

## **Negative Impact: Removal of Minimum Lot Width and its Effect on our R-C2 Properties**

### **1. Impact of Built Form—**

- Developers wanting to maximize the square footage of 2 dwelling units within one detached residence, would create buildings which are not contextually sensitive, overshadow adjacent properties and detract from our community's character and quality of life.
- The scale of such homes would be out of character with the surrounding streetscape and would create a massing effect.
- Even at 42% of lot coverage without a garage, putting up 2 massive infills where only 1 bungalow currently exists raises issues around drainage and its effect on the foundations of the older bungalows which are adjacent.
- Updating the bungalows rather than removing them is not only environmentally friendly, it allows for aging in place; a secondary suite on an undivided 50 ft lot is already permitted.

### **2. Impact on Amenities and Services—**

- as we are not a "whole community," there are many facilities and services which are not available in our community
- we do not have a community school or any daycare facilities to speak of
- our current playgrounds are substandard and potentially unsafe
- we have both affordable and subsidized housing within our community, and are very multicultural in our makeup; our residents have been requesting access to programs and services through our community association. Because we are operating at 75% plus capacity in our community hall, we are unable to provide them, or subsidize them through the use of our hall. We are not able to accommodate our current residents' needs, let alone if we quadruple the population of our low density housing.
- we do not have an off leash area within our community, and no place to provide one
- we do not have bike lanes or connected pathways in our community, despite years of lobbying for traffic calming and walkable spaces
- we have limited services and facilities in our community for the current number of residents, let alone tripling the residents in our low density residential housing

-- what provisions will the City put in place for police/fire services as the population increases in our communities?

-- will there be changes to ward boundaries as our communities increase in density, or will our voices just become more diluted?

**All of these need to be considered when adding density, and many of them cannot be addressed when the density is added to established communities which do not already have facilities and services in place.**

### **3. Impact on our Urban Canopy—**

-- as a community, we have gone on record as supporting a private tree bylaw to help maintain our urban canopy

-- as developers look to maximize living space for 2 dwelling units within new builds, we risk the loss of the private trees which make our community attractive, add to community character, and enhance our quality of life

-- we are also concerned about the loss of the natural habitat for our bird population

-- removing trees in our established community to allow for larger developments, also has an effect on surrounding properties; the shade provided by trees is an environmentally friendly means of reducing interior temperatures, and evergreens help insulate homes from winter winds

-- Low Density Residential Housing Guidelines for Established Communities advocates in section 4.6 that *New developments in Established Communities should enhance the streetscape, through the retention of healthy mature trees and planting*—this is difficult to do when developers attempt to maximize living space to accommodate 2 dwelling units in 1 new infill

### **4. Impact on Movement—**

-- we are not a whole/walkable community

-- we do not have existing bike paths (they have been requested as a quick and simple form of traffic calming)

-- we are down to 1 bus route which is not high volume, and we have no direct bus route to the Westbrook LRT

-- we have been lobbying for better transit connections through surrounding communities and a direct connection to the Westbrook LRT; it has not happened to date, and the City refuses to make any promises

-- bike paths and transit access need to be enhanced in our community in conjunction with any increase in density

-- safe, pedestrian friendly, walkable spaces also need to be created throughout our community before more density is introduced. As part of the recent engagement for Street Capacity Guidelines, 100% of the communities in attendance agreed **That traffic calming which is agreeable to the community needs to be in place BEFORE density is increased within existing communities.** We have submitted several traffic calming proposals with City staff over the last few years, and want assurances that traffic calming will be a priority before mandating increased density.

**The negative impact of built form, limited amenities and services, removal of our urban canopy, and our current limited options for movement are our biggest concerns with regards to removing the minimum lot widths for secondary suites and the drastic increase in density it has the potential to produce in Rutland Park.**