

June 17, 2025 Site Plan Approval and Zoning Bylaw Amendment Approval Meeting Presentation

My name is Jeff Boyd and I live at [REDACTED], Schomberg with my wife and one of my adult children. We are located directly north and adjacent to 326 Main Street, Schomberg and have lived here for 26 years.

We are not against development on the 326 Main Street site as we support intensification over sprawl. Intensification in a heritage community like Schomberg means extra detail must be taken to ensure the resulting development fits in with the character of the town.

Based on the latest submission provided from Weston Consulting on behalf of Marcor Realty we urgently request that council deny the application for site plan approval and bylaw amendment at 326 Main. In my opinion this proposal needs major changes before approval.

This last plan submission is the worst one yet in terms of fit with the community as it increases the height of the building a further ten feet and decreases the amount of parking for building residents and now, Schombergers on the Main Street.

The height of the building has always been problematic in that it towers over every structure in the downtown. This building will be visible from all directions, especially from the East and North. The focus of Main Street will no longer be the heritage buildings but instead a modern, towering glass, steel and brick structure that has no place here.

Because of its proposed height, the building will shadow neighbours up to an additional 6 hours per day. It is so tall, residents of the building will be able to peer down into every surrounding neighbours property including those to the southwest.

Parking

The consultants cite 3 multi-storey dwellings in Ontario as justification of why only one car parking spot per unit will work at this site. One is in Orangeville, one in Cambridge and one in Grimsby. I was curious how it was possible that one parking spot per unit was adequate for those residents so I investigated.

In Orangeville, I discovered that one of the two buildings was 90% seniors and the other had a high number of seniors as well as families.

In Cambridge, the property manager revealed that senior populations in their two buildings were 50 and 60% respectively.

In Grimsby, a realtor selling one of the condos said that the senior population was conservatively 50%.

A little Googling also revealed that many senior households have no vehicles so at that point I understood the pattern of why these sites were chosen for comparison.

I was curious why the consultants didn't reference the building at 149 Church since this building allocates one parking spot per unit and should more accurately reflect the demographic applicable to the 326 proposal. I found out, some residents at 149 Church are paying to park in the Catholic Church parking lot.

So, while it's possible to present a sunshiny picture of parking outcome for the 326 Main proposal by cherry picking sites in other communities, we can see a local example of where 1 spot per unit doesn't work and most likely won't at 326 Main.

Cash in Lieu Of Parking

The planning department has said the Township would accept cash in lieu of providing the parking required by bylaw for the commercial development. Cash in lieu would also be accepted to replace the 7 spaces the consultant says need to be removed from Main Street so that residents exiting 326 Main will have adequate sight lines. The problem with this plan is there is no place to provide more parking no matter how much cash the Township receives. I'm told the Township tried to expand the Green P parking at the south of town behind the Post Office and/or toward the fairgrounds. Both organizations said 'no'. So where will new parking be built?

Many addresses on Main have already paid into the cash in lieu fund but no new parking has been built. This is what causes the Presbyterian Church to string a chain across their driveway and post 'No Parking' signs. This is why residents living above Main Street businesses often find strangers parked in their spots behind their buildings.

The other problem with cash in lieu is that there is no requirement for the Township to spend that money in Schomberg. In my opinion, cash in lieu is no solution. It only makes residents think there is a solution.

Housing Crisis?

Is there still a housing crisis? In investigating the 3 sites the consultant used for parking comparisons, I found that all of the buildings had multiple vacancies and this is 10 days into June. The building in Orangeville is offering 3 months free rent. The buildings in Cambridge are offering 2 months free rent. Why would they do that if there is a 'housing crisis'? The realtor in Grimsby told me that lots of rental units are coming on the market because of vacancy taxes implemented by municipal governments.

It seems more like Ontario is facing an affordable housing problem. The proposed development does nothing to remedy that as there is no indication that any of the proposed condo units will be deemed to be affordable. That doesn't mean we should sacrifice our current living standards or character of our existing village as a consequence. It does mean that there can and should be additional dwelling units built on the eastern part of 326 Main Street but those units should blend in with the current character and not resemble anything like what is being proposed here.

I'm to understand the Township has budget to oppose developments council deems as too objectionable. If this building doesn't fit the description of objectionable what would? This vote will probably be the most consequential vote of your term in relation to Schomberg.

I will leave the last word on this to Doug Ford. On March 21st, 2024 and several days after, when asked if he would allow 4 plex buildings in residential neighbourhoods province wide, he said "I can assure you 1,000 per cent, you go in the middle of communities and start putting up four-storeys, six-storey, eight-storey buildings and right deep into the communities, there's going to be ... a lot of shouting and screaming, that's a massive mistake," Ford said. "We are not going to go into communities and build

Submitted By Jeff Boyd, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

four-storey or six-storey buildings beside residences like this,” said Ford, standing at a construction site where new homes are being built in Richmond Hill.

Please deny the bylaw amendment and restrict the height of any structure on 326 main to 3 floors with no rooftop amenity. That one singular action will remedy egregious shadowing and privacy issues with the proposed structure as well as removing any parking concerns due to reduced number of units.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to me.