

Peggy Newman

54 George St. N., Harriston, ON. N0G1Z0

May 29, 2016

CAO/Clerk

Mr. Bill White

Town of Minto

5941 Highway 89

Harriston, ON

N0G 1Z0

Dear Mr. White:

The purpose of this letter is to present a written submission in opposition to the proposed zoning by-law amendment to the properties located on Part Park Lots 4, 5 and 6, RP61R-20210 Parts 9, 10 and 11, with municipal addresses of 24 George St. N., and 100 William St. E., Harriston. (As per the "Notice of Public Meeting for Amendment, and Notice of Complete Application" sent out from the town office, dated May 13, 2016.)

My interest and concern regarding this proposal is based on the property that I own and reside at being adversely affected by this requested change. I live at 54 George St. N, Harriston and my backyard backs directly onto the planned "park and storm pond" green space that is part of the site plan for this area. I have lived at this address since January 2015.

My first point of opposition is that I chose to build a new home in this new development, and entered into a contract to build with Metzger Construction (applicants), under the advertised site plan that there would be a green space park behind the first 6 single home lots along George Street. When I originally chose the lot that I would build on I based a large percentage of that decision on the layout of the property behind the lots. I chose the lot I am currently on because it would be in the middle of the green space behind the properties, maximizing my view and minimizing the impact from other lots or buildings. If the plan that was advertised to me showed that there would be a building lot coming up to the corner of my lot, I would have chosen differently. I chose to build in this development because, as advertised to me in the outset of planning, it would provide my family with a quite, residential setting, with lots of green space. I moved into town from a rural area and what this development was offering to me in terms of space and setting was, and is, important.

My second point of opposition is that taking away one third of the advertised green space and replacing it with more building units will adversely affect all of the surrounding properties. The application for amendment to the zoning of the open space, to be used as building site for more townhouse units, completely changes the physical layout, visual impact, noise impact, and environmental impact of the area. The application for rear yard setback and distance between buildings to be reduced has a huge impact as well on surrounding properties. Essentially the neighbouring properties will be looking at end-to-end brick walls, with very small yards and therefore very little

landscaping possibilities. The request for the rear yard setback to be reduced means that the townhouse units will be very close to other property lines, therefore increasing the negative impact to surrounding properties.

My third point of opposition is centered around the environmental impact of this requested change. This area is a natural flood plain, and because of this the “park and storm pond” area was necessary in the original layout plan of the development. When I chose to build, very careful consideration was given with regards to this fact. I knew this was a wet area and I went over many factors with my builders (Metzger Construction) to ensure that it was okay to build in this area and that I would not be looking at future water problems. The design of the house, the grading of the property and the existence of the “storm pond” are all important factors to ensuring that the water is managed and not going to cause future structural or cosmetic damage to my property or house. The proposed amendment asks for a reduction in the storm pond size by one third. The original site servicing agreement between Metzger Construction and the Town of Minto (dated July 1, 2013) states that a “combined park and storm pond no less than 1.0 acre in size...shall be retained by the Town”. The proposed amendment will reduce the size of this storm pond to well under 1.0 acre. I am interested to know what the Maitland Valley Conservation Authority recommendations and requirements are for this area.

With regards to water management as well, my concern about having an increase in townhouse units, a decrease in space between units, and a reduction of storm pond size is that when it comes to Winter snow management, surrounding properties will be affected. With a plan to build units close together and add a fourplex backing onto the storm pond area, where will snow be moved to? Where will it be piled? Will piles of snow be pushed up against surrounding property lines, and when Spring comes will the melting piles be causing excess run-off onto these property yards? An area that is already naturally wet needs space to manage snow and drain properly.

My fourth point of opposition is that if the proposed re-zoning is approved to allow a larger townhouse development to be built, the resale value of my property will decrease. The amount that I paid for my property and house is reflective of a large future green space behind it, with open views. The value of it will most certainly be less with a large fourplex building backing up to the corner of my property and a reduced green space available behind my property.

The last point that I wish to make is that when I chose to build in this development, the site plan advertised a “senior living homes” development of 19 units (behind building lots 7-11). The layout of these units and the intention of them being “seniors condos” (as they were repeatedly referred to by Metzger Construction) meant to me that they would be nicely spaced, privately owned, well maintained, quiet residential condo units. This was a positive aspect to this area and it added to my choice to build here. Although it has not overtly been advertised as such, I have come to hear that the intentions of these townhouses is no longer “condo ownership”, but rather rental units. I understand that the intention is for these to be “senior housing”. What is the guarantee that the future use of these units is by seniors and that the intended vision of this development is maintained? I do not see how anyone can guarantee that, and with providing an increase in number of units and marketing them as rentals I am concerned about the future of this area.

I did not purchase and build a new home in this development with the understanding that this was the future plan. I purchased with the knowledge of the previous plan advertised to me with the vision of what I would be looking at and the space my family would be able to enjoy when I stepped out into my backyard. The proposed amendment to the development of this area changes that vision for me and for the other homeowners that have already purchased here.

With regards to the reasons stated above, I strongly feel that the proposed amendment to the re-zoning of part of the open space for park and storm pond for the development of townhouses be rejected. I also strongly feel that the amendment to allow relief from the rear yard setback and distance between buildings be rejected.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Peggy Newman". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

Peggy Newman

Please inform me in writing of the decision made regarding this matter.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "P. Newman". The signature is written in blue ink and is positioned below the text "Please inform me in writing of the decision made regarding this matter.".