

April 13, 2018.

**Meghan White, MCIP RPP**  
Planner  
Planning & Building Services  
Town of Newmarket  
[mwhite@newmarket.ca](mailto:mwhite@newmarket.ca)

**Re: Old Main Street Tertiary Plan**

Dear Ms. White

Thank you to you, your staff and your support resources for the session held last evening. It proved to be an informative exercise enabling us to gain a better understanding of the desired development ideas and limitations. During the presentation by Mr. Scorgie, certain thoughts and ideas were presented that generated questions in my mind that we were unable to discuss given the nature of the agenda. Consequently, I am addressing those questions to you below for your thoughts and commentary.

Questions arising from the presentation:

- Portions of the woodlot are deemed “protected”, while others are “sensitive” areas. What criteria differentiates the classification of these two areas?
- Groundwater flow patterns in this area are peculiar to say the least. While certain homes along Dover Cres experience continuous flow of groundwater into their sumps, others in immediate proximity experience no groundwater flow into their sumps at all and never have. How will development under the different land use concepts illustrated influence groundwater flow under residents on the south side of Dover Crescent?
- Several homes along Old Main are within the currently designated floodplain. Is it correct to understand that those homes are grandfathered in respect of occupancy within a floodplain, thereby no change is contemplated until the homes are vacated as no future development would be permitted?
- The presentation gave consideration to the various pros and cons of the draft land use concepts, however, there appears to be no consideration, assessment or disclosure of the merits and drawbacks of these concepts on property owners adjacent to the development area in question. In discussions with a representative of MPAC, the entity responsible and accountable for accurately assessing and classifying all properties in Ontario in compliance with the Assessment Act and regulations set by the Government of Ontario, it was clear that densification in the area of the west and northwest portions of the Plan would definitely result in a reduction in value of those properties along the south side of Dover Cres. What pros and cons for and against those living on the south side of Dover Cres would be anticipated in the three land use concepts proposed?
- With respect to the cost to develop the infrastructure under any of the land use concepts presented, would it not be the responsibility of the developer to pay for such improvements in the development? Those costs would then be taken into consideration by the developer when pricing the properties for resale.
- Concerning natural habitat and wildlife, development always pushes wildlife away and it is many years before it is returned to the pre-existing norm. We currently have numerous birds and small

mammals living within the area in question. How can development be undertaken in such a way as to retain and encourage natural habitat?

- Traveling north along Main Street passing the Newmarket Cemetery and approaching Bexhill, the vista that presents with the trees, open space and hillside is extremely pleasing. As we continue to develop into these areas we lose much of the appeal of Newmarket and more and more resemble the concrete jungles of other less desirable communities. As the Town grew through the 70's and early '80's, this area was not developed due to a number of issues including, the topography, the visual appeal, the ease of development elsewhere, the floodplain and the character of the little community. We purchased our home in 1986 due to the pleasant natural backdrop of the trees and low-density housing so that we could enjoy a quiet and tranquil environment. We could have easily paid less and bought in the neighborhood where we could back onto other houses and not enjoy this environment. We recognize and see that the Town is growing in leaps and bounds and developers are expanding into greenfield areas. The Town is also in the process of augmenting transportation services along the Davis and Yonge corridors. These are very appropriate areas for development and densification, given the intent of enhanced public transit. Why do we have this insatiable desire to backfill every underdeveloped space or green space in Town to satisfy a few landowners desire to cash out?
- Given the growth plans in more appropriate locations within Town (i.e. Yonge/Davis and greenfield locations), I understand there are already capacity constraints associated with the waste water / stormwater processing capabilities of the Town. Such capacity should not be consumed for nominal growth and current landowner desires at the expense of more strategic growth within the community. How is the Town balancing these priorities so as not to disadvantage strategic growth?

Also, I didn't leave my worksheet comments with you at the end of the evening, preferring to give further thought to the information and replying more comprehensively. I will attempt to capture these thoughts in the commentary below:

- I'm not so sure the process of a round table discussion and presentation was particularly effective in that there were very different perspectives at my table. The table was made up of two residents looking for significant development to maximize return on the sale of their property (and I don't blame them for wanting to do so) and two residents from the adjacent community who will only potentially suffer from the development, either by reduction of property value or by reduction in enjoyment of property and environment. We must not lose sight of the fact that the landowners looking to subdivide and develop will not likely continue to reside in this community, despite suggestions of wishing to be able to afford to have a condo in the development, while others will need to endure the changes made for some time to come. Furthermore, the more homes the developer can cram into the space, the higher the value to the landowner, so there really is only one motivation of the existing landowner within the Plan area.
- The Vision Statement is generally appropriate especially in respect of retaining the rural, cottage-like and scenic natural character, respecting the existing topography and open space features. However, certain questions and challenges remain with respect to how the character can possibly be maintained given the eclectic assortment of homes.
- The Guiding Principles are vague and loosely worded leaving considerable room for interpretations by stakeholders. In doing so, anyone can justify just about anything in making change and keep within the Guiding Principles. Will Standards be prepared to give precision to how the Principles are to be interpreted? Without such measurable Standards, the Principles are only warm and fuzzy ideas to appease stakeholders.

- Notwithstanding the concept of encouraging porosity and unobstructed views between dwellings, townhouses and future fencing will defeat this concept and we will have brick walls lining this street, especially as depicted in the third Draft Land Use Concept.
- Of the three Draft Land Use Concepts presented in the worksheets, clearly the first is the most tenable with the second being a remote possibility. The third concept incorporating numerous townhouses and development of the Sensitive area is completely unacceptable and inconsistent with the Vision and intentions of the Guiding Principles. Furthermore, the sheer increase in population density in this small area as compared to the current and as serviced by proximate infrastructure, such an increase in population would be better served by locating such population on Davis Drive where the transportation services exist and were intended.
- In Concepts 1 & 2, the development properties along the north west portion of the Plan extend up to the Sensitive area. Who will own the property within the Sensitive area?
- As the Newmarket population continues to grow and as the population ages, there will be an increasing demand for cemetery space. The adjacent St. John's Cemetery has a finite opportunity for expansion and, given the topography, any expansion would only be possible through the acquisition of one or both of the properties adjacent the Old Main Street laneway to the cemetery. If these properties are developed, it will forever eliminate any opportunity for growth within the Town. What consideration has been given by the Town to assist the existing cemetery in acquiring these properties and thereby augment this societal asset as a part of the community infrastructure? Consideration should also be given to acquiring from the cemetery the alternate laneway off of Bexhill Drive to preserve more green space.
- Given the challenges of stormwater management in this community, increasing the extent of hard surfaces through development will only exacerbate the problems of stormwater runoff. Minimizing this impact will be critical in light of climate change that is upon us resulting in increased storms and flash flooding. Also, the notion of improvements to the existing swale as an alternative to subsurface collection and direction will result in swales not maintained, a collection point for waste and debris and restriction of the existing landowners use of the property. Filling in the swale and incorporating a sidewalk with subsurface collection and direction of runoff in storm sewers would be an improvement.

Hoping the input provided above is useful and in anticipation of your commentary.

Kindest regards,

Peter Stott  
[REDACTED]

Cc: Tom Hempen  
Tony Van Bynen  
B. Scorgie  
Residents of Dover Crescent (South Side)