

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2025 11:54 AM

To: Alex Singbush <alex.singbush@greatersudbury.ca>; Stephanie Poirier <stephanie.poirier@greatersudbury.ca>

Subject: Opposition Letter to Rezoning Application for 944 Falconbridge Road, Sudbury

Re: IN THE MATTER OF AN application under Section 22 and 34 of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13

Location: PIN 73569-0020, Plan 53IM1194 Lot 33, Lot 10, Conc 5, Township of Neelon, & PIN 73569-0050, Parcel 34542, Plan M380 South Part Lot 25, Lot 10, Conc 5, Township of Neelon (944 Falconbridge Road, Sudbury)

Attention:

Alex Singbush, Manager of Development Approvals, Planning Services Division, and Stephanie Poirier, Senior Planner, Planning Services.

My name is Gayle McVittie and I live at 943 Meadowside Ave, Sudbury. My husband and I purchased our home at 943 Meadowside Avenue in 1960. Don Lita Subdivision was a rare gem, all single family residences in a self-contained neighborhood surrounded by mostly bush and rocky hills, a great place to settle and raise a family. It is more than a subdivision. It remains a community where most people know and help neighbors from all 5 streets.

I am strongly opposed to this Zoning By-Law Amendment to change the zoning classification from C2(74) to a R4-5 High Density Residential Special Zone to permit a 5-storey multiple dwelling containing 52 units (your files 701-6/24-09 and 751-6/24-22).

The proposed development is simply too large for the property size and not in keeping with the character of the entirety of the neighborhood of 1-2 storey residential homes. The fact that the developer is asking for special allowances (front yard setback 6m where 15m is required, and 1.2 parking spaces where 1.5 are required) confirms that the proposed dwelling is too large. Requirements are in place for a reason and in this case, safety for people and property from a 4 lane busy road and providing adequate parking for tenants and visitors. Underprovided parking will not meet the demands and could result in roadside parking inside the subdivision where there are many walkers, dogwalkers and children playing or riding bikes.

The site plan draws no attention to the difference in **LAND ELEVATION** problems. Lots 33 and 25 are approximately 5-8 feet higher than the back yards of the older homes on Meadowside (935, 943, 947, 955, 961, 967, and 973) which were built

in the 50's with SEPTIC TANKS, field beds and intentionally sloped back yards. This is the case for all of the older homes because the Don Lita was not on City sewers until some time in the late 60's. In 1991 Tulane and Meadowside streets were extended for new homes to be built and with that came landfill to bring them up to the elevation of Falconbridge Road. The old homes are at a severe disadvantage to manage water run off. The very back of my yard every spring has a puddle of water that takes a couple extra months to dry up but **in 65 years of living here I have never had a flooded basement**. I do not believe a mere drainage swale will be adequate protection from the water run off from this proposed development. Who will be responsible if my house is flooded?

I read that "setbacks are the minimum required distances between a building and property boundaries, such as roads, side yards, and rear yards. These regulations ensure adequate space for ventilation, natural light, privacy and safety while contributing to neighborhoods aesthetic privacy. My back yard at 943 Meadowside has 5 mature healthy pine trees and a vegetable garden at my back property line. Due to elevation level differences and inadequate easement I am very concerned about contaminants from refuse containers, parking lots and vehicles, idling cars in winter. I am also worried about the height of the proposed development blocking the afternoon sun in my yard and the effects that will have on my trees and gardens and the enjoyment of my own home.

If, for some inconceivable reason this development is approved, the site plans are not acceptable.

1) FENCING: The site plan shows a 1.5m opaque fence. That is only 5', which most adults can look over. This not an acceptable height for back yard privacy. The average truck is over 6 feet tall so the

minimum height of this fence should be at least 2.5m (8 feet). Add a wall of tress at the back of the parking lots for aesthetics, privacy and noise buffering.

2) PRIVACY: 5 storeys of windows and balconies, people looking down into the back yards and bedroom

windows of homes on Meadowside, Tulane and Hudson.

3) TRAFFIC CONTROL: The site plan shows adding a 3 lane entrance/exit onto Falconbridge Road in close

proximity to the Tulane entrance/exit. In fact there is only 250m between Don Lita's two entrance/exits on Tulane and Hudson. The developer has not addressed traffic lights in their site plan and it should be their responsibility since they would be creating the problem.

4) REFUSE AND GARBAGE CONTAINERS: The site plan shows 2 waste containers and 3 green containers

along the back easement and near the back yards of Meadowside homes. Refuse area should be an underground waste container system to protect against debris of open bins and smells, seepage of contaminants, and to not attract wildlife.

5) GREENSPACE, BIODIVERSITY, POLLINIATOR GARDENS: The site plan does not include any real green space for

tenants to enjoy with the exception of the front setback. One can hardly expect to picnic on the side of Falconbridge Road and 4 lanes of heavy traffic.

6) LIGHTING: The site plan does not show security and parking lot lighting, nor does it address preventing

light pollution to the back yards and bedroom windows of the homes on Tulane, Meadowside and Hudson.

In summary, I am respectfully requesting City Staff and Council to postpone making any decision on this Rezoning

Application and Development until a lot of the issues and concerns have been researched and addressed.

Sincerely,
Gayle McVittie, and
Brenda McVittie-Packham

GM/bmp