

Candace Hamm

Subject: FW: File B-2020-082, B-2020-083 & B-2020-084

From: Adam & Kate Weishar [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 11:21 PM
To: Coreena Smith <CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca>
Subject: File B-2020-082, B-2020-083 & B-2020-084

**** [CAUTION]:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Coreena,

I have received the consent application notice for the noted files. Comments are due by the end of the 12th so they can be included within the planning report process. Here are comments I have related to the proposal:

1. The attached map delineates the areas considered. The zoning for the area requires a storm water management plan and the sites to be fully serviced with municipal water and wastewater to enable the lifting of the holding designation. The developer should be required to ensure this is completed properly before development may proceed and the holding lifted.
2. Within the zoning document it states the following related to vegetation: Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 3.14,a Planting/Visual Screening:
 - a) Shall only be required along the front, exterior and interior lot lines and no further than 4.5 metres (14.7 ft) from said lot lines; b) Shall be a minimum 1.5 metres (4.9 ft) in width; c) Shall be comprised of the following along the front lot line: (1) One row of cedar trees having a minimum height of 1.5 metres (4.9 ft) at the time of planting and maintained at a minimum height of 2.0 metres (6.6 ft) at time of maturity. The initial development on the benefitting lot has planted vegetation that appears to not be within compliance of the zoning provisions. What assurance do I have as an adjacent landowner this will be corrected for the developed parcel and complied with on the future lots. My concerns relate to aesthetics while viewing commercial development adjacent to residential and noise or acoustic levels with improper noise buffering by way of sound berms or properly sized vegetation.
3. In early 2020 I requested consideration of the Municipality to consider the same process by spoiling the original consent for lots 10 and 11 Noeckerville Hill Drive to enable the construction of a new residential home across the common lot line and construction of an accessory structure. In March of 2020 the CAO from South Bruce advised the following: *"In response to your inquiry below municipal staff spoke to Council last evening to seek their interest in entertaining your request to merger lots 10 and 11 by way of conveyance of land to South Bruce. At this time Council does not feel it is in their best interest to move forward in this manner as the acquiring of the land would need to be seen as a legitimate municipal purpose. With the subdivision agreement just being approved in 2018 council felt that the justification is not there to stand the test of legitimacy for municipal purposes."* Our proposal was offering a daylight corner on lot 11 which abuts to municipal ROW's. The proposed planning application is requesting the same of Council, however with the triangular section of land being retained by the original parcel yet offering no future benefit to the small sliver conveyed. I would like to understand should Council support this application what has changed between early 2020 and early 2021 with respect to development of the lands in this area. How will this proposal stand the test of legitimacy?
4. The town of Mildmay has seen two subdivision phases developed and moved forward in recent years. The lots associated with those phases are either sold or spoken for which reduces the available residential lots in Mildmay to

nearly nothing. The adjacent parcel of land is better suited for residential development given its proximity to the downtown, schools, grocery store and other services. Developments such as the existing site or proposed are better situated with highway access in order to mitigate the challenges of residential and commercial developments adjacent to one another. Working with landowners in the community and establishment of a business park in the community would offer many benefits while not impacting a residential neighbourhood.

Overall I am supportive of growth and development in the community. However, I feel this land is better situated for residential growth the community requires. The proposed 85 feet of frontage along Adam Street will open up opportunities for commercial and business growth that would be better situated within a serviced business park that has highway access to support the ingress and egress required to operate such businesses while mitigating mixed use challenges. Should Council elect to support the planning application I would be looking for assurances proper vegetation buffers are planted and maintained to mitigate aesthetic and noise concerns.

Please confirm receipt of submitted comments.

Thanks

Adam

Individuals who submit letters and other information to Council and its Committees should be aware that any personal information contained within their communications may become part of the public record and may be made available through the agenda process which includes publication on the County's website.

If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies (electronic or otherwise). Thank you for your cooperation.