

Proposed Apartment at Bayview and Cartier Crescent

City Files: D01-20008 and D02-200014

To whom it may concern:

This letter is in regard to our opposition to applications to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-laws to allow the development of an 8 story, 165 unit apartment building at the corner of Bayview Ave and Cartier Crescent, specifically lots 122, 124 and 126 Cartier Crescent.

Our area is an established single family dwelling neighbourhood, zoned "Neighbourhood" as per "Land Use Schedule A2". This proposal flies in the face of the current zoning which was, and is in place to protect the character and quality of life in this neighbourhood. The proposed monolith doesn't remotely resemble the surroundings

As per the "OMB-partially-approved-Official-Plan-Part-I", Section 4.9, opening paragraph "Compatible new development should represent a "good fit" within the physical context and character of the surrounding area.", and 4.9.1, line 3, "3. *Development* shall be *compatible* with the character of the adjacent and surrounding area in accordance with policy 4.9.2.4 of this Plan.

This proposal is far from it. From 4.9.1.2, line 3 " 3. *Medium density residential development* shall have a maximum site density of 50 units per hectare⁷ (20 units per acre)."

There is also a height restriction per 4.9.1 line "4. *Development* within the Neighbourhood designation shall have a maximum building height of 3 storeys, except on an arterial street where the maximum building height shall be 4 storeys; "

Again, the proposed development does not remotely conform the local land use zoning, quoted in small part above.

There are also a number of other issues with the proposal such as :

- The design proposal does not conform to the "set back" from Cartier Cres, as per the document "zoning_bylaws_6671_and_10010_rflp_01_11" section 4.18, "ESTABLISHED BUILDING LINE Means that the average distance from the street line of existing buildings on the same side of the street in any block where more than half the lots on such side have been built upon, at the date of the final passing of this by-law" . Precedent appears to have been set by the many building permits for the large new homes on Cartier that all conform to this set back.

- Encroachment on road allowance

- Snow removal without proper set back. Where will the snow from the road and sidewalk clearing be put?

- As per the design proposal, the air handling exhaust will be directly beside the existing detached home at lot 120 Cartier. This will most likely contravene "zoning_bylaws_6671_and_10010_rflp_01_11" section 4.40, OBNOXIOUS USE-- Means any use which is or could be a nuisance to the occupants or owners of any neighbouring land or buildings by reason of the emission or the creation of odours,

gases, dirt, smoke, vibration, fumes, cinders, soot, waste, or depositing or leaving unsightly objects or chattels thereon or otherwise."

-- The driveway in the proposed design is directly beside the home at lot 120 Cartier. The entry/exit to the proposed building is directly beside the existing home. Logically this will lead to noise and poisonous exhaust fumes from vehicles both driving by and standing and or parked at those front doors. This infringes on the neighbour's rights to clean air and enjoyment of their property

-- While a traffic study will likely show that there is "adequate capacity" on Cartier Crescent and Tormore Ave, there is no doubt that there would be a huge proportional increase in traffic on those streets. Tormore has no sidewalks, and furthermore, the federal government had intended to put a community mailbox on the street. Common sense indicates that this will lead to pedestrian safety issues. It also infringes on our right to enjoy our properties without the increased traffic, capacity or not.

-- Given the proposed height of the building, the property at 120 Cartier will receive no direct sun until midday. Even a shorter building would have a similar, but lesser effect. This again infringes on their rights.

-- The home directly across the street on Cartier will have their view radically changed by having to look at an storey building

-- Given the proposed height of the building, this huge building will be seen from both sides of Cartier, Tormore, and Balkan. Part of the reason I purchase a home in this neighbourhood was so that I didn't have to look at something like that. If I had wanted that, I could have purchased elsewhere. This again flies in the face of intent of the Official Plan, Section 4.9

These are some, but not all of the issues.

It seems that someone has spent a great deal of time, energy, and money purchasing the five lots, severing them, and designing a building that couldn't be any bigger for the increased footprint. The feeling we get is that they would not have done this without a reasonable expectation of success. This may be an obscene opening gambit, but if they were approved for 1/2 or even 1/4 of their proposal, it would still be way out of character with the rest of the neighbourhood.

Amendments must be for the good, not the detriment of the existing residents.

Recent development approvals in Richmond Hill also make it appear that there is a movement by council(s) to support developers and no real council support for their constituents. Local interest groups have basically been ignored.

So

The question here is:

Why does this developer, or any other in Richmond Hill, have the expectation that such a gross proposal is possible????? And worse, that some of those recent proposals were in fact approved.

A solid, concise answer to this question would go a long way to solving some of the scepticism, pessimism and distrust fostered by the way constituents have been represented in Richmond Hill.

Actions speak much louder than words