

From: [Bonnie](#)
To: [Annette Crummev](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: rezoning
Date: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 2:47:22 PM

Based on information I have gleaned from reading the Planning Advisory Committee's report, which I received on March 1, 2019, and the email from Kaitlyn Lacelle, Urban Planner, dated March 4, 2019, I would like to replace my email to the Town Clerk, dated February 28, 2019, with this email.

Years before the sale of the lands owned by the Moncton Golf and Country Club (MGCC), I attended an information session at MGCC presented by Clayton Developments dealing with the construction of homes in the proposed Fairways subdivision, including Phase 2. At that meeting, Clayton assured those in attendance that upscale single family homes on generous lots would be built on said lands. Also, a high rise condo building was planned for the periphery of the development.

A secondary plan to guide overall development of said lands was developed in 2011. " ... the 2011 concept contemplated single unit dwellings."¹ According to the email from Kaitlyn Lacelle, Urban Planner, to me on March 4, 2019, the current designation of zone R1 allows for "minimum lot requirements for each zone" and that "approximately 103 single unit dwellings could be built today based on those minimum lot requirements ... only an additional 7 units" compared to the proposed 110 duplex units that would be built under the proposed R2 rezoning plan. "The Planning Advisory Committee's report states that the plan to rezone Phase 2 to R2 "is not a significant change as it remains a low density residential land use and is still compatible with surrounding land uses and the overall neighborhood concept."² Furthermore, Ms. Lacelle states that, "Therefore, the additional noise and traffic, when compared to what could be built today, is not much different." I contend that compared to what was originally planned by Clayton, a higher density neighborhood would indeed result in more people, traffic, and, as a result, more noise. In addition, the traffic load on Pinewood Road will be substantially increased, since it is the only access and egress for Phase 2.

While Clayton may be following the letter of the law, it doesn't change the fact that neighbors and property owners of the Phase 2 plan of the Fairways subdivision were told they were getting something very different from the current proposal, whether or not the property is rezoned to R2 or remains R1. It is only recently that Clayton requested the rezoning of Phase 2, due in part to the fact that, "... semi-detached dwelling lots are being sold and homes are being built at a much more rapid rate than the phases containing single unit dwellings."³

"The applicant is also proposing to maintain a 5 metre treed buffer along the western property line." " ... which will provide screening and privacy from existing residential homes on McAllister Road."⁴ What does "maintain" mean in this context, since at the present time, most of this land is overgrown scrub land and is littered with deadfalls and the residue of trees felled by N.B. Power along their easement. Will this buffer be cleaned up? Will it be planted with trees?

I would hope that Clayton Developments would not renege on their assurances given in the past. Rezoning Phase 2 to R2 was not mentioned in the original Clayton Developments meetings with residents of Riverview; and from what I hear from other property owners, there had been no notice of rezoning until recently.

I would hope that the Town of Riverview would protect its citizens from developers that propose to change their original building strategy to the extent that it would alter the makeup of a neighborhood without regard to existing homeowners.

Bonnie Starzomski



Riverview

Footnotes:

¹ Page 3 of Planning Advisory Committee report to Council which is on Council's agenda for March 11, 2019

² Page 3 of PAC report

³ Page 5 of PAC report

⁴ Page 4 of PAC report

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: clerk@townofriverview.ca

Message Score: 30

High (60): **Pass**

From:

My Spam Blocking Level: Low

Medium (75): **Pass**



Low (90): **Pass**

[Block](#) this sender

[Block](#) gmail.com

This message was delivered because the content filter score did not exceed your filter level.