

Formal Objection

Please accept this as a formal objection to the proposed action to amend Bi-law 2010-100Z from “I” institutional and “FD”, Future Development to “R3-1: Medium density residential. Furthermore, the residents contest the proposal for 179 medium to high-density dwelling units and site-specific relief of the required parking to service such units.

I like to start by saying how I recognize how extremely important this committee is and the role you play in the building and developing of our community. You do this by listening to our residents, and consult the guidelines that are set out with Sudbury’s Official Plan. This plan as you know plan is there to guide us in Sudbury’s development and land use. It establishes long-term goals, shapes the policies, and outlines development strategies for our city. It is critical in shaping our community properly.

Today before you, 200+ households have signed a petition. Over 200 households are objecting to this proposed development as it relates to zoning, and parking and other concern.

One street over from this proposed development is a subdivision under construction. I have not heard of any concern of this development.

Why? This new subdivision is consistent with the neighborhood in terms of height, density, scale and utilizes the same services of Snow and Waste Management. Furthermore, it has brought us a new small park for our kids to play.

Why the objection to the proposed development on Estelle St.?

A study was commissioned and paid for by the developer to prove if this type of development could possibly work. It reviews areas such as parking, traffic study, water supply, sewage capability and measurements of the lot. It does not suggest or recommend that introducing a Medium density type housing will serve our community well (R1 & R2) and or improve the quality and function of the neighbourhood.

For these recommendations and improvements, we need to consult our City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan.

How does this medium density development fit in?

**1. Referring to the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan
Subsection 3.2.1 Living Area 1, Page 31
Communities/Policies**

Medium and high-density housing should be located on sites in close proximity to Arterial Roads, public transit, main employment and commercial areas, open space areas, and community/recreational services.

This neighbourhood is not close to main employment and commercial areas, or recreational services to accommodate the needs of this development.

2. Subsection 3.2.1 Policy 6b Page 32.

*The proposed development is **compatible** with the surrounding neighborhood in terms of scale, **massing, height, siting, setbacks,** and the location of parking and amenity areas*

This neighborhood is zoned R1-5 & R2-2 with one to two story single family homes with quiet surroundings. This project proposes five story buildings, built up on an already elevated grade. This is not compatible with surrounding neighbourhood. Nor does meet the scale and massing found anywhere else in the neighborhood.

3. Section 3.2.1 Policy 6c. Page 32.

Adequate on-site parking, lighting, landscaping and amenity areas are provided; and,

The developers are requesting site-specific relief asking for one parking space per unit where 1.5 parking spaces are required. 179 multi-person units with a limit of one vehicle per household left with little to no visitor parking. (21 spots)

If you are to live in this neighborhood, you will have to drive. There is nowhere to walk for grocery or professional services. Simply finding grocery without a car will require you to take a taxi, which would likely cost \$40 one way. Alternatively, taking a transit, which would be completely unrealistic in carrying many bags.

They make a loose comparison of Greenbrier apartments located off the arterial road of Second Ave. The residents of Greenbrier are able to walk to grocery, pharmacy, hardware, major parks, employment and

commercial areas. This is not a suitable comparison and cannot be accepted in determining what number of parking spots are required on the Estelle Development. You cannot walk to any of these above mentioned stores and commercial areas where this development is proposed. You will need to drive and as such will have a need for adequate parking.

Furthermore, in the study there is a suggestion of the overflow parking being available on Estelle St. Parking on residential streets is not permitted during the winter months.

These commercial properties require the residents to vacate the parking lot completely on regular basis during the winter months to allow for the clearing of snow. This means the residents of the development will move their vehicles to the neighbouring streets. Two hundred plus cars crippling the street and creating havoc for the residents, emergency and City services.

4. Section 3.2.1 6d Page 32.

The impact of traffic on local streets is minimal.

Please note a traffic study submitted by Tulloch Engineering who had retained JD Northcote Engineering Inc. to complete.

In the Introduction of this study it reads:

“Tulloch has retained JD Northcote Engineering Inc. to prepare the traffic impact study in support of the proposed development.”

Also, in the Legal Disclaimer

This report was prepared by JD Northcote Inc. for the account of Tulloch Engineering Inc.

Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such parties. JD Northcote Engineering Inc. accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this project.

A traffic area study conducted in 2017 provided with attention on:

Levesque St/Kingsway
Moonlight Ave/Kingsway,
Levesque St/Bancroft (Assumptions were made)
Moonlight Ave/Bancroft Dr.
Estelle St/Bancroft Dr. *November 2021*
Estelle St/North Access of proposed development
Estelle St/South Access of proposed development

All of which the traffic counts were conducted in March of 2017. With the exception of the Estelle Bancroft intersection which had been conducted in November 2020 at the height of Covid.

An assumption was made for the very important intersection of Levesque St/Bancroft for the PM peak traffic hours as there was no count on traffic and therefore adjustments were made for the other intersections with a suggestion of 1.5% increase in in traffic per year.

The findings of this study show that 89% of the new traffic will be finding their way to the Kingsway through Estelle to Rheal St to Levesque. Yet, they have not studied these streets to determine if they will be overwhelmed.

Since the traffic counts of 2017, new major developments have arisen in the area including a new road leading into Estelle St. across from the proposed development property.

Traffic is a major concern and the question of why the developer has chosen to ignore access to this property from the intended access/egress service road to this property through Bancroft drive. Opening this dedicated access/egress road would help in mitigating some of the traffic concerns with Estelle, Rheal and Hines Streets.

To have a full understanding of this project, we need a true and current traffic impact study. Please request the developer do so before any further action.

What can we expect with this Medium Density development with inadequate parking?

Privately owned heavy equipment moving up and down our quiet residential roads at all hours of the day and night creating noise and disturbing the residents with managing their waste and snow through a private contractor. Equipment demands such as tri-axle trucks, backhoes, power sweepers and other commercial support vehicles will also be required to manage the property. Due to the type of residences, vehicles such as moving trucks, food delivery, consumer goods delivery etc. would also become a constant nuisance.

We can only hope this will not have much of an impact on our Sudbury drinking basin Ramsey Lake. We often see our beaches closed due to algae breakouts.

Please consider our concerns and follow our City's Official plan as it related to development. Reject the application to rezone to R3.

Thank you,

Tim Lee