

DATE: June 19, 2021

TO: Tecumseh Town Council

FROM: Tamra Tobin Teno  
[REDACTED] Little River Blvd

RE: Briday Proposed Development for 12433 Dillon Drive  
Teno 4<sup>th</sup> submission  
Regular Council Meeting on June 22, 2021

---

I am responding to Mr. Ublansky's revised proposal wherein he suggests his offer of a reduction in height of one of the buildings and the resulting change in density from 63 units to 55 is sufficient to address the concerns of the neighbourhood taxpayers. It is not. While the height reduction is welcomed, the overall proposal is still much too dense and still non-compliant with the governing Official Plan (OP).

Here are the non-compliant features:

<b>Tecumseh Official Plan</b>	<b>Briday's non-compliant development</b>
S. 3.3.1(ii) – permitted medium density residential units do NOT include stacked townhouses	Briday wants stacked townhouses
S. 3.3.1(iii)(a) - medium density developments should have access onto an arterial or collector road	Briday's Plan has access onto a LOCAL road.
S. 22.11(d) – The Town is to facilitate small scale residential infilling and intensification	Briday's Plan is not small scale
S. 2.11(c) – The Town is to maintain and improve the quality of life for the residents by preserving the existing small-town atmosphere	Briday's plan does not do this. The proposed big-city style is not small town and the density is more befitting Toronto, rather than a small town.
S. 3.3.8 - infilling means a residential development of a similar scale, density and use...	Briday's Plan is not of a similar scale or density. Please see below discussion.

Section 3.3.8 of the OP says that infilling means a residential development of a similar scale, density and use on vacant lots or undeveloped lands within built up areas. Mr. Ublansky's proposal, which Mr. Hillman endorses, is not of a similar scale or density. The protection of an existing neighbourhood character takes priority in considering an intensification project and in this regard Mr. Ublansky's attempts have been minimal and unsatisfactory. Please see the charts below for comparison figures:

SCALE OF OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD	SCALE OF BRIDAY'S PLAN
97% single family <b>detached</b> houses	100% <b>attached</b> townhouses
<b>23%</b> are 2 storeys	<b>100%</b> are 2 storeys

DENSITY OF OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD	DENSITY OF BRIDAY'S PLAN
Density is <b>4.62</b> units per acre	<p>Briday's property <u>cannot</u> build on the park land, the storm water management pond and the Little River access corridor. Thus, there is <b>only a buildable area of 4.87 acres</b></p> <p>55 units = <b>11.29</b> units per acre.</p> <p>This is <b>245% more</b> than the surrounding neighbourhood.</p>

As you can see from the above, Mr. Ublansky's proposal is still not right for our neighbourhood. For comparison purposes I'd to like to discuss the precedent set by the Town in allowing the Arbor Grove development on Carmelita Court in the St. Anne's school neighbourhood. This development agreement was approved only 6 years ago (By-law 2015-38 dated April 14, 2015). Fully **5** of the current council, including the Mayor, were part of the Council which voted to approve that development.

The below table compares the St. Anne's neighbourhood prior to the development with our neighbourhood:

ST. ANNE'S NEIGHBOURHOOD	OUR OLD VICTORIA NEIGHBOURHOOD
Infilling of a surplus school site	Infilling of a surplus school site
Existing stable residential built-up area	Existing stable residential built-up area
Majority of the residences are 1 storey with some 2 storeys	Majority of the residences are 1 storey with some 2 storeys
Density of neighbourhood <u>prior</u> to the Arbor Grove development = 5.2 units per acre	Density of neighbourhood <u>prior</u> to Briday's proposal: 4.62 units per acre (slightly less than the Carmelita neighbourhood)
Located within Community Improvement area	<b><u>Not</u></b> located with Community Improvement area

The Arbor Grove ("Carmelita") development was approved by the Council at the time because it was within the Community Improvement Plan (CIP) area where the Town wants more density to compliment and enliven the main street area. According to Mr. Hillman's report at the time, the density of the Carmelita development was appropriate because:

- the CIP "encourages the development of higher density residential uses within the CIP area... to ensure the street is active and alive all days of the week and all times of the day."
- the proposed Carmelita development would satisfy the "Big Moves" the Town identified for its key design elements defining the CIP concept.
- The CIP document identifies the importance of the redevelopment of the former St. Anne High School lands, to the rejuvenation of the entire CIP area.
- There is merit in having regard for the **range, scale, location and nature of surrounding uses, the geographic location** of the proposed development along with current policy initiatives encouraging standards that support more compact and efficient development. (My emphasis)
- The proposed density was a moderate increase from the neighbourhood.

Based on the above, Mr. Hillman said the density increase for the Carmelita development in the CIP area was appropriate. As such, following the Administration's suggestion, the Council at the time approved a moderate **30%** density increase for the neighbourhood.

Now compare that to our Old Victoria neighbourhood which is *not* in the CIP area. The density increase that Mr. Ublansky wants, and which Mr. Hillman supports is **245%** more. Why does the Mayor's CIP neighbourhood only have a 30% increase in density and our neighbourhood is threatened with a 245% increase in density? It is incomprehensible that Mr. Hillman is now saying that this 245% increase is moderate.

For your ease of reference in comparing, please see the below table:

CARMELITA DEVELOPMENT	BRIDAY DEVELOPMENT
Part of CIP area	Not part of CIP area
7.1 acres ( <b>larger</b> than the Victoria neighbourhood)	5.66 acres, with only 4.87 buildable acres
48 units	55 units
Density: 6.7 units per acre	11.29 units per acre
Percentage increase in density: 30%	Percentage increase in density: 245%

Council approved the 30% increase in density for the Carmelita development because it was in the CIP area and important to the CIP main street initiative. We are NOT in the CIP area, and yet Mr. Hillman says that a 245% increase in density is a moderate increase and is suitable as small-scale infilling for us. There is absolutely NOTHING that can justify that. Nothing.

Our neighbourhood deserves the same respect as the Mayor's neighbourhood. We would support a 30% density increase. **That would mean only 6.0 units per acre resulting in a total of 30 units on Briday's buildable acres.**

CARMELITA NEIGHBOURHOOD RECEIVED	OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD SHOULD RECEIVE
Density increase: 30%	Carmelita Density precedent: 30%
# of units built: 48	Applying the Density precedent # of units: 30

Based on all of the above, Mr. Ublansky's proposed revision is still non-compliant and definitely unsuitable for our neighbourhood. The precedent of the Carmelita density is only 6 years old and 5 of the current counsellors were part of the Council that approved it. We are asking that this Council apply that same precedent for us. Like the Mayor's neighbourhood, we deserve better.