

RE: REZONING 1661 BURTON AVENUE  
APPLICATION FOR A DAYCARE FACILITY FOR  
8-12 CHILDREN AND POSSIBLY INCREASES  
UP TO 24 CHILDREN.

AS WE ARE ONE OF THE PROPERTY  
OWNERS ON OAKLAND STREET THAT WILL  
BE AFFECTED BY THIS APPLICATION.

THE BACKYARDS 1670 OAKLAND AND  
1661 BURTON WILL FACE ONE ANOTHER  
SEPARATED BY THE BACKLANK.

SINCE OPENING THE DAYCARE IN EARLY JUNE  
THE NOISE HAS CHANGED THE ATMOSPHERE  
AFFECTING OUR CORNER AND WITH THAT  
COMES THE EXTRA TRAFFIC THAT INVOLVES  
OUR STREETS, AS WELL AS POSSIBLE  
PARKING PROBLEMS THAT MAY BE CREATED.

REGARDS TO THE ABOVE ITEMS MENTIONED:  
WE ARE NOT IN FAVOUR OF THE  
APPLICATION TO BE APPROVED.

RECEIVED

SEP 19 2019

LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Sherman, Robert PENC:EX <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** September 19, 2019 1:59 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: 1661 Burton Ave proposed development application

To the Mayor and Council,

I am writing to voice concern about the proposed change in zoning at 1661 Burton Ave. to allow a private residence to be converted to a commercial business.

I would like to point out that I feel the applicant, Gillian Fehr, knowingly provided misinformation to the community about what she is asking the community to support. She stated at a community meeting on April 29th that she was looking to increase the client space at her daycare from 8 spaces to 12, when in fact, in a letter to the the mayor and council (I am assuming that it was sent as part of the application on Apr. 12<sup>th</sup>, 2019) that she stated she would like 24 spaces – double what she presented to the community.

A potential 24 additional cars in our neighborhood is a significant increase in traffic; there could be up to and additional 48 vehicles coming in and out of our street at busy times of the day – beginning and end of day. The streets in our neighbourhood are not designed to handle that amount of traffic nor the additional parking that is needed to accommodate those vehicles.

In regards to the parking situation, the applicant has identified 2 parking stalls on the property in the submitted plans, however, I don't believe these spaces are used for parking. From a practical point of view, would cars be pulling in and out of a daycare center if the kids are in anyway going to be moving across the common area that precedes the parking spaces? This raises a safety concern.

That leaves only one parking spot on the street in front of the business that is usable. How do potentially 24 cars jockey for one space? The answer is, they cannot; there for the only options are that street parking marked for residents only will be used OR the No Parking/No Stopping areas marked on Shakespeare St. will be used – which they currently are (illegally I might add).

The applicant also stated at the community meeting that parking would not be an issue and that she would direct her clients to not park in the no parking zone and that they should be parking in the Hillside Mall parking lot so that the residents are not impacted. This is not the case. It is not uncommon now to see at least one vehicle parked in the marked no stopping area on Shakespeare St. directly outside of the daycare. The owners of the daycare seem to big the biggest offenders of this as I frequently see a vehicle parked in this area. And I understand that one of their staff got a ticket for parking there illegally.

The applicant has not shown that she wants to integrate herself into the neighbourhood, but rather take up much needed residential space to put in a business that enriches herself. She has said words to sell herself and her business to the neighbourhood, but has not followed through on them to show she is actively working to become part of the neighbourhood.

There are far too many concerns – increased traffic, lack of parking, safety of the children is the identified parking spaces on the property are used, lack of transparency (what she presented at the community meeting vs what she has applied to the city to approve) – to approve the application based on what has been submitted.

Respectfully,

Rob Sherman  
1628 Burton Ave.