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 15, 2024 6:04 PM  
**To:** Wendy Kaufman; clerks  
**Cc:** Pauline Fortin; Fern Cormier; Rene Lapierre; Bill Leduc; Joscelyne Landry-Altmann; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Urgent Concerns: Preservation of Nickeldale Trail  
**Attachments:** Preservation of Nickeldale Trail and Natural Spaces.pdf  
**Importance:** High

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Wendy,

Please find attached a letter expressing my deep concerns regarding the proposed development in the Nickeldale area.

Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Best regards,

Mariah Falat

March 15, 2024

**Subject: Urgent Concerns: Preservation of Nickeldale Trail and Natural Spaces**

Dear Wendy Kaufman,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to file an official complaint and express profound concerns regarding the proposed development project in the Nickeldale area, particularly concerning the rezoning and redrafting applications submitted by Dalron, which are set to be reviewed by the planning committee.

As an avid user of the Nickeldale trail, I am writing to you with a heavy heart and deep concerns regarding the proposed development project in our beloved area. For years, the Nickeldale trail has been my sanctuary—a place where I find solace, recharge my spirits, and bond with nature. Each day, I lace up my shoes, leash my faithful companion, and embark on a journey of physical activity and mental rejuvenation along this cherished trail. It's not just a path; it's an integral part of my life—a lifeline that keeps me grounded and connected to the natural world.

The benefits of spending time in nature, particularly along trails like Nickeldale, extend far beyond physical exercise. Research has shown that regular exposure to green spaces reduces stress, improves mood, and enhances overall well-being. For me, this trail isn't just about getting my steps in or breaking a sweat; it's about finding peace amidst the chaos of daily life, connecting with fellow nature enthusiasts, and nurturing a sense of belonging within our community.

The prospect of losing this invaluable resource to urban development is not just disheartening—it's deeply distressing. The proposed construction of semi-detached dwellings threatens to sever our connection to nature, disrupt the delicate ecosystem that thrives along the trail, and deprive us of a vital outlet for physical and mental health.

I implore you to consider the profound impact that this development will have on the health and well-being of countless individuals, including myself and my furry companion. The Nickeldale trail isn't just a piece of land; it's a sanctuary—a refuge from the hustle and bustle of city life, a sanctuary where memories are made, and bonds are forged.

I urge you to prioritize the preservation of our natural spaces and the well-being of trail users like myself in any decisions regarding the rezoning and redrafting applications. Let us not sacrifice the sanctity of our trails for the sake of progress but instead, strive to find a harmonious balance between development and conservation.

Thank you for considering my concerns, and I trust that you will make the right decision for the future of our community and the preservation of our natural heritage.

Warm regards,



Mariah Falat,  
1331 Orange Grove,  
Sudbury, ON P3A 4T9

E: [REDACTED]

T: [REDACTED]

## Maria Gonzalez Santos

---

**From:** David Robinson <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 15, 2024 11:27 PM  
**To:** clerks; Wendy Kaufman; Joscelyne Landry-Altmann  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] John Lindsay; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Tyler Clarke; [REDACTED] MacDonald,  
Don; [REDACTED] Jennifer Hamilton-McCharles; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] CBC News; Paul Baswick  
**Subject:** Another LETTER of Concerns Royal Oaks Nickledale Dalron Subdivision File #1

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**Dear Planning Committee, Councillors, City Staff, and Representatives of Dalron Construction,**

One question should concern you: "Is this the plan offered the best we can do?"

- Does it increase the quality of life for the people of the area"
- Does it add another jewel to Sudbury's collection of good places to live?
- Does it increase property values as much as possible for the community as a whole?

These are the responsibilities of this council. No one else has that responsibility. If you are not sure that you can say **yes** to each question, you have not done your job.

We know it serves the developers reasonably well, but has the Council and its planning department actively worked to get as much benefit for the larger community as possible? '

As you may know, I am an economist. I was the one who came up with the idea for the Architecture school downtown, I led the push to promote our mining supply sector.

My family and I initiated and initiated the part of the Rainbow Routes network that leads from Magnolia Boulevard to the increasingly popular "New Sudbury Historic Trail." I mention these things to remind you that I have a long history of working to build our city

I am also a consultant on economic development for communities, and I teach two courses in sustainable economic development for Northern Ontario economic development officers. I have done cost-benefit studies for the Northern Medical School and provided my expertise for City committees and groups.

OK, so what? As a recognized expert on development, I am saying you can do better than the current Dalron proposal for our community.

What you are faced with is not a routine development permit: it is an opportunity to send out a message to the people looking new homes, new workers, or a new place to do business that Sudbury, is not just pretty nice, but is energetically make itself into a better place to live. It is an opportunity to make one development and the large area asround it a better place to live. It is an oppotunmity to improve property values in the entire area.

The Dalron project is not worse than many other developments in the city. The problem is that it is not better, socially, not better for the environment and economically, and almost certainly not as good for Dalron as a creative and collaborative replanning process could make it.

I understand that the official plan calls for a "connected street pattern". Council can waive plan requirements if it is better for the community. It is, after all, Council's plan. Its purpose is to guide development. Just as the developer's "Concept Plan will retain flexibility," so should the city's general framework.

Why should council consider waiving that requirement?

- First because it is not necessary for most city work. Garbage trucks and snowplows can easily turn around at the end of a cul de sac.
- Second, emergency vehicles can easily in and out of cul-de-sacs as long as there is no parking at least one side of the street. With that restriction, service vehicles can put two wheels on the road margin
  - Waiving the restriction would allow the street to be narrower, saving land for the developer, The street would be cheaper to build and cheaper to plow.
  - removing street parking makes sense. Why is the city paying for paved parking spaces for private homeowners?
- Third, there is a good alternative to building an expensive link connecting just for emergency access: have the developer put the trail allowance right through and leave an unpaved passage through the greenway to Forestdale would be a valuable extension of the trail network, improving access from Forestdale and south. Connecting StreetA and Forrestdale with a full-service road is not easy or cheap given the topography. The city can exchange an unnecessary and burdensome self-imposed rule for a significant improvement for the neighbourhood and for the community.
- Fourth, you may recall that Forestdale Drive is not designed to connect the way your planners are now proposing. They seem to be changing the rules on the community.
- Fifth, good planning and development today means evolving toward denser development with more and better green space, access to nature, and walking trails. This plan does gesture minimally in that direction, but it can be so much better with your help.

We in the community need Council to find something Dalron wants - perhaps a bit more density, maybe a bit less road allowance, maybe reduced parking requirements - in exchange for a trail connection that the community wants very much. We want you to show some imagination and some courage to find a real win in this opportunity.

--

Dr. David Robinson

Economist at Large

Webpage: <https://drdavidrobinsonsudbury.wordpress.com/>

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]



## Maria Gonzalez Santos

---

**From:** robinson <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 16, 2024 12:18 AM  
**To:** Joscelyne Landry-Altmann  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] clerks; Wendy Kaufman; Joscelyne Landry-Altmann [REDACTED] Patch  
**Subject:** Montrose/Royal Oaks Dalron Subdivision

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Joscelyne

i am writing to support your efforts to protect the Nickledale Trail that runs north of Forestdale from Montrose to bout Magnolia. It runs on a strip of land owned by Dalron and scheduled for development that has become a famous local walking trail.

I want to urge you to find a fair exchange with Dalron that will make it worth their while to preserve the continuous green space for the entire area.

A major challenge appears to be that the city has insisted on a link between the new subdivision and Forestdale. that link would be expensive, nearly useless for city service vehicles, dangerous in the winter because is it so steep and it would reduce the quality of life for those already living on Forestdale. I believe that would reduce the tax revenues to the city as well. Do you think giving up this demand in exchange to preserve preserve green space that is of tremendous value to the community is possible.

I have live nearby on Magnolia for 37 years. I can tell you that the trails in this ares help to keep us here in Sudbury. They increase the value of every home in the area. And over the last 10-15 year, the number of people in the area and from other areas that I meat out on the trails has increased steadily. Trails like the one we are talking about are valued more and more. They are the key to attracting and keeping talented people.

Please try to convince your fellow councilors that with a little creativity they can achieve something terriffic.

Thank You,  
Janet Wright  
1376 Magnolia Blvd  
Sudbury,  
P3A-4V2