

Comments on 849 Gorham ((D09NP2003(OPA) D!\$NP2003 (ZBA))

Hello my name is Ted Bomers and I live at 210 Thornwillow Court. The west side of 210 Thornwillow Court abuts the property 849 Gorham Street which is the proposed development site. I have lived in this area since 1979. This stable established neighbourhood was mainly built in the late 70's although some homes were originally built in the early 1900's. Therefore, this is a prime area for the Established Neighbourhood Study. To facilitate this study, the town implemented an Interim Control By-law which prohibits "monster" homes to be built and limits the increase in GFA to less than 25%.

The current GFA for this property is 440 sq. meters. The proposed GFA for this development is 3684 sq. meters. This is an 800% increase in GFA. I would call this a "monster" development compared to the increase of 25% under the Interim Control Bylaw to control "monster" homes.

The north side of Gorham Street, in which this property lies, consists of bungalows, side splits, back splits and 2 storey single family residences. In the town official plan, they are zoned as R1. The only exception is 847 Gorham Street which is zoned Commercial Office. In the Planning Justification Report, Larkin+ mention that several properties are institutional and commercial. If I take the 120 meters notification used by the town for the impacted area, then only one property is zoned as commercial as mentioned above. The Planning Justification Report mentions 12 institutional/commercial properties. Would this be called an alternative fact?

Larkin + are trying to justify this proposed development by saying it is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. I would like to point out a few areas where this is not true.

The houses surrounding 849 Gorham Street are well paced out and lot sizes vary but have a minimum lot size of 366 sq. meters. The proposed development has a minimum lot size of 130.8 sq. meters. This is about 1/3 of the lot size of the surrounding properties. Do you call this neighbourhood compatibility?

Maximum height as per By-law R1-B,C,D- 119 is 7.5 meters for one storey, 8.5 meters for one and half storey and 10 meters for 2 storey. R1 -D -119 is the predominant classification of the surrounding properties. The proposed development exceeds the height of the 11 surrounding properties by a

minimum of 1 meter to maximum 3.5 meters. Do you call this neighbourhood compatibility?

Lot coverage for this area is proposed to be 30% according to the Established Neighbourhood Study. This proposal has a lot coverage of 32.2% which includes the roadway and walkway. If you exclude these, so that you have a fair comparison to the surrounding neighbourhood where roadways and sidewalks are not included in lot coverage, then the lot coverage is 48.4%.

Do you call this neighbourhood compatibility?

All residences in the immediate neighbourhood have peaked roofs. The proposed development has flat roofs with air conditioners on the roof top. This is common in commercial and industrial buildings, not residential homes in which this development will be located. In addition, the land developer proposes to have rooftop amenities. Therefore, you might see wet bars, hot tubs, furniture and BBQs on the rooftops. The Town currently has no regulation on roof top amenities, so anything goes. Therefore roof top amenities must be prohibited in this development. Again, do you call this neighbourhood compatibility?

Existing lots along Gorham Street from Leslie Street to Alexander Road have either a front lot setback or side lot setback of 15 meters. The proposed development has a setback of only 3 meters from the property line. If this development is approved as is, it limits the town's ability to expand Gorham Street roadway or put in a turning lane onto Alexander Road. This road is frequently used by fire trucks and ambulances. Also, the proposed development would not fit in with the character of the neighbourhood. It would stick out like a sore thumb. Again, do you call this neighbourhood compatibility?

Larkin+ say that the townhouse development on Doak Lane is similar to this development. That development is about 120 meters from Gorham Street behind 2 high rise retirement apartments and is not in the middle of a single family dwelling area.

On page 27 of the Planning Justification Report, it states that "The proposed units will front onto an interior street with rear yards facing the backyard of adjacent properties." On page 15, it says "The site design provides for an

interior access road with all units facing into the interior of the development.” This is incorrect as the end units face onto Gorham Street as their front entrances face Gorham Street. The Planning Justification Report must be amended to reflect this discrepancy.

This proposal is asking for an R4 zoning for the townhouses but it is asking for exceptions for 3 out of 5 standards for this zoning. Also, it is asking for R2 for the semi-detached zoning but it is asking for exceptions for 4 out of 5 standards. If this development can't even meet the minimum standards for these 2 zoning standards, it should not be allowed.

There are inconsistencies between the Planning Justification Report and the Arborist's Report with regards to the number of trees to be removed on this property. How many will remain and how many will be removed. What is correct? I request that a peer review of the Arborist's Report be undertaken. Based on that review, the Planning Justification Report should be amended to provide the correct information.

I have three other concerns. Firstly, the applicant is Gorham Development 849 INC. but most of the documents were prepared for Gorham Partnership. Who is this? I have not been able to find a registered company in Ontario by that name.

Secondly, Larkin+ state several times that the reason for this proposal is to provide “more affordable housing”. What is meant by “more affordable housing” – more affordable than what? Is The Gorham Partnership willing to commit to a reduced price for these homes or are they trying to squeeze as many units into this property so to increase their profit margin? The Town of Newmarket in conjunction with the Federal Government just committed to 216 “real” affordable units at 195 Deerfield Rd.

Thirdly, there seems to be a big rush to have this approved ASAP. Why is the town holding statutory public meetings during the summer? When I spoke with the former ward 2 councillor, he indicated that the town has not had meetings (council, committee of the whole or public meetings) during July in the last 40 years. Due to Covid19, the provincial government has legislated that time lines in the Planning Act do not need be adhered to. Why is this development being pushed through? Why has there been no builder identified to start this project ASAP? This proposal is prepared for a land developer. If this proposal is shovel ready, then that needs to be addressed

before Phase I becomes a reality by engaging a building company. This could be another Slessor Square where approval is given but there is no build and no increase in revenue to the Town of Newmarket through Property taxes.

In summary, this development will destroy the character of the neighbourhood by removing the majority of trees on this property to allow for a too dense number of townhouses with flat roofs and roof top amenity space. It does not fit within the current build of the neighbourhood. In the limited space left there has been no accommodation for Canada Post Boxes, snow storage in the winter and garbage storage for this complex. Where will these facilities be housed on the property?

I strongly oppose this development and want Newmarket Town Council to reject this development as it has been proposed.

Thank you,

Ted Bomers