

**THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF SEVERN
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**



**Thursday, June 18, 2015
Council Chambers - Municipal Office**

7:00 P.M.

AGENDA

ADDENDUM AGENDA

G. CORRESPONDENCE (*for information*)

Page #

3 Zoning By-law Amendment - 3979 Sandcastle Court

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (a) Bill & Alma Hill | 1 |
| (b) Lyn Shoniker | 2 |
| (c) Couchiching Shores Ratepayers Association | 3 |
| (d) Ellen Cohen | 4-5 |
| (e) Joe & Nancy Wise | 6-8 |

June 12, 2015

Mayor Burkett and Members of Council

Re: June 18 meeting for application Z-15-03 3979 Sandcastle Court

This letter is to express our continued opposition to this rezoning.

The upstairs of the home is rented out to full time tenants. They are very nice people and although our interaction has been limited it has been friendly. As an example they wondered about buying our canoe. I explained that it was our friends but I did loan them life jackets, told them where the paddles and safety kit is and said they were welcome to borrow it any time they wanted.

The registered owner, Rami Friedman and I have had various conversations, again quite cordial. About a month ago he was out admiring the work we had done by our waterfront (approved by the MNR) and I provided him with several details and suggestions as he is looking to redone their lakefront. His father and another contractor joined the discussion, again commenting on how well it looked and asking questions.

Later we got talking and Rami told me the septic system did not pass and they would have to “extend it”, but the y still wanted to proceed with the accessory unit for the care giver which would give two rooms for his grandmother and care giver and “the other three” for him and his family when they came up.

To be clear, our concern is not the people but what they are attempting to do. This is single family mostly retirement community more or less an “island” and an idyllic place to live. If the application is approved there will be three units in that house, which is not in keeping with the zoning or our interpretation of what an accessory apartment is designed for.

We believe Council has the power under current legislation to deny this request and would ask that you do so respecting the wishes of the community that has been expressed by many others in addition to us.

We would respectfully request that BEFORE any decision is made that the building inspector do a thorough inspection of the ENTIRE house. Further that a report be presented to Council with the findings at a subsequent meeting open to the public so we all know the facts.

Regards,
Bill and Alma Hill
3977 Sandcastle Court
Washago Ontario
L0K 2B0

CC Sharon Goerke
Andrew Fyfe

From: Basslake(Shoniker) [<mailto:basslk@rogers.com>]
Sent: June-14-15 2:13 PM
To: Andrew Fyfe; Mayor Mike Burkett
Cc: CSRA Board; Bill Hill; Debbie; Home Computer
Subject: 3979 Sandcastle Court - Application
Importance: High

Sirs:

The following information has come to light as of yesterday via Mrs. Joseph Friedman, wife of the owner at the above noted address. Mrs. Friedman stated that there are currently 3 units at the above noted address occupied as follows:

**Upper Unit is rented to a couple and their child who are not related to the Friedmans.
Secondary Unit on the main floor is occupied by herself and her husband.
Third Unit on the main floor is occupied by her son, his wife and their 9 year old son.
They currently have 4 bathrooms between the three units.**

No statement of an elderly grandmother was mentioned and in fact Mrs. Friedman stated that she herself would only be in attendance on weekends or extended vacation times.

During the first meeting Mr. Friedman stated that he needed a unit for his 103 year old Kosher Mother. The Application being presented again to Council states "an accessory apartment". An "Accessory Apartment" is defined as follows:

"An Accessory Apartment is a common name for a basement apartment, a secondary suite, or another form of secondary residential unit in a house that contains no more than one other unit. An Accessory Apartment: consists of a self-contained set of rooms that can be used as an independent unit."

Due to the fact it has been established that there presently exists three units at the above noted address; for this very reason this application should be quashed.

If Mr. Friedman again denies his wife's statement it is incumbent upon this Honourable Council to seek the truth/facts before making any decision on the application by way of a sworn affidavit from Mr. Friedman or Site inspection by your Building Department. If this application is granted at the meeting on June 18, 2015, there is nothing stopping Mr. Friedman to go ahead with his original plan to 4 plex this dwelling as he stated earlier when he took possession of the property.

I trust the foregoing will be given serious consideration.

**Lyn Shoniker,
3985 Sandcastle Crt.**



COUCHICHING SHORES RATEPAYERS' ASSOCIATION

June 12 2015

Mayor Burkett and Members of Council

Re: Rezoning 3979 Sandcastle Court Meeting June 18

This letter will reaffirm that the Couchiching Shores Ratepayers Association continues to object to the rezoning application.

The upper floor of this home is currently rented out to fulltime residents. While those that have met the tenants indicate they are nice quiet people the fact remains that approval of the application will put three units in the home based on the plans that have been shared by the owner. The units are the upper floor, the accessory unit possibly for a care giver for an elderly relative and then living space for the relative, or other family members.

In previous correspondence the Association has stated that our contention is that the Township has the tools available under the Strong Communities Through Affordable Housing Act, The Townships Official Plan and Zoning By law supported by the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement to deny this application.

It has been suggested that the Association is reading these documents selectively. On two occasions a request has been made for an explanation as to why our understanding is not correct. We have yet to receive a response.

The Association has its Annual General Meeting on Saturday June 20. The application is on our agenda because as you are aware 61 people signed a petition opposing the rezoning and they are requesting an update. We have a responsibility to our members to provide them with the information. There does not appear to be an agenda on the Township's website for this meeting or any staff reports. Will they be available before the meeting? The notice about the June 18th meeting indicated that while not the statutory public meeting that people or a public body will be able to comment so possibly some of our concerns can be addressed then.

We look forward to hearing from you.

**Regards,
Debbie Barnett
Chair
Couchiching Shores Ratepayers Association**

**c.c. Sharon Goerke Clerk
Andrew Fyfe Director of Planning**

Sharon Goerke

From: Ellen Cohen <sandcastle3985@rogers.com>
Sent: June-15-15 10:17 AM
To: Andrew Fyfe; Sharon Goerke
Cc: Mike Burkett; rstevens@twonshipofsevern.com; Judith Cox; Henry Sander
Subject: Rezoning 3979 Sandcastle Court - meeting June 18

Importance: High

My letter is to acknowledge the notice of meeting regarding a rezoning request from the owners of 3979 Sandcastle Court and to voice my objection to their application. I ask that this letter become part of the deliberation of council and that I be allowed to address the issue of rezoning at the public meeting on June 18, 2015.

- I am very concerned that council would even consider a change of zoning before there has been an inspection or confirmation of what has already been built.
- I am very concerned that council would consider a change of zoning that could have a negative effect to our environment, particularly if poor/inadequate septic systems are in place.
- I am very concerned that council would not consider the impact on the waterfront based on the increased number of people and boats at one single dwelling.
- I object to the fact that council would consider a change of zoning for the applicants, especially considering their plans and their reasons for requesting rezoning have changed multiple times, certainly since their original application.
- I object because they have completed construction on multiple units before rezoning has been approved.
- I object because rezoning our street not only changes the character of our neighbourhood, but negatively effects property values.

This is my take on what has taken place at 3979 Sandcastle Court this year:

1. During delivery of construction materials earlier this year, we observed 4 brand new toilets in the open garage, some believe there were five.
2. During construction, it was obvious from the materials being delivered that the construction being undertaken was major and possibly beyond what was originally requested in their application to the township.
3. The applicants have, since approximately the end of March, rented the top floor of this property to full-time tenants, a man and a woman with a dog.
4. The applicants have already built and completed two additional separate apartments on the lower level of the property: one for Joe Friedman and his wife, Ruth. The other for Remi Friedman, his wife and their 9-year old son.
5. The applicants have stated to neighbours that this is a fact.
6. Since the end of March, the applicants often choose to park their cars on the grass of the township parkette in the court area of Sandcastle Court, rather than in their driveway or even on the side of the road. They park blocking the community mail box. This is not only when they are having construction on their property, but overnight as well. This behaviour already indicates a change in our neighbourhood whereby too many cars at one property because of multiple units has given the applicants the need to park elsewhere, in fact on township property, an area that is for recreational use. It is not a parking lot.
7. The applicants have not increased the capacity and/or efficiency of their septic system thereby impacting the environment and the health of our neighbourhood.
8. The applicants have changed their 'story' several times in an effort to convince council that what they are doing is within guidelines and by-laws of Severn Township when in fact what they have done is construct multiple apartments in a zoned single family dwelling. In fact, on this past weekend, Remi stated that they had 2 sofas

delivered, one for his unit and one for his father's. He was happy to say that one sofa wouldn't fit in his unit but it fit in his father's unit.

9. The applicants' original contention was that they needed an accessory apartment for their aged mother/grandmother, plus one for her caregiver. To our knowledge, there is no aged mother/grandmother. Not once has she been referred to in front of neighbours, even in extended conversations. Nor has the aged mother/grandmother ever been, to my knowledge, to this property. Therefore, there has never been a caregiver at their property and, therefore, no need for a 3rd unit for this caregiver.

I would not object to one of our neighbours building a small accessory apartment in order to accommodate an aged parent or a grown child. Or even, for example, a widow or widower who needs either the income or comfort of having someone in his/her home.

However, I object to my neighbourhood becoming one of multiple family rental units. Perhaps if the applicants were simply renting out one unit of their residential property, the issue would not have reached such a boiling point in our neighbourhood.

There is no aged mother who needs a caregiver. The 2nd and 3rd units have already constructed and are for the two applicants and their families, while the top of the house is rented to full time renters.

I appeal to staff and council to address the issues at hand and deny the applicants rezoning. Council and staff have the tools to do so and I implore you to use them.

The applicants have already abused the entire process and should not be rewarded with council approving such a significant change to our cherished zoning.

Regards,
Ellen Cohen

**3985 Sandcastle Court, RR2
Washago, ON L0K 2B0
705-717-0322**

From: Joe Wise [mailto:Joe.Wise@rci.rogers.com]
Sent: June-17-15 11:09 PM
To: Mike Burkett; Ron Stevens; Sharon Goerke
Cc: Andrew Fyfe; 'Joe-The Wise's'
Subject: RE: Objection to Re-Zoning Application # Z-15-03 - 3979 Sandcastle Court, Washago Ont.

Re: Zoning Application Number Z-15-03 (P15-036) – Joe Friedman
3979 Sandcastle Court, Washago Ont. Plan 1609 Lot 21 Blk E, Township of Severn

Honourable Mayor Burkett and Council of Severn Township

We reside at 3975 Sandcastle Court – two properties to the South of the subject property and would like to reaffirm our objection to this rezoning.

I do not believe that Mr. Friedman nor the Township has demonstrated or justified why the existing Zoning of SR2 should not be maintained. There have been no geographical or environmental changes to the region that would create a need for change in zoning (such as the addition of Municipal Sewers). It is my belief that the original Developer and Township Council of the day recognized the sensitivity of the land adjacent to the shore of Lake Couchiching and as such assigned the SR2 Zoning in order to maintain minimal impact by allowing only Single family dwellings along the Shore.

The applicant has already discovered that the existing septic system of the Single Family dwelling will not support a Multi-Unit Dwelling without replacement / upgrades, yet the address is currently being occupied as two (2) distinct dwellings – possibly as many as three (3) . Despite the ongoing rezoning application, open building permit and the requirements for a new Septic system - the added pressure of a multi-tenant dwelling on the property's undersized septic system will directly impact runoff into Lake Couchiching. The property's proximity and direct access to the open ditch line and North boarder swale, will surely impact the lake water quality. Lake Couchiching is our community's source of drinking water, and any additional pressure on it by this application and the precedence it may set, should be taken very seriously.

In closing we again respectfully request that the Council Deny this zoning application request.

Sincerely,

Joe and Nancy Wise
joewise@rogers.com

From: Joe Wise

Sent: Sunday, February 15, 2015 10:30 PM

To: 'mburkett@townshipofsevern.com'; 'rstevens@townshipofsevern.com'; 'sgoerke@townshipofsevern.com'

Cc: 'afyfe@townshipofsevern.com'; 'Joe-The Wise's'

Subject: Objection to Re-Zoning Application # Z-15-03 - 3979 Sandcastle Court, Washago Ont.

Attn: Sharon Goerke
Clerk, Township of Severn

Re: Zoning Application Number Z-15-03 – Joe Friedman
3979 Sandcastle Court, Washago Ont. Plan 1609 Lot 21 Blk E, Township of Severn

Honourable Mayor Burkett and Council of Severn Township

We reside at 3975 Sandcastle Court – two properties to the South of the subject property and object to this rezoning for the following reasons.

I have had the opportunity to have conversations with Mr. Joe Friedman and his wife Ruth on a couple of occasions. They have indicated to me that they do not plan to live at the residence, but plan to renovate it into several apartments, and in fact have someone renting currently. Since taking possession of the property they have never lived in the home and plan instead to rent out units as apartments. Mrs. Friedman indicated she only plans to use one of the units for a couple of months in the summer. Before Christmas the Friedman's sent out a letter stating that they were planning on building an in-law suite and that we would be getting a notice from the "City" informing us of this. The Township notice that we recently received indicates that building an in-law suite was obviously not their intention as indicated in the attached letter. Currently while this rezoning application is still in review, they have a building permit to complete interior renovations. Yet the amount of construction and multiple bathroom amenities such as toilets that I have seen suggests to me they are not waiting for approvals to proceed with the construction of apartments. I am sure the building inspector will need to follow up on the progress of the existing building permit?

Based on what the Friedman's have told me, we feel that this property will become a non-owner occupied multi-unit rental property. This proposed rezoning will potentially set precedence within our small community of 65 single family homes. In the past our community has demonstrated that we do not want multi-tenant rental properties within our neighbourhood. This was specifically shown during the application for a Residential Bed and Breakfast on Treeline Drive several years ago. If this application is granted, the potential cumulative impact to our small community will change it from an idealistic, quiet single family dwelling neighbourhood, into a multi-tenant rental residential community.

I would also like to point out that the subject property has a Township easement on the North side of the property. This Easement is a drainage swale, with a culvert from the open ditch line at the front of the property to the shore of Lake Couchiching. The added pressure of a multi-tenant dwelling on the property's septic system will directly impact runoff into Lake Couchiching. The property's proximity and direct access to the open ditch line and swale, will surely impact the lake. Lake Couchiching is our community's source of drinking water, and any additional pressure on it by this application and the precedence it may set, should be taken very seriously.

Water is our most precious resource We need to protect it.

In closing we respectfully request that the Council Deny this zoning application request.

Sincerely,

Joe and Nancy Wise
joewise@rogers.com