

## Written Submissions from the Public as of August 10 2020

	Name	Date
1	Fintan Flynn	February 28, 2020
2	Merv Smith	April 6, 2020
3	Robert Warner	April 14, 2020
4	Lee, Laurie, Mackena and Malone Regan	May 6, 2020
5	Jeff and Chrissy Keane	May 10, 2020
6	Fintan Flynn	May 12, 2020
7	Sandy Fonger	May 22, 2020
8	Jeff and Chrissy Keane	May 27, 2020
9	Mervyn and Patricia Smith	May 29, 2020
10	Valentino D'Souza and Deepti Fernandes	June 3, 2020
11	Bill de Vries	July 6, 2020
12	Chuck and Krista Melanson	August 6, 2020

Village Clerk & Council for the Corporation of the Village of Sundridge  
P.O. Box 129,  
110 Main Street,  
Sundridge, Ontario,  
POA 1Z0

Chuck & Krista Melanson  
P.O. Box 185  
Sundridge, Ontario  
POA 1Z0

August 6, 2020

RE: Opposition to Zoning By-Law Amendment, Part Lot 75 (10356 Highway 124)

My wife and I are two of the strongest advocates for senior housing in the Village of Sundridge. For years, we have invested in and developed low-density, community-appropriate projects in the Village and surrounding communities to add sorely needed capacity to exclusively support seniors and have plans to continue to do so.

We are strongly opposed to the proposed plan to construct large multi-family commercial buildings on Highway 124.

We have reviewed the NOAH Development Proposal and supporting materials with respect to Council Resolution 2020-094. We understand that the proposed development would see 50 additional housing units; with an unknown allocation of units to the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board (below-market/affordable housing rentals).

We have a number of concerns we'd like to bring forward for Council's consideration with respect to this by-law amendment:

- 1) Density & Community Appropriateness

The images presented in the media of the proposed project are a significant departure from the housing density found throughout our community and we would argue, against the small-town feel of the Village of Sundridge. Absent a comprehensive community development plan, has the Village considered whether such a development project reflects the vision for community? A referendum may be the proper avenue for the community to decide on this project absent such guidance.

## 2) Village Septic Capacity

When the Village last held a public meeting to discuss septic fees; we were left with the understanding that the Village septic system was sized to accommodate existing land use plans (low density, family dwellings) and the existing population.

We are concerned that the septic infrastructure (pumping stations, settling ponds, etc.) is not adequate to accommodate this development and the 10-15% increase in Village population. The Miller & Urso report dated May 20, 2020 makes reference to the sanitary connection at the property, but makes no determination on upstream infrastructure.

Further, based on reporting in the media (nugget.ca article dated August 5), the Municipality of Powassan is entertaining a similar project (or perhaps the same project?). Per the media reports, construction equipment is on-site and site work has begun - without permits or agreement on cost sharing with the Municipality – with specific concerns raised by their Council about sewer capacity and connectivity.

Will the Council work to prevent a similar scenario from happening here?

We would request that an impact study be done on the existing septic infrastructure with respect to the increased population to a) ensure alignment with the guidance in the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 and; b) transparently provide the rate payers of Sundridge with the costs (and distribution of responsibility for those costs) to uplift the infrastructure or capacity that may be required to support this added population.

## 3) Water Aquifer & Runoff

In the years we've lived in the Village, we've seen a number of projects impact the water table. It would be in the interest of all residents to understand what impacts this additional water consumption and the wells required to service the buildings would have on the local water table.

Remediation systems to address water quality are incredibly expensive and the need for such systems is often an unforeseen consequence of development elsewhere in the localized area. We've seen this first hand at several of our properties.

Residents are already under considerable financial pressure from sewage fees and high property taxes (as compared to Strong or Armour); not to mention the ongoing COVID-19 crisis.

Is the developer prepared to guarantee or indemnify residents with respect to their water flow rates and quality?

The area of proposed development is also prone to flash flooding during heavy rainfall and snow melt. Based on a lay-review of the Erosion Control Plan, we're not satisfied that the design will adequately protect the highway or adjoining lands from surface water contamination or flooding.

#### 4) Access & Traffic

The proposed development is quite close to the busiest intersection in the Village and existing traffic going to/from senior's lunches at this location already fill that area to capacity.

Has any consideration been given to the increase of traffic to the Village?

What volume of localized traffic would necessitate controls being added on this part of Highway 124? Who would bear those costs? The Site Service Plan does not provide any additional controls or access to this property from what exists today nor does it speak to added traffic volumes on this section of Highway 124.

Traffic will undoubtedly attempt left-turns from Hwy 124; crossing 2 lanes of highway; this will be a significant safety hazard.

It should be noted that the Village has several open railway crossings. Does the increase in population & traffic proposed by this development compel the Council to review whether there should be controlled access added to these crossings?

#### 5) Fire Service Protection

Has the Village performed a review of the capacity, capability and training to properly protect the residents of this development in the event of a fire or other emergency?

We feel that the support and endorsement of the local Fire Service must be mandatory before this project is approved.

If there's additional capacity needed by the Village and its service providers (Fire included) to support these buildings, it's imperative that Council communicate those challenges and associated costs so that rate payers can make an informed decision about this by-law amendment and the development overall.

The costs to increase fire service capacity to properly service a multi-story building would be significant. There is no discussion in the proposal that speaks to cost sharing, indemnity for costs or other offers for these types of issues.

Media reports of a \$30,000 annual tax contribution would not be cost-neutral to the Village should, for example, the fire service need capacity improvement. The rate payers of Sundridge need to understand that its possible they will bear the difference.

## 6) Social Services Supports

It has been proposed that a portion of this development would be allocated to/by the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board. Affordable housing is a cornerstone of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 and needs to be part of every community's development plans.

Research has shown<sup>1 2</sup> that adopting affordable housing strategies must be done in a transparent, cooperative and collaborative approach with the community.

We are concerned that the Village has not considered the investments in community supports that will be needed to properly provide for such a strategy; including local health services. The Village is without family doctors and the Nurse Practitioner is not taking on additional patients.

Capacities in local health care, fire, paramedic, police and CMHA services may need investment & support from the Village.

We will unreservedly support investments in these and other community services provided such a need is communicated in a transparent, collaborative way.

Has the Village satisfied itself that there is adequate capacity to support this additional population, or what costs might be involved to increase these supports if needed?

The NOAH Development Proposal mentions multiple subsequent phases (Pages 2, 3); which would exacerbate the concerns of all the points we've raised above.

We are interested in supporting development of capacity in the Village to service seniors; and we hope that Council rejects the proposed by-law amendment in favor of a more appropriate concept that addresses the concerns we and many other residents have raised.

We formally request that Council reject the application to amend the Municipal Zoning By-law 89-002.

Sincerely,  
Chuck & Krista Melanson

---

<sup>1</sup> StatsCan: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series  
<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85f0033m/85f0033m2009020-eng.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Savoie, J. (ed.). 2008. "Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime"