

To: Patricia Cho, Planner
John Taylor, Mayor
Tom Vegh, Deputy Mayor
Jane Twinney, Ward Councillor

Re: File # D14=NP21-01 (ZBA), D11-NP21-01 (SPA)

We object categorically to the re-zoning of the subject lands from existing Residential Detached Dwelling 15M Zone (R1D) to Mixed Use Zone (MU-XX). Also, we want to make clear how deeply we object to the construction of the proposed four-storey condo building at the corner of Lundy's Lane and Watson Avenue in Newmarket. There are many reasons that the area should not be re-zoned and that the building should not be built.

1. The area is one of single-family dwellings with lawns, gardens, mature trees, and spaces between the houses. This proposed building is detrimental to the neighbourhood and the feeling of community with respect to both long-time residents and new families wanting to move to the area. The development adds nothing to the area; it changes the nature of the neighbourhood where owners have spent time, effort and money to maintain and enhance their properties.
2. The dominance of a four-storey building is a feature that will discourage prospective buyers of existing houses at present-day prices. This will cause a serious decrease in property values.
3. Lundy's Lane between Davis Drive and Watson Avenue is of historical significance in Newmarket. The four brick houses on the east side are venerable and are reminiscent of earlier times. The proposal requires the destruction of one of these houses. Owners of these properties have gone to great lengths over the years to maintain the character of these beautiful old homes. The loss of even one of these houses is a loss to the heritage of Newmarket. It is our understanding that the Town's vision is that new buildings in established neighbourhoods blend in with the existing houses. There is NOTHING in these plans that is true to this vision.
4. The proposed building will require the removal of most of the trees in the area; that means that old-growth trees that should be valued and preserved will be destroyed. The loss of such trees affects the environment and the air quality. The tree inventory of May 2020 in the proposed plans states that of the 67 trees on the property only six will be retained. All these trees but four are designated "average to good condition", and should be protected.
5. The site plan states that for 79 units there will be 85 parking places and an additional twelve spaces for visitors, with no legal parking on the surface. This is unreasonable for these days of two-car families. Illegal parking is inevitable.

6. According to the application for re-zoning, the company is asking for a number of exemptions; some of these are a concern to us:
 - a) 6.2.4.8 a landscape buffer shall not be required. (The lack of a landscape buffer will make this building fit in even less.)
 - b) 6.2.4 a mechanical penthouse will be added. (This means a 5th floor on a four-storey building!)
 - c) 5.1.5 a drop-off site on all three frontages. (This cannot be allowed because of already existing traffic congestion.)
 - d) 5.2.1 principal entrance faces both Bolton and Watson (Watson shouldn't be allowed; it is narrow and already has stopping/parking problems.)
 - e) 5.2.5 loading is proposed off Lundy's Lane, loading garbage and servicing (Because of the volume of traffic on Lundy's Lane and the daily illegal parking, this should not be allowed.)
 - f) 5.2.10 Balconies are provided along the building frontage. (All balconies should be inset in all cases.)
 - g) 5.2.35 Building has been designed to complement and fit in with existing neighbourhood by integrating brick into the design. (No part of this building, no matter what material is used, will fit into this neighbourhood.)
 - h) 3.2.37 The proposed use of materials to set back to ensure an interesting façade and is sensitive to surrounding uses. (This is misleading; set-backs will not make this building acceptable; no part of the design will make it part of the neighbourhood.)
 - i) 5.2.42 The development will be providing cash in lieu of parkland. (!!! What? How can cash be seen as an alternative to parkland? With the Town's focus on green spaces, how can this even be considered?)

7. Cars from 79 condo units will add to already serious congestion on Lundy's Lane. We six who live on the short stretch of Lundy's Lane between Davis Drive and Watson Avenue have endured on-going traffic issues since the construction of the Medical Building at the corner of Davis Drive and Lundy's Lane. The problem issuing from the Medical Building is that cars park illegally on the street while waiting to pick someone up from a procedure or appointment. This parking infraction has spilled over onto Watson Avenue. The No Stopping signs are ignored daily.

Despite multiple phone calls to the Town, despite many conversations with our Ward Councillors, Jane Twinney, Victor Woodhouse, Diane Springsteen, despite meetings with former Mayor Tom Taylor, Town Lawyer, By-Laws Officer/Supervisor, and despite submissions and presentations to the authorities, the problems accompanying illegal parking have continued. We have pointed out the dangers when there is a line-up of cars going into the Medical Building, the difficulties when exiting or returning to our own driveways, the difficulties on garbage days when parked cars interfere with pick-up, and difficulties for emergency vehicles when cars are parked illegally. Nothing has worked – the cars still park illegally and the dangers still persist.

Since the reconstruction of Davis Drive, cars from Bayview Parkway and Bolton Avenue cannot make a left turn onto Davis Drive, and they now come over to Lundy's Lane; the traffic light at Lundy's Lane and Davis Drive allows for left turns. Many cars exiting from underground parking

on Bolton Avenue will be added. This will add to traffic volume on Lundy's Lane that has already been significantly increased.

Now, to make matters worse, the proposed building has underground parking with an exit onto Lundy's Lane as well. Lundy's Lane is a two-lane street with bike lanes on both sides; that leaves no room for stopping, parking or drop-off. The exit from underground parking onto Lundy's Lane will add to already serious traffic problems and dangers that already exist. An exiting driver from the condo building will inevitably block both the sidewalk and the bike lane while waiting to turn onto Lundy's Lane. There should be no exit onto Lundy's Lane for the safety of walkers, bikers and drivers.

Even the slightest research into traffic issues on the part of the architect, builder or investor should have shown them the folly of putting this proposed building in this residential area. It will have a negative and detrimental impact on the whole neighbourhood and the people who live there. It is unconscionable that the Town Council would consider an application to change the zoning for this established neighbourhood.

The application should be denied, and the area should be left as a Residential Detached Dwelling Zone.

Maria Luczka, 27 Lundy's Lane Maria Luczka
Jeff Scobie, 26 Lundy's Lane Jeff Scobie
Marcia Sinclair, 34 Lundy's Lane Marcia Sinclair
Wendy Emerson, 38 Lundy's Lane Wendy Emerson
Jana Vale, 46 Lundy's Lane Jana Vale
Paul Loria, 35 Lundy's Lane Paul Loria