

Sep 22, 2024

TO:

Township of King City

RE: Proposed King City – Doctors Lane Development Plan – OBJECTION

Dear Planning Department and King City Council

We have reviewed the current proposed plans for “**King City - Doctors Lane Neighbourhood Concept Plan**”

There are many aspects that we are in agreement with, specifically many of the changes proposed in the core area near the old arena, business area, and downtown core.

HOWEVER we are **OBJECTING** to the proposals that would impose absurd changes within the existing residential areas.

Specific Objections:

1. The proposal to allow a 6 story development at Elizabeth Grove and Keele Street, on the site of the existing United Church adjacent to the ambulance station.
 - a. It is the definition of insanity to allow a 6 story condo or any other multi story / multi-use site to be built on a residential street, particularly in an area of single family homes.
 - b. For those that are ignorant of the existing traffic load that ALREADY exists along the corridor of Elizabeth Grove / Patton Street / Warren Road, please bring yourself up to speed.
This is a virtual highway of traffic used by commuters bypassing the town centre and instead racing through the neighbourhood as a shortcut. At best it is annoying, and at worst dangerous to children and other pedestrians.
2. Up to 3 story development on the former Eva L Dennis public school site **AND** on the existing park area at Patton Street and Kingslynn Drive. That is entirely inconsistent with the existing neighbourhood and will once again, introduce excessively tall structures looming over everything else on the edge of a park area.

It seems the planning department continues to disregard the negative impacts that large scale redevelopments have, including supporting ridiculous variance requests and oversized homes that frequently exceed established bylaws.

And now the potential imposition of yet more negative impact on existing residents.

This seem to be yet another instance where there is little to no concern as to the needs and comfort of existing residents and is instead weighted in the favour of developers, development, and profits for same. We are the people that actually LIVE here. Many of use for many decades.

Alternative Recommendations:

Elizabeth Grove / Keele Street:

I have no idea who actually owns the United Church property nor the position of the owner as to any redevelopment plan or existing zoning. Nonetheless, this property is a peaceful area with a unique structure that should remain as it is – an extension to the park it is adjacent to.

Rather than pollute and diminish the existing park that has been recently improved with a giant multi story tower, simply discard and completely remove that proposal from the plan going forward.

Answer this: Exactly what benefit to existing King City residents is the 6 story building you included in your plan? I think none, other than increased property taxes at the expense of all the residents nearby.

Have you even considered what the traffic impact would be on the side streets?

Patton / Kingslynn:

Considering the prior Eva L Dennis School was a one story, small, public institution that served the community on an ongoing basis, you should utilize that property and the adjacent property for development of something that actually serves the community on an ongoing basis, just as the public school did for decades.

For example, a one or two story home to support the elderly, with preference offered to elderly King City residents. What you are proposing is simply a bunch of large excessively tall homes where the township gains a temporary capital influx by selling the land but otherwise no positive impact on the community. A cynical and short sighted opportunity and nothing more.

Medical Services:

1. I am aware that the existing doctor's office on Doctors Lane has been seeking approval to increase their building size to enhance the medical services and increase the number of doctors. This has been ongoing for years. I have no insights into what the delay is other than foot dragging on the part of the township and/or planning department.

While I see the "Development Potential" highlighting in your proposal there is no specific reference in your lengthy plan with respect to "medical services" in King City. It would behoove the township to allow the existing medical folks to proceed with and enhance the services they offer NOW. Indeed there should be some prioritization of what is TRULY a fundamentally critical vs what is "attractive".

Priority one: Medical, Fire, Police.

Everything else is secondary or tertiary.

We currently have the unique benefit of a very few dedicated family doctors in our town. This is a vital service that everyone in the township benefits from. Failure to provide our doctors with a reason to STAY in King City will have the inverse result and encourage them the LEAVE King City. Please get the priorities in the correct order.

Respectfully,

Scott and Susan Harding



King City Homeowners for over 30 years