| From:    |   |
|----------|---|
| To:      | <u>Clerks</u>   |
| Cc:      | Planning  |
| Subject: | Written Comments for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment - 66 Roxborough Road, file number D14NP2011 (ZBA), D09NP2011 (OPA) |
| Date:    | October 12, 2020 10:32:01 PM  |

To whom this may concern,

Please accept this email as written comments for the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for 66 Roxborough Road, file number D14NP2011 (ZBA), D09NP2011 (OPA).

I would like to formally request that the application be amended to include a revised Arborist Report that meets the minimum requirements of the Town's <u>Tree Preservation, Protection, Replacement</u> and <u>Enhancement Policy</u>, to modify the site plan to increase the area of soft landscaping and open space, to triple check the application meets the minimum requirements for parking, and to revise the concept drawings so they are true to what the new homeowners and our community will receive. Currently, the application does not support the Town with its goal to increase tree cover and it does not support the Town's vision to create a healthy and sustainable community. This letter includes four sections to further outline each of my concerns.

## Section 1 - Request for an amended Arborist report

The submitted Arborist Report does not meet the minimum requirements of the Town's Tree Preservation, Protection, Replacement and Enhancement Policy. The report is missing:

- a *detailed* maintenance plan/program trees to be preserved and protected (e.g. pruning, fertilizing, mulching, aerating, watering, cabling and etc.)
- a monetary value for the one City Tree being removed
- and the total compensation values for trees being removed and not being replanted on
- the site as per the Town's the Town's Fees and Charges By-law (<u>www.newmarket.ca</u>)

According to the Arborist Report, the total Depreciated Aggregate (cm) of the 13 trees being proposed to be removed is 355.5 cm, and if 60mm trees are to be planted in replacement, a total of 59 trees are to be used for compensation. The proposed landscaping plan is only showing nine replacement trees: the Arborist Report is missing the compensation requirement for the remaining 50 trees that will not be planted on the site, including a monetary value for the City Tree. I would like to request that the Arborist Report be revised to meet all minimum requirements of the Town's Policy.

## Section 2 - Increasing the area for soft landscaping and open space

According to my calculations, the proposed soil volume for four of the five trees being planted in the front yard of the proposed townhouses is approximately 8.8 cubic metres or less, assuming the soil depth is 0.3 metres. One of the five trees has a larger planting bed and soil volume. The <u>City of Toronto</u> seeks a minimum of 30 cubic metres for each separate tree planting area: the planting area for these four proposed trees is sitting at 29% of the 30 metres cube target proposed in the City of Toronto specifications. While you could argue the nearby unit paving could be considered growing space, I would please ask that the site plan show how the soil under the pavers is supporting tree growth. Based on <u>DeepRoots</u> recommendation, an 8.8 cubic metre soil volume will lead to a projected mature tree size of four inches in trunk diameter with a canopy diameter of 14 feet. If the soil volume for each tree increased to 30 cubic metres, these trees could increase to approximately 16 inches in diameter at breast height with a canopy diameter of 32 feet.

The Town's 2006 Official Plan has a goal to increase the tree cover of the entire Town from its current level of 9% to 12%, and in Section 9.2.7 it states "in new subdivisions, the program will

ensure there is "no net loss" of trees through the preservation of existing trees and the planting of replacement trees." In addition, the Town recently endorsed a low impact development and stormwater management program which promotes the protection of green infrastructure. If the Town is indeed working towards these goals and it values the benefits of trees (i.e. green infrastructure), I strongly ask that the Town seeks an amended site plan that has more soft landscaping and open space to protect soil, to give space *for more trees to be planted*, to give green spaces for its new homeowners and to further support the LSRCA Technical Guidelines for Stormwater Management Submissions. This current site plan is eliminating existing green infrastructure – it will leave the new homeowners with cramped backyards where they will be exposed to each other, they will likely have no room to plant large trees and they will be exposed to significant sun and urban heat islands on hot sunny days. If the development takes place as is, the Town will lose tree canopy cover and contravene its own policies and goals for a healthy and sustainable community.

As an option, please reconsider the size of each dwelling on this site and please ensure this site plan meets the minimum standard of its Low Impact Development Policy. According to the <u>University of St Andrews</u>, new research is indicating that energy policies must factor in the average space per person is increasing in homes; and, <u>Green Builder</u> indicates that a good minimum area for a two storey house with two bedrooms is 895 square feet, and a good area for a three storey house with three bedrooms is 1,100 square feet. Currently, this site plan is proposing a two bedroom dwelling at 1,900 square feet and a three bedroom dwelling at 2,750 square feet. The size of these proposed dwellings seems extravagant compared to many of the homes in this neighbourhood: I live in a nearby three bedroom home which is approximately 1,400 square feet. Reducing the overall footprint of these two Townhouse designs will support the future homeowners with reduced energy costs and it will give them and the community more space outside for the many health and wellness benefits offered by green infrastructure.

## Section 3 - Minimum parking requirements

According to the Town's Zoning By-law 2010-40 and its calculation of parking requirements for residential units (Section 5.3.1), a townhouse on a public road requires two parking spaces per dwelling unit plus 0.25 visitor spaces per dwelling unit which shall be provided exterior of any garage. According to the application, there is no visitor parking and there is only one outdoor parking space per dwelling. I would like to request that the application be closely reviewed and amended to ensure there are at least 2.25 (i.e. three) visitor parking spaces for the site and there are a minimum number of two outdoor parking spaces per dwelling to meet the minimum standards of the Zoning By-law. The current application does not meet the Town's By-law standards, and this would be a major concern for this site and the surrounding neighbourhood. Queen Street is extremely busy, and it would be unsafe to park on Roxborough where there are twists, turns and a busy intersection. We already have street parking issues in this neighbourhood. This is an extremely important item to triple check for the future and success of this new subdivision.

## Section 4 - Concept drawings

The location plan provided is beautiful, modern and inviting; however, the concept plan shows palm trees and it is missing a concept of the backyard for both Townhouse types. Plam trees do not survive in our landscape, and many residents enjoy spending time in their backyard. May I please ask that concept drawings be amended so the trees and shrubs shown are true to what these new homeowners and residents will see and to include concepts of the backyard for each Townhouse type. Trees, shrubs and perennials need to be at the core of this site plan to ensure its new homeowners and nearby neighbours maintain a healthy and sustainable life.

In closing, I would like to thank the Town for its progressive policies and I hope these comments will help protect these new homeowners and the rest of our community from future parking issues and

the loss of green infrastructure, health and well-being. We need to protect our community for generations to come.

Thank you,

Heidi Breen

