

## Hannah,Allison

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 27, 2025 1:07 AM  
**To:** Hannah,Allison  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] Cinanni,Vincent; Osanic,Lisa  
**Subject:** COA - 25-005 For tonight's meeting

Caution: This email is from an external source. Please exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

The applicant for the development along the Cataraqi River next to the Woolen Mill is asking for several zoning changes from the Committee of Adjustment.

I was taken by surprise by this application as the applicant met with various members of the community and told us that no zoning changes would be required for the development that the corporation wished to build.

Now, we are faced with an application that asks for 8 variances including major ones which will

- reduce the set back from the water from the required 30 m to 23 m, a reduction of over 20%
- increase the number of units in the building from 50 to 75, an increase of 50%, and
- increase the number of balconies on the main wall of the building from 45% to 75%, an increase of 30%.

One of the reasons in the staff report to justify the reduction in the required buffer from the water is that a rain garden and native flowers will be added. "These features have an added benefit of helping conceal turtle nesting sites from predators and reduce human interactions with turtle nests providing thereby fulfilling the intent of the waterbody separation distance." (page 9) Predators of turtle eggs are predominantly raccoons, skunks, foxes, snakes, and dogs, that will not be deterred in any way by a few plants.

Further, there is nothing in the amendments to guarantee that the open space surrounding the building will not be fenced. If fencing is installed at the 23 m mark (closer to the water than the required 30 m) any suggestion of gardens etc. is irrelevant. There would be a barrier closer to the water than should be allowed.

This development is suddenly turning into something much different than originally presented privately to the community.

Also, the staff report does not mention the easement that the City has on the 30 m buffer area which I had understood would prevent any reduction in it. Has this extra protection of this area been removed? And, if not, what legal steps need to be taken to remove it?

Please do not accept a reduction in the setback of 30 m from the water.

Sincerely,

Vicki Schmolka  
[REDACTED]