

From: [Lindsey Green](#)
To: [Elisha Milne](#)
Subject: FW: 24 Stacked Townhouses Proposed for Main St E Dundalk
Date: September 12, 2024 2:03:06 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Samantha Parent [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 1:00 PM
To: Lindsey Green <lgreen@southgate.ca>
Subject: Re: 24 Stacked Townhouses Proposed for Main St E Dundalk

Hi Lindsey,

I would like to submit my thoughts and questions concerns about the townhouse proposal (Application C17-24 271 Main St E Inc. (Cale and Reg Barnes). Agent: Mr. Shayne Connors, MHBC & Mr. Kory Chisholm, MHBC Roll: 420711000119700).

Please forward these to council and the appropriate parties. I have many questions...I also have questions/comments about the growth of this community as a whole.

1. I have townhouse ownership experience in Barrie, where I lived prior to moving to Dundalk. I lived in 91 Coughlin, which at the time were brand new builds that I bought right from the developer. Since moving, there was a fire in the complex that spread between units. Thankfully the Barrie fire service was well prepared and responded so quickly that the spread was largely deterred. Is our fire department prepared for this? Can multiple trucks gain the access they need should there be a fire? What kind of fire separation is proposed between units? If it's the bare minimum, those owners deserve better in my opinion. Some of these new builds go up and spread so fast. In rural areas, are we prepared to fight such a fire with 24 units, and potentially upwards of 100 people and pets all living in such a confined space? I would like to hear more about this. The safety of these lives is way more important than seeing how many units can possibly be squeezed into one town lot.

2. I have concerns about the location being so close to their neighbours, looking down into their yards, due to using a residential lot in town. Can a larger empty lot that has WAY more space around it not be used for such a project instead, with it's own green space, adequate parking, and privacy and noise separation? If this lot is green lit for such a massive profit-making opportunity, what is to stop other developers from buying family homes, tearing them down, and putting in huge unit projects like this all around town? Many of our residential lots in this town are generous in size. If this type of project, where someone is able to make many millions off of one residential lot in town, is approved...then I see the future of other developers taking opportunity to do the same. Is this the community plan we want to have? Where long-term residents are driven out because instead of having neighbours, they have the noise and lack of privacy of having tons of people sandwiched together right beside their home? Generations of families leaving? Is that the plan? I think council needs to seriously consider if this is the future they want to build in this town. If you drive out people who do have a pride of living here and investing in this community, and you bring new people who have fast-built homes without consideration for those residents to have a pride of place in their living situation, who is then investing in the community with pride and excitement? Who will volunteer? Who will run events? What is the vision? The plan should not be focused solely on homes. It should be also focused on a safe, accessible, and thriving community for *everyone* - new and old residents alike.

3. I have concerns about costs for buyers and what kind of buyer protections will exist. They are proposed to be affordable. I am assuming that is just meaning they will be sold at market value for these units, and not less. But I also assume there will be a type of condo corp involved to maintain the property — which will add more fees. Sometimes first time home owners don't know how to adequately budget for all these hidden fees and just look at the mortgage cost. Some condo fees can be pretty high. Will people actually access these units as “affordable housing” and is this actually solving a need for housing that is affordable in our community? If not, this should not even be considered.

4. In my opinion, after reviewing the proposal, 24 units is greedy from the developer trying to get every dollar they

can off this land...and not in the best interest of our community or the people trying to access affordable homes. I am very much in support of the creation of affordable housing in this community. But those people also deserve access to safe housing, adequate parking spaces, and green space that is readily and safely accessible too. If any such project goes forward, I believe a crosswalk needs to be installed at that location to grant children safe passage to the park across County Road 9. Anything less than that is not responsible and a tragic accident waiting to happen. Who is going to pay for the crosswalk?

5. What is the developers background and interest in creating accessible, affordable housing? I request that this info be presented to the community please.

6. Are there any Eco-initiatives in this plan? Affordable housing should also be responsibly built and eco-friendly. This is the way of the future in developments. I would like to see our community be more innovative in this area, working with green developers. I would like to see this as a consideration by council for all builds in this area. Developers should be responsible and mindful to our local habitats and the health of our ecosystems, with as little damage to our historic trees as possible. We need mature trees. We need to consider the destruction of the natural habitats in this area to throw up as many houses as possible in the short-term, is not a responsible long-term solution to a vibrant community plan.

8. One handicapped parking space and two visitor parking spaces is not in any way adequate. Where will all these guests park? What about units with multiple vehicles? During winter holidays, when almost every unit has company over, where will anyone park with consideration made to plowing? A proposal of this scale requires an actual parking lot in my opinion. This should be non-negotiable. It's obvious they will all park in the Foodland / Jug City parking lot...and that lot being filled with non-shoppers is not acceptable either. There is no capacity for that at our one and only local grocer to lose parking space.

9. As we increase the housing, are we responsibly increasing access to services/resources? Overall, developing this town any further without access to essential resources is irresponsible. We need to be way more ahead with our planning. I have spoken to so many new residents who want to leave (or left already) because they didn't realize there are so little essential amenities and services in this community. Why are we growing without making sure the growth is responsible?

10. Having affordable housing is only one piece of the pie to ensuring residents of our community can thrive - they also need accessible education services, health care, jobs, and adequate infrastructure. I think we need to slow down the housing (so many Flato units sit empty currently) and green light building other community resources first to grow the local economy.

11. Housing insecurity is a real rapidly growing issue. There needs to be a tiered plan and resources available to help people at every level they may be facing the threat of poverty and/or losing their homes. Affordable housing is one thing, but we do not have local shelters. What happens if these people who supposedly moved here to find affordable housing, cannot afford this a year down the line? Where will they go next? Many people are a job loss or an injury away from losing their homes. They need access to financial literacy programs, family support services, anger management, rehab programs, local jobs with opportunity for growth and advancement, transportation to be able to access work and school and programs, in short - they need services to be able to get themselves into better situations. We need to provide access to resources for people in these situations by addressing what tools are they lacking in order to be able to get into better situations? Throwing up more homes that are not actually very affordable is not going to help any of these issues and create more community problems in the long run.

Thanks!
Samantha Parent

Homeowner, business owner in Dundalk