

From: Vince De Angelis

Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 9:46 AM

To: Clerks Richmondhill clerks@richmondhill.ca

Subject: SRPBS.25.007

Good Morning:

I reside at 40 Edgar Avenue.

I have resided at this address for 50 years and am familiar with the area.

I oppose the application as submitted. Specifically, I take issue with the creation of:

1. lot 2 out of the back half of Lots 77 and 78 of the existing Plan of Subdivision;
2. lots 4 and 5 out of the back half of Lot 79 of the existing Plan of Subdivision;
3. Lots 9 and 8 out of the back half of Lot 8 of the existing Plan of Subdivision; and,
4. Lots 7 and 6 out of the back half of Lot 9 of the existing Plan of Subdivision.

At the very minimum, each lot should have the same width as the lot to the rear and fronting on Edgar Av. or Scott Dr, as applicable. What the applicants are proposing is to create 9 lots out of the existing 3. While the lots municipally known as 35 and 37 Edgar Avenue have a smaller width from the other properties on that street, it may be due to a lack of subdivision control at the time of their creation; making each property a legal non-conforming use. The same may apply to 18A and the abutting lot to the East on Scott Dr. They have always presented to me as being awkward on a street where each lot has an average 70ft frontage. This aberration should not be repeated at the rear of these lots.

The site specific provisions proposed by the applicants even fall below the increased density permitted under the "R3" Zoning Standard. The applicants have not provided any justification for falling below the minimum lot standards already set by Council.

The increase in traffic and noise in the neighbourhood has been palpable of late: the increased density will have a negative impact on the immediate and surrounding neighbourhoods and will set a dangerous precedent. There is more than enough development (with larger lots) that can be achieved in this proposed infill to meet any concerns about housing shortages in our community.

As such, I submit that the proposed lot configuration of the draft Plan of Subdivision is not in keeping with the existing lot pattern of the existing lots in the area and should be denied as submitted.

Regards.

Vincent J. De Angelis, LL.B., T.E.P.