

Sharon Sweeney

██████████
Cambridge, ON ██████████

March 16, 2023

Rachel Greene
Senior Planner
Planning Services, Community Development
City of Cambridge, ON

File Number: OR01/23 - 229-247 Royal Oak Road

Good Morning Rachel,

Thank you for speaking with me yesterday.

As discussed, I am hereby giving my permission for Sharon Venturin of ██████████, Cambridge, ON to also speak on behalf of our property at ██████████ at the upcoming meeting regarding the proposal to redevelop the site 229, 235, 239, 247 Royal Oak Road (OR01/23) with two warehouse buildings.

I will be out of the province and unable to attend this meeting. It is very important that our voices are heard, and our concerns are addressed regarding this proposal.

Outlined below are a few of my questions/concerns. There are many, however I have just identified six. Please forward them on.

Thank you,

Sharon Sweeney

Sharon Sweeney

File Number: OR01/23 - 229-247 Royal Oak Road

Sharon Sweeney – [REDACTED], Cambridge, ON
March 16, 2023

First and foremost, when the previous development was happening around us, we were told “this side of the street would remain residential.” Piece by piece the business and industrial development in this area has been encroaching on our homes. Disrupting and negatively impacting our lives.

Property Rights and the Constitution: **Everyone has the right to the use and enjoyment of property, individually or in association with others, and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with law and for reasonable compensation.**

Please do not deprive us of the use and enjoyment of our property by going ahead with this proposal.

Concerns:

1. Wells. We have our own well systems and have spent a lot of money to ensure we have the proper equipment for our homes and our water. If our wells are damaged – our homes become worthless.
Who is going to ensure that if the wells are compromised from this construction, (now or in the future) we are properly compensated for the loss? Who is responsible?
2. Where will the entrance/driveway be for these warehouses? In looking at the Planning Justification Report – Page 8, this section is very unclear. It is stating that “access point is located as far to the west as possible to reduce traffic conflicts”. Does this mean they are putting the entrance as far west and as close to the driveway of the residents at [REDACTED]?
3. Peak traffic. We are currently experiencing issues on a regular basis with traffic being backed up in front of our property during peak hours. This proposal is showing another 200 trips per hour can be added in an already congested area during peak time. What is going to change to allow this extra traffic? There was mention of a roundabout on Speedsville Road. Is that the solution?
4. Traffic Report: Region of Waterloo: Impact Study and Parking Study: Page 3; Number 11
A person with disabilities or horse and buggy frequent users of this intersection and the answer was “not expected to be”. What does this even mean?
Did anybody consider/consult the residents who live in this area to determine if there were anyone with disabilities that could be affected by this increased flow of traffic? Or is the question only related if there was a public facility to assist persons with disabilities?
5. What are the specific facility operations at these warehouses?
6. Noise pollution: We currently have an excess amount of noise with the increased lanes on the 401, plus the added traffic movement from the recent Trademark development. What barriers are going to be put up to mitigate the extra noise that will be inflicted on the local residents with this proposed development and business operations?