

[REDACTED]
Cambridge, ON
[REDACTED]

To whom I trust this will concern:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to an official plan amendment and zoning By-law amendment OR05/22: 44 and 46 Millcreek Rd, 5 Liberty Dr.

HISTORY

As a more than 40 year resident of the Liberty Drive and Athlone neighbourhood, I have seen many changes to this quiet, dead end area.

This area was designated under the Veterans Land Act and populated originally by those who qualified under that Act. I believe the lots had to be ½ acre or more to qualify under that Act.

Primarily homes were and are 1 to 1 ½ story bungalows.

When I became a "new" resident here I was invited to attend a Club to get to know neighbours who then became friends. That opportunity still exists. It is a neighbourhood where you know your neighbours and can trust they will watch out for you/your property.

Although many of the original owners have now gone and some of the lots have been subdivided to allow an additional home on the original lot, the R3 zoning has allowed for building in keeping with the neighbourhood.

There are no sidewalks. There is little traffic on Liberty and Athlone, as the area is a dead end neighbourhood.

ZONING

I understand that the current R3 zoning allows for a maximum height of 15 metres and up to triplexes on a property.

There are approx. 32 houses in this neighbourhood. If there were 4 persons per household, which I know is more than actual occupancy, that would make a density of 128 persons for the entire Liberty/Athlone area.

Similarly if there are 2 cars per household, there would be 64 cars in the entire neighbourhood.

Assuming the new proposal is on approx.. 1+ acres, with 77 units and 4 person per unit, the number of persons would be 308 persons, *almost TRIPLE* the density for the entire neighbourhood. Calculated by hectare this would be an enormous increase to the existing density

The car situation similarly would result in 104 parking spaces and with an average of 2 cars per household, 154 cars. Where does the overflow go? This is almost triple the number of existing cars in the neighbourhood.

This is not in keeping with this neighbourhood.

I understand that, not only has there been a proposal for rezoning but that the proposed rezoning to RM3 also includes a request for a further increase in density to *more than double* that allowed, from 40 units per gross hectare to 89.

Again this is not a good fit for the existing neighbourhood. Those homes closest to this proposed development are 1 ½ storey homes as are those across the street.

I understand the allowed height of the buildings are also much greater than under R3 zoning. This is not in keeping with the neighbourhood and an invasion of privacy for those close to this proposed development.

The requested side yard setback also reduces greenspace between properties, something that is prime in this neighbourhood.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS

With increased density comes:

increased traffic resulting in decreased leisure enjoyment by those in the neighbourhood, increased traffic pollution/noise and safety concerns

-a large parking area results in increased traffic resulting in the need for snow removal, maintenance and garbage/recycling/compost area with an additional increase in noise and noise pollution and the regular addition of commercial vehicles to the neighbourhood. Additional light pollution, from such a big complex, is also a concern.

-the units themselves have to be accessed by moving people in ,77 times initially, plus resale/rental traffic afterward – more traffic and noise/inconvenience with large trucks in the area

- construction traffic would be a major issue in this small neighbourhood, as it was when Franklin Blvd was being reconstructed. This resulted in service disruption, noise, dirt and general inconvenience to all in the neighbourhood.

-already overcrowded schools/buses and services would be further taxed

-safety concerns for those in the neighbourhood, particularly elderly and children is an issue

For these reasons I strongly oppose a change from R3 to RM3 zoning.

I believe the needs of the neighbourhood would be best met by preserving the present zoning.

Sincerely,

Barb Hinchcliffe

