

To: City of Greater Sudbury
Alex Singbush
Manager of Development Approvals
Planning Services Division
Box 5000, Station A
Sudbury, On
P3A-5P3

RECEIVED

MAY 18 2021

PLANNING SERVICES

From: Roger Doucet
201 King St.
Sudbury, On
P3C-2V9

Thursday, April 15/2021

This letter is in resentment to file# 751-6/21-5 dated April 15/2021

Re: Application for amendment of By Law 2010-10Z to changing the zoning classification from "R2-3" LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL to "R3(S) MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL SPECIAL rezoning in order to permit a multiple dwelling with 12 units to be extended to 16 (Legal) units

We reside and own a 201 King St and kitty corner to us we own 216-218 King... and so, next door to 220-222 King St. Sudbury. As landowners ourselves we have to follow the laws and by laws. Our concerns are that the 220-222 King St. Sudbury apartment unit is fully occupying the land that it resides on (is this not a problem at the root level), there are 14 parking spots available...but 16 units are asked for. And so here's the problem...

We own the parking at 216-218 King St.....where do you think people park, I've got 5 parking spots available for my tenants and keep the parking clean of snow and even brush parking area of winter sand in spring. The property has planted cedar hedges and adjacent to parking a backyard of four beautiful trees. Shows pride of ownership, greening trees and clean well manicured yard.(Green)

And so I get parking pressures from building 204-505 and parking pressures from 222 king st. I've approached parking violators and advised them of "No Parking" sign in yard, I get yelled at, I've had to call police on instances where they were going to assault me. I'm not the parking police...and you certainly have to consider the steps to get a tow from the City of Sudbury. If four parking spaces are taken by tenants the fifth spot which is partially on sidewalk is taken by violators...and they usually say that it's city property...ugh!

220-222 King lines up their weekly garbage on side walk for city pick up adjacent to our property, 220-222 property manager say's that it city property and there is nothing you can do. I've had people drop off mattresses from 220-222 building and shouted at because it's city property. Ok no big deal until you have to pick up garbage left from overspill or people rumaging through it for cans...Who gave me the job to put up with mattresses that are not picked up for weeks and scrap pieces of garbage that have to be picked up after every city pick up. 220-222 King...It's time to put your garbage out in front of your own building, not dump it in my yard. A couple of owners previous (Dr. Delariva) owned 220-222 King and 216-218 King St. and so allowed garbage to be put on 216-218 property...I don't think this is grandfathered in, so put your garbage out in your own property!

220-222 King over the winter has been renting two parking spaces one and two to 204-505 tenants in another adjacent building and now I see the reserved parking signs removed...I

AS
GF

guess to show that 220-222 king visually has all parking spaces available and to prep for this amendment. A concern is now 204-505 is short two parking spots, and so they will be parking on street and our parking lot. Also 204-505 king was to be maxed at nine units...I see 10 mailboxes and they have recently sold and real estate ads indicated that an additional unit can be added to eleven units. hum!

I've included a areal plan indicating where plowed winter snow is pushed on our property, snow stressing cedar hedges with breakage, salt, sand, garbage and sping raking and cleaning and disposal.

I've also indicated where garbage is dropped off on "CITY PROPERTY" from 220-222 King St. applicant .

Area is stressed by these two large apartment units and my property takes the brunt of it.

The said above apartment of 220-222 King is at its limit and should not be allowed to "legally" add four more units from 12 units nor site specific relief for parking be allowed. There is more but I'll digress.

Because we live here we live it! As indicated I am strongly not in favor of such request.



In closing we would like to be advised of any public meeting to follow,
 Roger and Eva Marie Doucet
 201 King st. Sudbury, On P3C-2V9