



This petition has collected  
113 signatures  
using the online tools at [ipetitions.com](https://ipetitions.com)

Printed on 2019-03-10

# Fairways Rezoning Petition

## About this petition

Clayton Developments has submitted an application to the Town of Riverview to rezone Phase 2 of their Rosebank Cres plan from single family homes to duplexes.

There is a public hearing with the Town Council on March 11, 2019. We are encouraging residents of the area to participate in this hearing, and also take part in this petition.

Please join us in opposing this proposal as we feel that this will;

- - Increase traffic
- - Increase noise (Heat pumps, AC Units, people, dogs, etc.)
- - Decrease property values
- - Be unfair to those that purchased in the area under the current zoning plan

In our opinion, Clayton developments has been unable to sell their lots for single dwelling homes due to unreasonably high prices; they have failed to offer them at fair market value.

If you are against the rezoning of this area from single family homes to duplexes please sign this petition to be presented to Town Council on March 11, 2019.

## Signatures

1. Name: Matt price on 2019-02-21 23:46:51  
Comments:  

---
2. Name: Sean Rollo on 2019-02-22 01:57:30  
Comments:  

---
3. Name: Tara Newcombe on 2019-02-22 11:48:28  
Comments:  

---
4. Name: allison price on 2019-02-22 12:38:47  
Comments:  

---
5. Name: Derek Foster on 2019-02-22 12:45:25  
Comments:  

---
6. Name: Heather Foster on 2019-02-22 12:46:31  
Comments:  

---
7. Name: Andrea Steeves on 2019-02-22 12:52:05  
Comments: I would be very upset at this...it is NOT what the homeowners that are already there signed up for when they invested their money in their land and in building beautiful homes. No reason for them to take a cut in value of their homes to compensate for poor planning on the developers part.  

---
8. Name: Scott McMullen on 2019-02-22 13:02:12  
Comments:  

---
9. Name: Jonathan Newcombe on 2019-02-22 13:07:10  
Comments:  

---
10. Name: Alan Newcombe on 2019-02-22 13:07:31  
Comments: The proposed subdivision should not happen as the owners of the extremely high end homes on Rosebank will see their property values plummet if a subdivision as described is built  

---
11. Name: Gerry Porter on 2019-02-22 13:47:34  
Comments: When purchasing our lot to build our home, we were shown and explained the future development plans and it did not include putting 2 unit dwellings on Rosebank and adjoining streets. This is unacceptable. The fact that Clayton handed out pamphlets to our homes that only shows a handful of 2 unit dwellings on the re-zoning, and then we find the actual re-zoning proposal and it shows the complete area to have 2 unit dwellings shows us how Clayton is underhanded and sneaky in their methods to get this passed.

We were misled and this is wrong!

- 
12. Name: Rebekah Earle on 2019-02-22 13:49:24  
Comments:
- 
13. Name: Tracy Porter on 2019-02-22 13:49:41  
Comments:
- 
14. Name: Angela Rollo on 2019-02-22 14:07:38  
Comments:
- 
15. Name: Jennifer mcmullen on 2019-02-22 14:21:46  
Comments: Please keep this zone a single family home area.
- 
16. Name: Jennifer on 2019-02-22 14:37:40  
Comments:
- 
17. Name: Lara lavoie on 2019-02-22 14:40:45  
Comments:
- 
18. Name: Krystal on 2019-02-22 14:53:54  
Comments:
- 
19. Name: Gary Porter on 2019-02-22 15:02:29  
Comments:
- 
20. Name: Pat Porter on 2019-02-22 15:03:23  
Comments:
- 
21. Name: Tony Spencer on 2019-02-22 15:12:44  
Comments:
- 
22. Name: Jansen Porter on 2019-02-22 15:12:50  
Comments:
- 
23. Name: Isabelle on 2019-02-22 15:48:51  
Comments:
- 
24. Name: Kim Caissie on 2019-02-22 16:29:46  
Comments:
- 
25. Name: Kristina Cornell on 2019-02-22 16:46:59

Comments:

- 
26. Name: Lyne roy on 2019-02-22 17:04:58  
Comments:
- 
27. Name: Jenn on 2019-02-22 17:44:42  
Comments: No changes should be made once people have bought into one image and focus without ALL of those already there agreeing to the changes
- 
28. Name: Mike Porter on 2019-02-22 17:46:07  
Comments:
- 
29. Name: Angie Carter on 2019-02-22 17:56:57  
Comments:
- 
30. Name: Shane Carter on 2019-02-22 17:57:34  
Comments:
- 
31. Name: Angie Porter on 2019-02-22 17:57:52  
Comments:
- 
32. Name: Melissa Gill on 2019-02-22 18:07:57  
Comments:
- 
33. Name: Asheley Price on 2019-02-22 18:26:28  
Comments: This is really unfair to people that have already purchased in the area under the current zoning and decreases property values of those surrounding.
- 
34. Name: Shane Price on 2019-02-22 21:20:43  
Comments:
- 
35. Name: Lynda King on 2019-02-22 22:44:19  
Comments: This is so wrong I so many levels!
- 
36. Name: Willard King on 2019-02-22 22:45:59  
Comments: This is very wrong
- 
37. Name: Paul Crosby on 2019-02-22 23:03:55  
Comments: For once, can the town of Riverview stick to a plan and protect the families who have invested in their new homes! A development should stay as planned, otherwise, people fell deceived and tricked. It also makes the neighbourhoods look cheap and messy.
-

38. Name: Martha Maxwell on 2019-02-23 00:14:22  
Comments:
- 
39. Name: Kerri-lyn Tunison on 2019-02-23 00:46:59  
Comments:
- 
40. Name: Ken LeBlanc on 2019-02-23 01:34:32  
Comments:
- 
41. Name: Nancy Leblanc on 2019-02-23 02:59:22  
Comments:
- 
42. Name: Monique LeBlanc on 2019-02-23 07:59:30  
Comments:
- 
43. Name: Tanya Porter on 2019-02-23 12:20:25  
Comments: This is very sneaky move by developers and rezoning should not be allowed.
- 
44. Name: Geoff Douglas on 2019-02-23 12:36:24  
Comments:
- 
45. Name: Katelyn on 2019-02-23 12:50:01  
Comments: This is a joke
- 
46. Name: Karen Langin on 2019-02-23 13:08:52  
Comments: Not impressed....bought this lot and home to have a quiet street single family homes....not to mention property tax is ridiculously high....
- 
47. Name: Taylor Haines on 2019-02-23 13:08:53  
Comments:
- 
48. Name: Carl Maclean on 2019-02-23 13:12:59  
Comments:
- 
49. Name: Bronwyn and Kevin Sharpe on 2019-02-23 14:17:22  
Comments:
- 
50. Name: Emily Brennan on 2019-02-23 15:12:00  
Comments:
- 
51. Name: Mark OSullivan on 2019-02-23 15:45:31  
Comments:

- 
52. Name: Jay Lee on 2019-02-23 16:31:37  
Comments: I am against the rezoning of the duplexes
- 
53. Name: Michael Delaney on 2019-02-23 16:32:10  
Comments: I strongly disagree with this proposed change. This is a neighbourhood of single dwelling homes - there is no good reason to change that.
- 
54. Name: Helen on 2019-02-23 16:35:19  
Comments: I don't like this change
- 
55. Name: Dave MacFadyen on 2019-02-23 16:41:39  
Comments: If approved, this rezoning will leave an island of single family homes and lots between two R2 zones. The obvious issue for those of us who purchased a lot and built a home in keeping with the original vision of the developers is a change in the nature of the neighborhood in which we live. Density will rise, increasing traffic which must pass over our streets.  
If the remaining R1 lots are sold and homes are built in keeping with the original vision, we face a probable decrease in the value of our homes. My biggest concern, however, is the unsold lots in the R1 section. If the developer has not been able to attract sufficient buyers with the expectation that the next phase will also be high end R1 housing, what will they need to do to sell the lots once the new section is zoned R2? The construction of lower end single family homes will definitely decrease the value of our homes.  
The developer needs to act in the best interests of the developer. The town needs to act in the best interests of the town. Is Riverview best served to eliminate this area as a location for higher end homes? Should the town support the short term economic interests of the developers over the long term economic interests of the residents? The developer is a Nova Scotia company who will no doubt leave once the lots are sold. The residents have chosen to live here and pay taxes here forever.
- 
56. Name: Bonnie Starzomski on 2019-02-23 17:51:46  
Comments: COMMENTS ATTACHED TO PETITION AGAINST REZONING OF ROSEBANK CRESCENT TO R2  
February 23, 2019  
Many 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 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. Perhaps they think no one remembers that assurance, or perhaps they don't care. But, WE CARE.  
I count 31 duplex lots on the Phase 2 plan, which means that 15 more dwellings could occupy the land than would be occupied by single family dwellings on lots of the same size. This density would allow for roughly twice as many residents, vehicles, and as a result, double the traffic and the likely potential for double the noise.  
We were also told at that meeting with Clayton that a generous buffer between existing homes and new construction would be allowed. I have not heard if that buffer will be provided; if so, how deep would it be? The fact that approximately 45' of land is to be
-

allowed between existing homeowners' property lines and the back edge of the newly constructed dwellings is not to say that other things, e.g. trampolines, pools, kennels, baby barns etc. would not occupy said 45'.

I would hope that Clayton Developments would not renege on their assurances given in the past. If the real estate climate has changed since those assurances were given, then it should not be existing homeowners who should suffer the consequences of rezoning. Call it duplicitous, bait and switch, or misleading, but rezoning Phase 2 to R2 was not mentioned in the original Clayton Developments meetings with residents of Riverview. I would hope that the Town of Riverview would protect its citizens from developers that propose to change the makeup of a neighborhood without regard to existing homeowners.

---

57. Name: Paul Cowie on 2019-02-23 17:58:35  
Comments:

---

58. Name: Weldon Green on 2019-02-23 18:11:23  
Comments: Against this rezoning. Protect current taxpayers and not a Halifax development company.

---

59. Name: Sheila Cowie on 2019-02-23 18:24:21  
Comments:

---

60. Name: sandra nelson on 2019-02-23 18:40:09  
Comments:

---

61. Name: Giles Allan on 2019-02-23 19:50:33  
Comments: This is absolutely not what was advertised when we purchased our lot and built our house - not in favour of rezoning after the fact - will lower existing house values and be a detriment in many respects to the area.

---

62. Name: Brenda Allan on 2019-02-23 19:51:10  
Comments: This is absolutely not what was advertised when we purchased our lot and built our house - not in favour of rezoning after the fact - will lower existing house values and be a detriment in many respects to the area.

---

63. Name: Tyler Allan on 2019-02-23 19:51:58  
Comments: Not in favour of rezoning after the fact - will lower existing house values and be a detriment in many respects to the area.

---

64. Name: Peter Starzomski on 2019-02-24 00:16:34  
Comments:

---

65. Name: Terra Spencer on 2019-02-24 00:43:19  
Comments:

---



66. Name: David West on 2019-02-24 01:33:58  
Comments: Damaging to property values.
- 
67. Name: John MacIntyre on 2019-02-24 14:46:22  
Comments: We purchased our land and built our retirement home with the idea that this would be a new single family homes only. That was the vision we bought into and this new re-zoning would dramatically change traffic concerns and home values.
- 
68. Name: Chris Caravan on 2019-02-24 15:36:54  
Comments: A single family home community was the vision described and a big factor in why we chose to build in this location - I do not approve of this shift in direction by the developer and rezoning after the fact, especially considering that little to no effort has been made by the developer to market and sell the Phase 2 lots as per original vision
- 
69. Name: Beverley MacIntyre on 2019-02-24 16:22:08  
Comments: We invested in a single dwelling neighborhood which offered a quiet, safe place to retire in and for our grandchildren to play in. I sure hope the town will protect the existing residents in the Fairways. If the rezoning is approved by the Town Council, our neighbourhood of two streets will be surrounded by semi-attached dwellings, duplexes and apartment buildings. Such a decision would set a precedent wherein the Town of Riverview supports large developers needs over their residents. Has the town conducted an independent study to determine what types of neighbourhoods and dwellings would support our existing residents seeking to downsize, affordable starter homes or unique neighbourhood designs to attract new residents to our Town? Our elected officials and our residents should be the ones leading the development plans for our Town!
- 
70. Name: Jennifer Caravan on 2019-02-24 16:25:10  
Comments:
- 
71. Name: Willard King on 2019-02-24 23:57:49  
Comments: This is not acceptable! Shame on you Clayton Developments after you have sold lots with previous agreements!
- 
72. Name: Wayne Gillis on 2019-02-25 00:57:26  
Comments:
- 
73. Name: Jennifer Griffith on 2019-02-25 01:06:44  
Comments: Bad business, going back on their word.
- 
74. Name: Audrey Griffith on 2019-02-25 14:50:42  
Comments: this will bring down the value of homes already there and increase the traffic through the area
- 
75. Name: Allison Killam on 2019-02-25 15:14:55  
Comments:

76.	Name: Vanessa surette	on 2019-02-25 15:22:02	Comments:
77.	Name: Kimberly Gunn	on 2019-02-25 15:33:58	Comments:
78.	Name: Heather Goguen	on 2019-02-25 15:45:24	Comments:
79.	Name: Tanya Chiasson	on 2019-02-25 15:54:29	Comments:
80.	Name: Pam Steeves	on 2019-02-25 18:36:03	Comments: Not fair to existing homeowners
81.	Name: Wendy Goguen	on 2019-02-25 19:19:17	Comments:
82.	Name: Sam Sneed	on 2019-02-25 20:23:53	Comments: Council is allowing this so Shaw Group can profit more and be heavily involved with the new \$16-20 MILLION Wellness Centre. Push back this project and make your Councillor Tammy Rampersaud accountable to you the homeowners!
83.	Name: Sasha	on 2019-02-26 12:46:18	Comments:
84.	Name: Robert Taylor	on 2019-02-26 13:36:40	Comments:
85.	Name: Jennifer Macdougall	on 2019-02-26 18:33:14	Comments:
86.	Name: Michael and Susan Thompson	on 2019-02-26 20:10:30	Comments: Earlier phases of Clayton development were approved with the understanding the remaining property would be R1 single family homes. Very disappointing to see this proposed change which will undoubtedly contribute to more congestion, traffic, noise and lower property values to those of us who have enjoyed this neighbourhood for years.
87.	Name: Danny Shea	on 2019-02-26 22:23:06	Comments:

88.	Name: Tyler Melling	on 2019-02-27 14:34:17	Comments:
89.	Name: Heath Johnson	on 2019-03-01 01:15:58	Comments:
90.	Name: Megan Richard	on 2019-03-01 01:37:15	Comments: We are strongly opposed to this rezoning project for all the reasons listed. This community invested in a neighbourhood of single family homes, and we feel very cheated by this change.
91.	Name: Jason Cornell	on 2019-03-01 02:11:16	Comments:
92.	Name: Dan Cormier	on 2019-03-02 11:24:26	Comments:
93.	Name: Keith Landry	on 2019-03-02 11:49:19	Comments:
94.	Name: Greg Lawlor	on 2019-03-02 11:52:19	Comments: This will definitely affect the immediate area with regard to increase traffic and lower housing values. The Town should not approve this rezoning. Protect your residents who pay taxes and elect you for once.
95.	Name: Carol Cottrill	on 2019-03-02 12:16:01	Comments:
96.	Name: Sandy Mechefske	on 2019-03-02 12:18:10	Comments: Too man people in a small area, for the soul reason of developer profits.
97.	Name: Launce young	on 2019-03-02 12:36:08	Comments: Area should be kept for single home development
98.	Name: Tara Underhay	on 2019-03-02 12:36:56	Comments:
99.	Name: Natalie Davison	on 2019-03-02 13:04:47	Comments:
100.	Name: Amy woodard	on 2019-03-02 15:01:29	Comments:

101. Name: Heather Pope on 2019-03-02 16:44:26  
Comments:
- 
102. Name: Christian moger on 2019-03-02 19:49:15  
Comments: The current owners have bought based on the current zoning. This zoning was taken into consideration when they determined the price they were willing to pay. If the zoning is changed then these original prices should be reviewed based on the new reality and compensated back by the developer. Perhaps this would have an affect on the request.
- 
103. Name: Jim and Marla Johnson on 2019-03-02 19:55:31  
Comments: Unfair to those who built homes in this development with the understanding that they would be single family dwellings only.
- 
104. Name: Nat Miller on 2019-03-03 00:54:03  
Comments: Please don't go back on the original plan. We have invested dearly into an quiet executive area and all that will change if you rezone area.
- 
105. Name: Sclarke on 2019-03-03 16:54:19  
Comments: Very disappointed to see this and unnecessary
- 
106. Name: Amanda Devison on 2019-03-03 17:02:41  
Comments:
- 
107. Name: Lisa Fraser on 2019-03-04 13:07:06  
Comments:
- 
108. Name: Derrick Bathurst on 2019-03-04 14:31:50  
Comments:
- 
109. Name: Wendy Bathurst on 2019-03-04 14:32:42  
Comments:
- 
110. Name: Dan McGrath on 2019-03-04 19:08:59  
Comments:
- 
111. Name: Lynn Lawrence on 2019-03-05 15:55:00  
Comments:
- 
112. Name: Don Robinson on 2019-03-09 19:47:45  
Comments:
- 
113. Name: Carmen Robinson on 2019-03-09 19:49:13

Comments:

---