## ED-24-45

From: Carrie Douglas <M.F.I.P.P.A. 14(1)> Sent: Monday, April 1, 2024 1:28 PM To: Bradley Marks <<u>BMarks@oshawa.ca</u>> Cc: clerks <<u>clerks@oshawa.ca</u>>; \* Council <<u>council@oshawa.ca</u>> Subject: Objection to Proposed Icon Development at Harmony/Pinecrest

We are very concerned about the impact the above development will have on our neighborhood.

A few specific concerns would be

1 - the density of the proposed development as it does not fit with our current neighborhood footprint/density 2-the entrance/exit onto Pinecrest Road only as our current neighborhood is not designed for hundreds of extra vehicles per day ie. no sidewalks/curbs/steep hill incline with s-corner (horrible in the winter) 3-pedestrian safety concern with increased vehicle traffic

I look forward to your hearing your thoughts on this matter and your support of our neighborhood will not be forgotten!

Larry and Carrie Douglas <M.F.I.P.P.A. 14(1)>

## From: Matthew Davison < M.F.I.P.P.A. 14(1)>>

Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2024 10:40 AM

**To:** <u>Mayor@Oshawa.ca</u>; John Neal <<u>JNeal@oshawa.ca</u>>; Rosemary McConkey <<u>RMcConkey@oshawa.ca</u>>; Tito-Dante Marimpietri <<u>TDMarimpietri@Oshawa.ca</u>>; Jim Lee (Councillor) <<u>JALee@oshawa.ca</u>>; Bob Chapman <<u>BChapman@oshawa.ca</u>>; Bradley Marks <<u>BMarks@oshawa.ca</u>>; Rick Kerr <<u>RKerr@oshawa.ca</u>>; Derek Giberson <<u>DGiberson@oshawa.ca</u>>; Brian Nicholson <<u>BNicholson@oshawa.ca</u>>; John Gray <<u>JGray@oshawa.ca</u>>; clerks <<u>clerks@oshawa.ca</u>>; \* Council <<u>council@oshawa.ca</u>>

**Subject:** Revised Applications to Amend Zoning By-law 60-94 and for Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision, Icon Harmony Limited

Good morning respected members of Council.

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Matthew Davison. I have lived in Oshawa for 15 years.

My wife and I (along with our two children) recently purchased a home at <M.F.I.P.P.A. 14(1)> in Oshawa.

After spending time with our new neighbours this summer, the gravity of the situation regarding the development being proposed at Harmony and Pinecrest has more than peaked my interest.

The idea of having almost 100 homes built who need access to Pinecrest Rd is unsettling.

This is one of the very last streets in the region that has kept its original charm. There are no sidewalks or curbs, the streets are narrow, the trees are very mature. It is quiet. Not a single resident wants this to change.

We spent a significant (to me anyway) amount of money to purchase this home as it reminds us of the homes we grew up in back in the 70's-80's. We have also just spent another large sum of money in renovations as this was supposed to be the last home we ever buy. That is now in question.

Many of these houses were built in the late 1950's. The simple truth is that the infrastructure on the street cannot support the traffic that will surely come if the residents in the new community need access to Pinecrest. Not to mention that the proposed entrance on the south will become incredibly congested and unsafe for those of us who use that access point. Both pedestrian and vehicle traffic will be impacted significantly.

As a Neighbourhood Association (**Maxwell Village Neighbourhood Association**) our concerns focused on the increased traffic throughout the community and the safety issues that will inevitably arise from that increase. We (as well as the Developer), both

requested direct access to Harmony from the new development. We also further suggested that a reduction in density would lessen traffic and therefore safety concerns. Unfortunately, the city stated they reviewed all of our concerns and justified all of their findings.

Our group has articulately made arguments about the below yet we have been ignored. We would all like to know why. Does anyone on council care about any of the below issues? For the families who live on Pinecrest and Swiss Heights? For the effort we are all putting in to preserve one last street in the city?

Some of the issues being ignored are;

1. Safety concerns arising from the additional traffic. Pinecrest simply cannot be an access road to the new development. It is not equipped. Pinecrest access is at the top of an already challenging hill with limited visibility. To increase traffic here would cause significant issues. There could be traffic jams simply trying to leave the subdivision. This is unacceptable.

2. Parking overflow into the existing community. There is no room for parking on the side of the street. This would become a huge problem. Among other things, our lawns come right up to the edge of the street.

3. Pedestrian safety throughout the community. The street is hardly wide enough now for two cars to pass each other in the event there is someone walking on the street. Adding more traffic to this area will be a significant problem.

4. Pedestrian safety for residents of the new development, especially children attempting to cross Harmony Road. 100 new homes = 200 residents at a minimum. All coming and going at the same time.

5. The impact on the existing streets and infrastructure. Pinecrest has no infrastructure to support this kind of traffic.

6. The costs to the city if it is determined it's necessary to add curbs and sidewalks to Pinecrest and Swiss Heights. Not to mention the fact that no residents want this. This will destroy the charm of the street.

7. Impact on local schools – overcrowding. Pierre Elliotte Trudeau is already over capacity. Where will the kids go?

8. This neighbourhood is noted by the city as 'desirable' — what will the impact of the development be after completion? Might I suggest; 'Less Desirable'.

9. Heritage value: one of the first post-war subdivisions. We are getting close to being 100 years old. Does that not matter to anyone?

Thank you for taking the time to read this. If you have made it this far, please know that I understand that things must change. Building new homes is important to the city. I would challenge that there is plenty of space to the North that would not impact our incredible street and neighbourhood and I very much feel for my neighbours across the

street as every house on that side is going to have unwelcome neighbours behind them.

Aside from that however, we urge you to reconsider the Pinecrest access point. There must be access from Harmony Rd coming North and South to the new community. If the proposed community has the ability to access Harmony from the North and South, where all of the required infrastructure can be built appropriately, both communities can exist together.

After reviewing the sequence of events to get us to the meeting on April 8<sup>th</sup> I do find it odd how the meetings have been scheduled at incredibly inconvenient times. Is it intentional to reduce the pressure from those who live in the community? Those who vote and pay an incredible amount of taxes? Those who likely commute to work and cannot get to an early afternoon meeting?

The scheduled EDSC meeting is at 1:30, currently is not available to the public and on a date where there will be a total eclipse of the sun. Could this meeting be moved to a more accessible date and time? Many of us on the street not only live in Oshawa but we work here. We have hundreds of employees who live here and commute from here. This is our home. This matters to us. As elected officials, I naturally assume you would like to hear all of our concerns.

Respectfully.

Matt Davison

Economic Development and Services Committee

April 2, 2024

RE: ED 24-42

Dear Committee:

I have expressed concerns on this application on a redevelopment of 1081,1093 Harmony Road last year, specifically the impact that the proposed development would have on the existing established neighborhood.

. significant increased traffic on Swiss Hts

. increased pedestrians jaywalking Harmony to catch southbound bus

I was fortunate to have meetings with the Region (Glyn Reedman) and City of Oshawa (Renjit Gill) who listened to concerns but both felt it wasn't in their respective jurisdiction to resolve traffic accessing Harmony Road. ie a City Problem that would need the Region to alleviate.

I believe:

the problem can be solved by a separate signaled access from the new development.

the problem can be reduced by keeping to the current zoning R1A

the problem can be eliminated by keeping the status quo

At a meeting I attended last summer in the city offices , both the Maxwel Neighbourhood Assoc and Icon representatives expressed support for a dedicated signaled access onto Harmony. The proposal I see today has <u>no such access</u> and <u>there is an increase in units form that proposed initially.</u>

I understand that any change comes with good and bad features.... However, in this instance I see

5 real options:

- 1) Status Quo.. three homes with three separate accesses onto Harmony
- Keep the zoning R1A... 26 new detached homes and 100% increase in traffic on Swiss Height and Pinecrest
- 3) Keep the zoning R1A with access onto Harmony... 26 homes and no increase in traffic on Swiss Hts and Pinecrest
- 4) Rezone and allow for access onto Harmony... 78 units and minimum impact on Swiss Hts and Pinecrest and problems with pedestrians crossing Harmony
- 5) Rezone without a new access... 78 units and 300% increase in traffic on Swiss Hts and Pinecrest and problems with pedestrians crossing Harmony

With increased traffic there will always be increased risk. In "Risk Management", if you can't eliminate a risk one tries to reduce it. I am flabbergasted that each proposal I have seen increases the risk.

I would encourage the committee to think on any proposal rather than simply follow process flowsheets. I do not see any reason to change the zoning to allow for a proposal such as this one. This is shoehorning too big of a development into an existing well functioning neighbourhood... It is not a good plan. Yes the current neighborhood it was planned in the 1950's and 1960's. That does not mean it is bad. A lot of things from the 50's and 60's function better than what I see today.

Personally I feel Option 2 has merit.

Thank you for your attention. I trust collectively you can make a good choice.

J Allan Arnott Citizen, Resident < M.F.I.P.P.A. 14(1)>