

Hi All,

A few concerns with this application.

First of all a reminder that 12 large mature trees were removed including the largest Heritage Sugar Maple that was 125-150 years old prior to the Demolition permit being submitted (loophole that the opportunistic career builder was well aware of).

Then to add insult to injury, the builder to max out profit paid a measly \$22,700 to remove 8 more Heritage trees to be able to max out the 35% lot coverage build at 185 Beechwood. The amount being billed is not a deterrent to builders that are lining their pockets at the expense of the trees that make this neighbourhood.

Question 1: did I miss the amount being paid to remove the 4 trees? This build will be worth over \$2,300,000 so I hope the amount being billed is significant; it should be \$50,000 to \$75,000 PER Heritage tree not \$5,000 per tree. If trees that size were removed in Town's like Markham without a tree removal permit the fine would be \$50k+.

Question 2: regardless of an agreement being signed with the neighbours to the West 4 years ago, trees benefits all of us and a reminder that Newmarket is last in York Region for Heritage trees...losing 3 more Heritage trees from a lot that has already 28 trees removed is not responsible considering the 100 years plus these trees have been alive. The builder is once again maxing out the 35% coverage as he did next door thus lining his pockets at a Lot; that I warned in 2013 was wider than the bylaw thus at risk for severance, however can the road setback be relaxed to moved the house forward and save the trees? This would reduce the coverage of the house which I think should have been done for 185 and this application to save more Heritage trees.

The trees are not in "direct conflict" with the building...the over-sized building is in direct conflict with the 100+ year old trees and in conflict with the motive of the career and opportunistic builder: to maximize his profit at the neighbourhoods' expense once again; same tactic for [REDACTED] house on Park Ave that he bought, demolished, built a personal property that he never lived in and sold off the remaining lot pocketing an estimated \$1,750,000.

Here is some rough math:

[REDACTED] bought the Historic Boyd House for \$1.3 Million
185 Beechwood sold for ~\$1,900,000 with an estimated profit of \$1,000,000 and sold as a Primary residence which was not accurate with never living there (see tax Roll # and address off Leslie St).
181 Lot was listed for \$995,000
Plus cost to build 181 estimated at \$1,350,000 (5,398 sq ft of finished area X \$250/sq ft building costs)

Net net this career predatory builder has made north of \$1,000,000 (majority tax free), taken advantage of loopholes in the process and this lot not being protected from severance as warned back in 2013.

Question 3: 237 Park Avenue, 181 Beechwood, 258 Park Avenue...all lots that were wider than the bylaw which several residents raised concerns about predatory builders back in 2013. Millard and Forrest Glen were protected however nothing was done for Park Ave and

Beechwood. Can we once and for all widen the minimum width bylaw to protect Historic properties like the Davis Mansion at 290 Park Ave and other lots at risk?

I have no issue if someone wants to buy a house a bulldoze it then build however having lots severed to maximize a builders profit at the expense of the neighbourhood has to stop.

Besides chainsaws the trees in this neighbourhood are under attack by:

- gypsy moths that have severely stripped the trees and will again next year with thousands of egg sacks being laid right now
- Beech Trees - ALL are going to die with having an airborne fungus
- Sugar Maples - many have structural issues and are damaged by the wind and many have an airborne fungus causing dieback
- Coniferous trees - all have been stripped by gypsy moths and may not survive

Lastly, relaying a statement made by a neighbour:

"I have lived in this neighbourhood for over 50 years. The trees and wider lots are what made Beechwood THE street to live on. So many trees have been removed from that lot alone and it seems like no one is listening to us and the town just does whatever the builder asks not thinking long term about the consequences or the residents that are paying a significant amount of property tax."

Thanks,
Chris Howie

Hi All,

Tree 4 - the previous driveway is West of the tree so I am wondering why it is being taken down...I assume it is to do a curved driveway like at 185 however the driveway and curb and tree should stay where they are.

Dust - PLEASE force/mandate/demand that for any stone cutting a WET saw be used. When the exterior of 185 was being worked on the concrete dust (that has chemicals) was everywhere for weeks; on vehicles as far as Park Avenue. There is NO reason why a wet saw cannot be used especially with water available. In fact, ALL construction in Town should have a required to limit dust (which I think is already in place) BUT wet saws should be required for any construction in town to reduce particulates/air pollution which trees help filter however we keep losing more trees to greedy builders.

On behalf of the residents in this area, thank you for your support!
Chris Howie