From: Mauro Manzon
To: Connie Rossi
Date: 4/27/2021 2:38 PM
Subject: Fwd: RE: File 751-6/21-09
Attachments: 95 Estelle Develpoment letter.pdf

Hi Connie,

Please find attached a written submission for the above noted file.

Thanks,
Mauro
>>> "David & Tamara" [redacted] 4/27/2021 1:07 PM >>>
CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.
Mr. Manzon,

Thank you for your time and effort to date.
Please if you could reply once you receive this e-mail. I would also like to kept up to date regarding the upcoming public planning debates.
Covid and all.

David

From: Mauro Manzon <Mauro.Manzon@greatersudbury.ca>
Sent: April 12, 2021 9:49 AM
[redacted]
Subject: File 751-6/21-09

David,

Subject: File 751-6/21-09 (rezoning application - 95 Estelle St, Sudbury)

Please find attached the requested information concerning the above noted file:

Rezoning sketch
Traffic Impact Study
Photo illustration of proposed multiple dwelling
2020 Provincial Policy Statement (Sections 1.1.1 through 1.1.3 and Section 1.4 are most applicable).

Further notice to be provided when the pre-hearing is scheduled.

Sincerely,
Mauro Manzon

Mauro Manzon, MPL, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner
Development Approvals Section
Planning Services Division
City of Greater Sudbury

Phone : 705-674-4455 ext 4293
Fax: 705-673-2200
e-mail : mauro.manzon@greatersudbury.ca

Hello Mr. Alex Singbush,

Manager of Development Approvals.

My name is David Fiacconi of 2848 Rheal Street and I wish to share my concerns regarding the 95 Estelle Street application and the proposed development.

I am under the belief that the original stretch of Rheal Street is slated for a major overhaul this summer consisting of sidewalks, curbs and an upgraded water and sewer system? A project much like the Maley Drive extension, much appreciated, but terribly over due. I say this as I had the privilege to endure, over a period of seven years, the pounding, shaking, and rumbling of progress while the Dalron Moonlight Ridge Subdivision took form. Some days, and there were plenty, as many as 40 plus tandem trucks full and empty rumbled and bouncing like a basket ball over a beaten and broken Rheal Street. Not fun nor pleasant for one's mental health when your house shakes from the pounding.

I have lived here for some 28 years, and in my mind, I am still a newbie to the area because my neighbour happens to be Rheal Leveque, whose family owned and farmed this land prior to this becoming Leveque subdivision. His son Richard now lives there. I bought my house from Donald Leveque who happens to still live on Darby Street and yes, as you probably already know all the streets around here are named after the Leveque children including Estelle, kind of special from a historical East End prospective. Before the Dalron Subdivision it was uniquely quiet around here but progress and ingenuity has allowed growth and there is nothing wrong with growth when it is done properly and respectfully. The Dalron Subdivision left a double standard in its wake, both East and West end's of Rheal Street were standardized with curbs and sidewalks leaving the middle of Rheal Street in its original condition. A lack of insight, by those like Janet Gasparini, when council was discussing the venture of infilling and various opportunities throughout the Greater City of Sudbury. It is great to take advantage of open spaces with new development but we should keep in mind the effect it has on existing homes, people and businesses because if we had done that Rheal Street would already be standardized.

Don Belisle, our roads manager sometime ago, stated to council and Mayor Jim Gordon and I quote, "If we don't fix it now were going pay for it later". This quote could certainly be applied to today's catchup game plan for Rheal Street. It's important to get it right the first time around I do believe that would be the premise to that quote.

As for the 95 Estelle application and its amendments on parking spaces per unit and that of amending the By-law from R-1 to R-2 or worse is absolutely an insult towards the Greater City of Sudbury and that of the residents of the East End. The by-law is there for a reason and should be followed and enforced on any past, present or future buildings and/or proposals. There are many examples that already exist concerning parking and the lack thereof in high density populated areas in our city without mentioning the downtown core. All these examples become inflated during our winter months.

Having your voice heard whether for or against such a proposal like 95 Estelle Street is vital if we are to move forward in a mindful, vibrant, and progressive way. Mr. Tom Davies does not get his name on our City's Centre of Governance because of his looks and he was a good-looking man. His fortitude and insight for the greater good of the Regional Municipality of Sudbury is legendary. Re-greening our Region with help from many members of our community was and still is a prime example of his leadership. I look forward to testing today's such leadership for that same insight and intuitiveness when addressing our future growth and all the implications that painfully come along with it.

It doesn't need to be painful nor intrusive, it can be positive and impressive perhaps even futuristic to a point where other communities once again will look to us for our fortitude and insight in building a strong and healthy community. North of Leveque Street and across the Kingsway lies an area of land that is jumping up and down waving its hands, perhaps even screaming for attention. A futuristic opportunity for high density housing with walking distance to nearby futuristic employment in Mr. Zullich's proposed entertainment district. Back this up with ample greenery, catchment ponds walkways, much like the very impressive and award winning Finlandia Village Retirement Complex off of Third Avenue, and we are looking at a standard that many may want to incorporate and follow. Strong leadership is not just limited to our city's officials and councillors, it requires that same strong leadership from the corporate sector and the public.

At this point I do put forth my name for further input regarding the 95 Estelle Street Proposal. My questions will be based around the Provincial Policy Act of May, 2020. Focusing primarily on Part V: Policies 1.0 (Building Strong Healthy Communities) and that of promoting efficient land use development patterns.

Thank you

57 Estelle Street
Sudbury, ON P3B 3V3

April 13, 2021

REGISTERED MAIL – WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Alex Singbush
Manager of Development Approvals
Planning Services Division
PO Box 5000, Stn A
200 Brady Street
Sudbury, ON P3A 5P3

RE: 2375423 Ontario Inc. and Bancroft Property Holdings
Application to Amend By-law 2012-100Z

We are home owners at 57 Estelle Street and we oppose the above-noted application and proposed development for the following reasons.

- Traffic on Estelle Street, which currently has about 35 houses, would be at least 5 times greater with the construction of 179 new residences. This is a concern for families with young children.
- In addition, the Moonlight Ridge development, which is currently underway, also has direct access to Estelle and will add to the increased traffic on our street. There would be 3 new accesses to our small street (for a total of 5). Estelle Street would have to handle traffic flow for the proposed new development (2 new accesses) as well as the Moonlight Ridge development (1 new access). The only vehicular access to the proposed development would be Estelle Street; there is no access shown from Rhéal, Bancroft or Lévesque streets.
- The increased traffic flow and the proposed rezoning to R3-1 Medium Density Housing zoning may lower property values on our street.
- Sewer and drainage requirements would greatly increase and we are concerned about the existing infrastructure being inadequate.
- We are concerned about stagnant water collecting in the proposed stormwater management ponds. One of the ponds (South Pond) is located directly behind our back yard, where we spend a lot of time. Residents in some municipalities have reported problems such as odours resembling rotten eggs, problems with mosquito population, and algae collecting in these types of ponds. Should these ponds overflow, contaminants would run-off directly onto lower properties and cause environmental issues.
- We are concerned about direct access to our property from the new development. We currently do not need fencing but would require some for security. This would be a considerable expense for us due to the fencing having to be built on solid rock. If any project were to proceed, security fencing would be required.

We trust that all our concerns will be considered and addressed before zoning is changed.

Sincerely,

Dennis Williamson

Denise Williamson

Dennis Williamson

Denise Williamson

From: Julie Pitre [redacted]
Subject: 45 estelle
Date: Apr 8, 2021 at 10:04:10 AM
To: [redacted]

RECEIVED
APR 1[illegible] 2021
PLANNING SERVICES

Hello Mr Singbush

My name is Julie Pitre, I received a Notice of Application regarding the future development of the old school property adjacent to my house on Estelle street. I do have concerns to express regarding the blasting that will need to take place prior to development of this property, currently there is blasting going on by Villano Construction across the street from us, and prior to that when that subdivision was being developed. Our house is the oldest on the street and our concern is that the repeated blasting so close to our home will have an impact on our foundation, without being able to 100% definitively guaranteeing that this type of activity will NOT affect the structural integrity of our home, what measures will be taken to, I don't want to use the word ensure, I prefer using the word guarantee that no immediate or eventual (short and long) damage will be imposed on the foundation of our home. I realize that there are tools of the trades and technology out there such as the rubber mats, seismic monitoring boxes etc, but sometimes the damage is done and too late for the homeowner to have any type of recourse. Right now there is no issues with our foundation, the first time around with the earlier development of the new subdivision across the street from us, our picture window cracked in two places and this was a few years ago, of course we never thought of taking pictures prior to the blasting starting, and with the current blasting we have videos of the blast wave impact, where you can literally see the wave hit the window, and even kids from my daughter's online class drop everything and ask her what that blast was, the whole house shakes. We do not wish to have similar problems happen where we will have to pay out of pocket for the repairs for something that was no fault of our own.

WE also have concerns that the units being erected will serve as low income or geared to income housing, as we fear this would depreciate the value of our property as well as the existing fence being torn down thus eliminating our privacy and sense of security as well and division of the said subdivision from our property,

Please confirm receipt of this letter and advise if this letter can serve as our submission of "voicing" our comments/ opinion/ contest to the development of this "said " property.

Thank you for your time

Julie Pitre
Owner of 45 Estelle street Sudbury Ontario P3B 3V3

[redacted]

Julie Pitre
April 8/2021

From: Julie Pitre [redacted]
To: <Mauro.Manzon@greatersudbury.ca>
Date: 4/19/2021 9:24 AM
Subject: Future development of 95 Estelle street

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

Good morning Mr. Manzon,

My name is Julie and I am the owner of 45 Estelle St., Sudbury. I am inquiring about the date to submit letters of concern or opinion on the future development of 95 Estelle St., Sudbury. I have received the notice of application dated March 29 for file number 751-6/21-09, I have already sent my letter in however with the news of a lengthier lockdown I was wondering if there was any consideration given to allow for an extension for residents in the neighbourhood to be able to send their letters. I was also wondering what the radius was that was allotted for those residing in the vicinity of 95 Estelle St. to have letters sent to them regarding this future development. I have been informed by some residents on Rheal Street and Moonlight Avenue that they did not receive any such letter and they did want to voice their concerns because the proposed development shows that there will be huge increase in traffic, row housing as well as to stormwater ponds and that could raise many concerns for immediate neighbours I would hope that it would be at least a kilometre radius all around because I believe its very important for all residents to be informed.

Thank you for your time.

Have a great day and stay safe!

Julie Pitre
45 Estelle street
Sudbury

Sent from my iPad

June 9, 2021

City of Greater Sudbury, City Clerk
P.O. Box 5000, Station A
200 Brady Street
Sudbury, Ontario
P3A 5P3

RE: FILE: 751-6/21-09, ESTELLE STREET PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

We, Marcel and Jo-Ann Bedard, wish to be informed of, and included in any meetings or decisions regarding this proposed development.

Attached is a list of concerns and requests regarding the proposed development for Estelle Street in Sudbury. A copy of this letter has been submitted by email to Mayor, Brain Bigger and Councillor of Ward 11, Bill Leduc. Please see that it is forwarded to any other necessary personnel.

Thank you,

Marcel and Jo-Ann Bedard
128 Estelle Street
Sudbury, Ontario
P3B 3V2

Residents of Estelle Street and surrounding area have already had to deal with problems of shaking (from blasting), dust and noise from an adjacent Dalron development. The blasting has been going on now for years in this area and seeing that there is a lot of rock in the proposed site area, we will have to deal with much more.

At this time, with another phase of the Dalron development, Estelle Street is having an access road built. The proposed development has 179 units and the only entrance and exits from these units is proposed to be on Estelle Street. Estelle Street is only a small side street. The traffic that will be created from this "medium density" proposal will be overwhelming.

We oppose the request for rezoning to "medium density". We would love to have it remain as greenspace.

We oppose the request for parking relief. The requirement is 1.5 spaces per unit and we feel that requirement is already too low as it is. Many families have more than 1 vehicle.

If any development is approved, it should only be "low density".

Also, if any development is approved we ask that the following be done:

- There should be upgrades to Estelle Street to handle the increase of traffic and pedestrians.
- The possibility of another entrance/exit from the new development onto another road should be looked into. This would cut down traffic on Estelle Street.
- There should be sewer and water upgrades to Estelle Street.
- Something should be done to control dust.
- A Storm Water Management Study should be made, to make sure there are no adverse effects on the area and to make sure drainage is appropriate. We don't want excess water drainage from the new development.
- A Pre-Blast Study should be done.
- A New Traffic Study should be done, accounting for the new road that is now in the process of being added to the West side of Estelle Street by Dalron development.

- Based on what Panoramic Properties has done, or actually, has not done with the old General Hospital Property in Sudbury, we ask that if any development is done, it's done from (start to finish) in a timely manner.

- We ask that some area be conserved and made into a park or left as greenspace.

P.1 of 7 File 751-6/21-09

Nancy Rozycheck
Apt 1
2855 Bancroft Drive
Sudbury, Ontario P3B 1T8
[redacted]

CITY OF GREATER SUDBURY
Alex Singbush
Manager of Development Approvals
Planning Services Division
P.O. Box 5000
Station A
200 Brady Street
Sudbury, Ontario P3A 5P3

Dear Alex,

Thank you for the letter dated March 29, 2021 which I received on April 6, 2021 concerning a NOTICE OF APPLICATION File: 751-6/21-09 in the matter of an application under Section 34 of The Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13:

Please see details of the insert of page 1 of your letter to me.

P2 of 7

Nancy Rozychuk

Greater | Grand Sudbury
www.city.greatersudbury.on.ca

Planning Services
Box 5000, Station A
200 Brady Street
Sudbury, Ontario P3A 5P3

File:751-6/21-09

March 29, 2021

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

having been submitted to the City of Greater Sudbury

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

Applicant: 2375423 Ontario Inc. & Bancroft 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 as illustrated on the attached sketch:

- Three (3) five-storey multiple dwellings with a total of 120 units;
- Seven (7) row dwellings with a total of 31 units; and,
- 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 required parking being one (1) parking space per unit where 1.5 parking spaces per unit is required.

Any person interested in voicing his/her comments on the application may write to the City of Greater Sudbury, Alex Singbush, Manager of Development Approvals, Planning Services Division, PO Box 5000, Station A, 200 Brady Street, Sudbury, ON P3A 5P3. If you are aware of any person interested or affected by these applications who has not received a copy of this notice, it would be appreciated if you would so inform him/her.

Please note: Comments submitted on these matters including the originator's name and address become part of the public record, may be viewed by the general public and may be published in a planning report, included in a Planning Committee Agenda and posted on the City's website.

...2

File 751-6/21-09

Nancy Rosychuk
May 27, 2021

I am opposed to the building or development of the proposed 179 unit complex considered to be Medium Density Residential in my neighbourhood which is considered to be Low Density Residential

Also I do not agree to changing the 1.5 parking spaces per unit requirement to be changed to 1 parking space. I believe that at least one extra parking space should be required to make available adequate parking for a delivery person, repairman, visitors, etc. With no where to park they would be forced to park on the street. This forced alternative could cause accidents, interfere with snow removal or violate parking by-laws.

I purchased my house with the intention of living in a low density residential area. Therefore I expected to live on a low traffic street and I was looking for safety, quiet and privacy. I specifically chose to live as far away as possible from any business area, medium density residential, high traffic streets or congestion or density.

Would Sudbury city council's decision to accept this development proposal violate my right as a homeowner who bought a house in an area that the city of Sudbury zoned or designated as low density. Should the City of Sudbury keep their word & integrity and maintain the present low density residential zoning as an obligation to individual homeowners ?

File 751-6/21-09
Nancy Rosychuk
May 27, 2021

It is not right to make a decision regarding this 179 unit proposal on the basis that the majority consensus or majority vote amongst the low density residential homeowners would be the only means to over-rule. Why?.. because I believe it is the obligation of the City of Sudbury to maintain the present low density as an obligation to the individual homeowners.

I would suggest that the developer of this proposal build this medium density complex in a medium density residential area.

I am obviously opposed to the applicant's proposal of rezoning & developing a congested complex of Medium Density Residential in my neighbourhood of Low Density Residential.

I have a few questions

How will the development of the proposed 179 unit Medium density residential plan POSITIVELY or NEGATIVELY affect the environment?

Would it cause an increase or decrease in carbon emissions?

Will the developer be required to follow the rules and regulations within the Community Energy Emissions Plan?

How will the proposed development impact the local environment and the environment at large?

File 751-6/21-09
Nancy Rozychuk
May 27, 2021

Would such a massive development remove a natural habitat for animals, birds, bees, other wild life, etc.? Is it absolutely necessary because it would contribute to decreasing the survival of wild life by replacing their natural habitat with buildings, cars, parking lots, streets, etc.?

Will the developer be cutting down or removing trees and other vegetation that sequester carbon emissions?

Will the developer be moving or removing soil because moving or removing soil would cause emission of carbon gas that is stored or sequestered in the soil?

Can the developer build elsewhere where their development would not violate the natural ecosystem of wildlife + their habitat and would not violate the individual rights of low density homeowners?

Perhaps this huge medium density residential complex could be built in a medium density residential land, void of trees and wildlife + their habitat, with the intent of reserving land around & amidst the complex, for the planting of trees + vegetation that would best sequester carbon emissions.

File 751-6/21-09
Nancy Rosychuk
May 27, 2021

Summary

Is this massive development a good idea (1) permitting the building of a huge complex considered to be medium density residential in a low density residential area

(2) causing increase / excessive traffic particularly on Bancroft Drive

(3) causing possible increase road maintenance

(4) causing possible depreciation or decreased real estate value of houses

(5) causing decreased desirableness of low density houses in our neighbourhood by potential buyers even more so with the increase of traffic

(6) causing the removal of wildlife & their habitat and thereby decreasing the survival rate of wild life

(7) causing the increase in carbon emissions with the removal of trees, vegetation and the moving or removal of soil, etc.

(8) Inadequate parking could force delivery persons, repairmen, yard care workers, visitors, etc. to park on the streets which could cause accidents, interfere with city snow removal or cause violation of city parking by-laws.

(9) causing a violation of the rights of property owners who purchased their houses in a low traffic, low density residential area.

File 751-6/21-09
Nancy Rosychuk
May 27, 2021

REQUEST:

I would like to request a traffic study on Bancroft Drive to find out if the traffic on Bancroft Drive is already at full capacity for a low density residential area.

Has there been any traffic study on Bancroft Drive before March 2020 when the Federal + Provincial governments were often giving orders for lockdown of business, schools, etc + giving orders for self isolation? During these times of government-ordered self isolation, a traffic study would hardly be accurate.

REQUEST:

I wish to be notified in writing of the decision of the City of Greater Sudbury on the proposed zoning by-law amendment

Thank you for contacting me for my concerns on a topic that could IMPACT ME in a big way particularly concerning

1. excessive traffic on Bancroft Drive
2. depreciation of my house
3. decrease in my being able to sell my home when I need to.

Nancy Rosychuk
[redacted]

J. Badger
133 Levesque Street
Sudbury, Ontario
P3B 3S8

Mr. Alex Singbush
Manager of Development Approvals, Planning Services Division
City of Greater Sudbury
PO Box 5000 Station A
200 Brady Street
Sudbury, Ontario
P3A 5P3

RE: Application for Rezoning – 95 Estelle Street, Sudbury

Dear Mister Singbush,

I have reviewed the information provided in the application for rezoning of *95 Estelle Street, Sudbury, ON*. I have two concerns with the said application:

- The proposed plan indicates a five-story multi-dwelling. I feel that five-story is to vertically impactful. **I would like to see all the development no more than three-stories in height.** This is due to obstructing and impacting sightlines of surrounding residences, privacy concerns of elevated viewpoints, and preserving the natural skyline that exists in the area. I strongly oppose a five-story development and would instead limit the development to three-stories.

- My second concern is the roadway infrastructure. **I do not believe that the small residential roadways of Estelle Street, Rheal Street, or Hines Street can support the additional traffic for pedestrian safety.** 179 dwelling units will generate over 200 additional vehicles in the residential area which many families utilize daily for walking, playing on the street, and enjoying the tranquility. The streets are quiet and safe, and adding this additional vehicle load will increase safety concerns for all members of the public. Due to this concern, for the proposal to go ahead I feel a roadways plan must also be developed and provided.

Thank you for hearing my concerns.
Please include myself in all other publications and notices regarding this application and development.

Mauro Manzon - Fwd: Proposed development at 95 Estelle Street

From: Bill Leduc <bill.leduc@greatersudbury.ca>
To: Mauro Manzon
Date: 7/7/2021 12:42 PM
Subject: Fwd: Proposed development at 95 Estelle Street
Attachments: ESTELLE STREET - LETTER TO CITY CLERK.docx; ESTELLE STREET - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS.docx

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: JoAnn Wicklander [redacted]
Date: July 6, 2021 at 9:40:35 PM EDT
To: Bill Leduc <Bill.Leduc@greatersudbury.ca>
Subject: Proposed development at 95 Estelle Street

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

Please see attached info that has been mailed to the City Clerk.

Residents of Estelle Street and surrounding area have already had to deal with problems of shaking (from blasting), dust and noise from an adjacent Dalron development. The blasting has been going on now for years in this area and seeing that there is a lot of rock in the proposed site area, we will have to deal with much more.

At this time, with another phase of the Dalron development, Estelle Street is having an access road built. The proposed development has 179 units and the only entrance and exits from these units is proposed to be on Estelle Street. Estelle Street is only a small side street. The traffic that will be created from this "medium density" proposal will be overwhelming.

We oppose the request for rezoning to "medium density". We would love to have it remain as greenspace.

We oppose the request for parking relief. The requirement is 1.5 spaces per unit and we feel that requirement is already too low as it is. Many families have more than 1 vehicle.

If any development is approved, it should only be "low density".

Also, if any development is approved we ask that the following be done:

- There should be upgrades to Estelle Street to handle the increase of traffic and pedestrians.
- The possibility of another entrance/exit from the new development onto another road should be looked into. This would cut down traffic on Estelle Street.
- There should be sewer and water upgrades to Estelle Street.
- Something should be done to control dust.
- A Storm Water Management Study should be made, to make sure there are no adverse effects on the area and to make sure drainage is appropriate. We don't want excess water drainage from the new development.
- A Pre-Blast Study should be done.
- A New Traffic Study should be done, accounting for the new road that is now in the process of being added to the West side of Estelle Street by Dalron development.
- Based on what Panoramic Properties has done or actually, has not done with the old General Hospital Property in Sudbury, we ask that if any development is done, it's done from (start to finish) in a timely manner.
- We ask that some area be conserved and made into a park or left as greenspace.

Rec'd May 3/2021

AS. MM.

Dear Mr. Singbush.

This is regarding the application under section 34 of The Planning Act re: file number 751-6/21-09.

The proposal for rezoning in order to redevelop the subject lands for the construction of various units.

Our main concern is the request for site-specific relief for the required parking being one (1) parking space per unit where 1.5 parking spaces per unit is required. Allowing this relief would mean that our streets will be filled with vehicles from the various units that do not fit in the parking lots. That is a dangerous situation not to mention, where would they park during the winter months, in accordance with the existing by-law?

Furthermore, according to the drawing provided to us, there will be 2, 5 storey, 45 Unit buildings, and 1, 30 Unit building, That totals 120 units, with only 100 parking spots. This is less than 1 parking spot per unit? Please explain the math.

Is it reasonable to believe that each household in Sudbury only has 1 vehicle. I would think not.

We are definitely concerned and opposed to having these multi-unit buidings in our back yard.

Thank you,

Leonard and Linda Cook
72 Levesque Street
Sudbury, ON
P3B 3S9
[redacted]

From: Celina Taramina [redacted]
To: <mauro.manzon@greatersudbury.ca>
Date: 6/9/2021 7:17 PM
Subject: 95 Estelle Street Application

Dear Mr. Manzon:

I would like to voice my concerns regarding the 95 Estelle Street Application and the proposed development.

The building by-law for this area is R-1. The proposal, which I find alarming, is to amend this by-law to R-2 or worse. By-laws are put in place for a reason and they should stand and be enforced on any past, present and future buildings. What is the point of putting by-laws in place if they can be amended to suit big business with no thought for the neighbourhood and existing community?

The high density of buildings, both high rise and low rise, and lack of parking and green space in this proposal is unacceptable. Because this new development will be sandwiched in between our existing community it is imperative that the new build abides by the same by-laws that we do. I feel there is nothing wrong with growth as long as it is done using the existing model of our neighbourhood in the forefront of the planning.

Land is not scarce around Greater Sudbury and there are areas that would be far more suited for this type of development. North of Leveque Street, across the Kingsway comes to mind where there is already a proposal for a vast entertainment development.

I would like to be notified regarding any further decisions or input regarding the 95 Estelle Street Proposal.

Thank you.

Celina Taramina
2851 Rheal Street