

Attention: Brant County Planning Staff
and County Council

Re: Application # ZBA 38-20 DN

Development of # 6 Maple Ave. N.

From - Mike Robinet



① Quick Review of the Previous
2021 Proposal

80 condos in two very large
buildings with a three storey
height.

The Key Problems of this Proposal

- ① The resident density was too high
which would have negatively
impacted the quantity and quality
of the water for the neighbourhood
and beyond.
- ② The property couldn't handle the
large number of vehicles that
would be on the site.

- ③ Our home at #10 Maple N. is just north of the subject property.
 We would be the most negatively affected.
 There was even a strong possibility due to our proximity to one of the structures, we would be often in shadow, especially during the winter months.

A petition was circulated in opposition to the proposal. It overwhelmingly illustrated strong resistance to the proposal.

We all know some kind of development must occur with #6 Maple, but it should be appropriate for the neighbours and the community as a whole.

I offered 2 suggestions:

- #1 A seniors' complex of 40 linked homes in groups of four.
 I used the floor-plan of those at the 'Seasons' retirement community in Brantford.
 These are single storey, one bedroom homes without any stairs to negotiate. They

don't have a basement but each unit has its own garage. They are intended to each accommodate a senior couple.

2 I proposed a cul-de-sac into the # 6 Maple property to allow access to the number of single-family detached homes that would fit on the site.

Both of these suggestions would mitigate the problems mentioned above concerning the 80 condos proposal.

* Now - the present 2022 proposal:

(B)

The applicant is seeking permission for a zoning change so they can construct 47 townhouses.

This should be rejected by the County Council.

It is inappropriate as the resident density will still be too high.

I was told by the #6 Maple N. property owner, that the planner was seriously considering my seniors complex plan and the single-family detached homes approach.

That is not what I see in the current 47 townhouse proposal. They seem to think, because I said 40 seniors units, they could get close to that figure and I would be happy. But this is like comparing apples to oranges.

The seniors complex would have $40 \times 2 = 80$ residents.

The 47 townhouses plan would likely have many more.

Several of these homes will likely have multi-generational families.

Let's say the number per unit is in the 4 to 8 resident range.

$$4 \times 47 = 188$$

to

$$8 \times 47 = 376$$

Thus the range is likely to be far too high for this property. It will be problematic to the neighbourhood and beyond.

Also the current proposal is laid out to accommodate parking for about 98 vehicles if we consider the drive way in front of each unit and the visitor parking spaces.

This will not be enough. The overflow will negatively affect the neighbouring properties.

So, I can't support this most recent proposal.

At the information meeting held by the planner on April 27, Dave Aston stated 6 single-family detached homes would be allowed on the property.

Knowing this and the fact the resident density must remain low due to the well-septic system, here is what I propose for # 6 Maple N.

Rather than 47 townhouses let's:

- ① Put in the senior's complex
- ② Put in the number of single-family detached homes allowed.

Both of these plans is acceptable. They are in the low resident density range required.

It would be great to have the senior's complex. Residents would have good access to the commercial core of the village.

The single-detached family homes would as be a fine asset to the existing neighbourhood. I would like to see the cul-de-sac named 'Miller Lane' to recognize that this property of initially part of the Jacob Miller farm.

Both would allow the property owner, planner and builder to make a profit.

Let's do what is right for the property, its neighbours and the community.