

From: Amini.Jannette
To: Amini.Jannette
Subject: FW: Zoning By-Law Amendment D14-231-2011 247 Portsmouth Ave
Date: Tuesday, January 24, 2012 10:12:34 AM

From: rlysaght@sympatico.ca [mailto:]
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2012 7:24 PM
To: Chan, Calvin
Subject: Zoning By-Law Amendment D14-231-2011 247 Portsmouth Ave

I am writing to provide comments on the proposed amendment for the above-referenced lot. Although I support the idea of affordable housing for seniors, I believe that the plan for this site is misguided and should **not** be approved for a number of reasons.

Although the lot is on Portsmouth Avenue and close to the health unit and the school board, it sits between residential properties. Particularly if the side yard allowances are reduced, the establishment of a commercial property of the proposed size at this site would greatly diminish the look and atmosphere of the area, and affect the quality of life for those holding nearby properties.

The establishment of a parking lot for 16 units on the site with reduced side yard clearance would adversely affect the environment of the residential neighbourhood, both from an air quality perspective and esthetically.

I am not aware of the extra burden that a large facility would place on the sewage and water drainage in the area, but feel this must be adequately explored.

As a site for senior living, there is little to recommend this location, given that there are no local retail outlets, no public parks within walking distance (Lake Ontario Park - 1.4km away) and even the Senior's Centre (1.2 km away) is not within walking distance for many seniors. The only advantage to this site is that it is on a bus route.

Finally, I am aware that the developers promoting this project has been less than forthcoming in presenting the project to local groups, and aggressive in seeking support. I understand that that the costs associated with residency in the proposed facility are not "affordable" for most on fixed incomes, and thus there seems to be no convincing argument in support of this development from a community perspective. An application that is not fairly described or promoted raises concerns about how the applicants will manage the business, and whether they in fact can serve as "good neighbours" and conscientious business people.

I should note that while I live in the neighbourhood, my property is not directly abutted by the proposed re-zoning site, and my property value would not adversely affected by the project. I do feel that it is wrong for this neighbourhood, however, and that it has been approached in a disingenuous manner. I hope that the Planning Committee will consider carefully and reject this application.

Rosemary Lysaght, Ph.D.
6 Authors Lane