

Thu 3/4/2021

10:13 AM



To: Port Elgin Planning

**\*\* [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.

I have questions and concerns regarding the above application.

My name is Robert P Simpson and I am the owner of 9 Cutter Road.

My primary concerns (not limited to these concerns) are:

- access to the Biener Bush trails system. Presently there is good access to the trail system from Cutter Road. This new development appears to cut off the access to the trails from Cutter Road. The Lakeside Woods subdivision off the 10<sup>th</sup> Conc near this new proposed development has 2 accessways to the trail system behind Lakeside Woods. I would like something similar for access to the Biener's Bush trail from Acton Drive.
- drainage is a big concern. Biener's bush has a very high water table and there is very poor drainage in the area of the proposed development. Cutter Road receives a considerable amount of drainage from the low-lying area. There is a risk of flooding in the spring on Cutter Road when melt run off is high. The town of Saugeen Shores has promised this will be fixed when the development behind Cutter Road goes forward. I want to be sure this is the case.

Bob Simpson

**From:** Jayne Holt  
**Sent:** Friday, May 28, 2021 12:05 PM  
**To:** Daniel Kingsbury  
**Subject:** Woodlands subdivision !

**\*\* [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 Dan,

I spoke to Julie yesterday. She advised me to email you. I live at 82 North Shore Rd. Port Elgin. The next phase of the Woodlands subdivision is directly behind my property.

I called and left a message for you on Mar.29 to be added to any future mailings regarding the new phase. I did not receive the recent mailings about the up coming meeting. Would you please add me to your mailing list.

My major concern is the drainage. With every development that has happened behind and south of me the water flow from the bush has changed significantly . This has caused some serious flooding across my property. The town did make a berm behind us draining to Fenton. This has definitely helped. I'm just worried with this new phase more water issues will arise.

Hoping to hear from you in the near future.

Jayne Holt

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.

**From:** Susan Dunlop  
**To:** [Port Elgin Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Subdivision file #S-2021-002  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 25, 2021 1:57:51 PM

---

**\*\* [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.**

I received notification of the proposed subdivision behind my home last week. My address is 84 N Shore Rd, Port Elgin ON. The concern I have about the application is drainage. We have had difficulty several times in the past with water draining from the town - owned property behind us onto our property. I would appreciate you sending me a detailed explanation of the proposed drainage plan for this subdivision, please. If you could tell me the company developing the drainage plan, and the company proposed to implement it, as well as time lines, that would be appreciated as well.

I thank you in advance for this information.

Sincerely,  
Susan Dunlop

Wed 3/17/2021  
10:45 AM



To: Port Elgin Planning

**\*\* [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.

Greetings County of Bruce Planning,

Re: S-2021-002: Proposed Woodlands Phase Three Plan of Subdivision in Port Elgin.

I am a neighbour and educated environmentalist. I have some questions on the environmental impact of this proposed subdivision phase that I would appreciate feedback on.

1. Updated Environmental Impact Study (EIS): The Environmental Review Study was completed by Stantec in 2008 for this entire Woodlands development area. That's 13 years ago. The SVCA guideline for EIS timing is within 3 years of development. Given the significant development that occurred in adjacent and upgradient areas over this 13 year delay, I feel it would be diligent to complete an updated EIS for this specific subdivision phase. This would capture any changes in wetland communities as well as meet current standards to include additional wildlife surveys (e.g. amphibians). This would also trigger a current EIS Management Plans and buffers to meet current/improved low impact development guidelines if some development is approved?

2. Development in Wetlands: Based on field surveys this proposed road and subdivision phase is clearly going to directly impact wetland areas including some marsh and swamp areas in the northern half that will be drained and filled for building lots. This seems contrary to planning policy and best practice for this coastal wetland complex that is part of the ecological function of this significant woodland (Special Policy Area #4)?

3. Interceptor Ditch: This subdivision phase is not approved (having lapsed) however there has been recent land alteration onsite including a large interceptor ditch which is now draining the central and southern swamp wetland areas towards existing ditch and drain at Acton Drive. This appears consistent with the Stormwater Management Report from 2010, but was this specific land draining approved to go ahead and drain the wetlands and shallow water table before the plan of subdivision is even approved?

Thank you very much for your feedback. Please feel free to direct this to others as appropriate (SVCA, Saugeen Shores) but please copy me on any emails so that I can follow-up if needed. I am not trying to be difficult, and if this Shoreline Residential zoned development is to go ahead, I would like to help ensure it meets current Environmental Management guidelines.

Thanks again,  
Barry Moss (BES)

Mon 3/8/2021

8:47 AM



To: Port Elgin Planning

\*\* [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.

Hello

My name is Jennifer O'Reilly.

I live at 11 Cutter Road, Port Elgin.

I am addressing my concerns of the proposed subdivision file # s-2021-002.

I am alarmed how many people are not aware of the green space that is going to be clear cut. I walk the 'blue ski trail ' everyday. The trail head starts on Cutter Road and turns south and east meeting up with Red trail. When directing my concern to council , they assured me the trails would not be affected by the planned subdivision. This trail runs directly through it. They are misleading the public into thinking otherwise.

The town has put up several trail signs which has also mislead the public into believing no further development will be taking place. The trails are very popular and I believe the public should be made aware of the future devastation of green space , not just the residents who live next to it.

Thank you for hearing my concerns

Kind regards,

Jennifer O'Reilly

Sent from my iPhone

Mon 3/8/2021

9:30 AM



To: Port Elgin Planning

**\*\* [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.**

There are a number of issues that should be re-visited on the renewal of the application phase 3 Woodlands subdivision.

1. A new environmental study be undertaken since conditions within the lower 10th concession has changed drastically with the construction new homes at the upper area west of Hwy 21.
2. I would like to know how many more phases are proposed for the Biener plot from the 10th concession south to Acton drive. Will there be any green space left in this plot to support the resident wildlife?
3. I believe the conditions of high water in ditches in Cutter Rd is a direct result of construction and drainage from new developments to the north. thus leading to the destruction of the green space that exists today.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the following number;

Thank You,  
??

Dean McCutcheon

Sun 3/7/2021

6:15 PM



To: Port Elgin Planning

**\*\* [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.

I've lived in this town for over 40 years and have appreciated its beauty and all its natural offerings since my youth, exploring the trails behind Beiner's fields. Although it makes sense that others would opt to live here, that growth and development are inevitable, I can't stand seeing the evidence of poor planning by developers and municipal leaders. There is obviously limited public green space but you wouldn't know that based on decisions to continue to build more houses, destroying the best parts of our community. All in the name of greed. It saddens and infuriated me. Those trails are more populated now than ever before. We should be looking for ways to expand our public green spaces for residents to recreate and enjoy, not destroy it.

I am in complete opposition of phase 3, the extension of Acton Drive being developed. Enough is enough!

Jodi McDonald

Resident of Saugeen Shores

Fri 3/5/2021

11:48 AM



To: Port Elgin Planning

**\*\* [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 there

I just heard on Jenny O'Reillys facebook page that our greenspace will be utilized for land development once again...I have lived on Miramichi Bay since 1999 and am wondering when enough is enough? I own an empty field a mile or two away and cannot build on it .. why is it better to remove green space than to build in an empty field? No one would miss anything by building in my empty field. So sad for the residents, the tourists, not to mention the wildlife. These are decisions that cannot be undone. No more deer in our backyards, no more rabbits, all the reasons why people love our area in the first place will be gone. Please do not pave paradise. Pave my open field of 12 acres! The limitations you put on my field and people who own it are unsustainable. The \$35/month I make on it doesn't even pay the taxes. Help us understand the logic in these decisions so we can support them...

Thx for listening..

Tracey Harron



March 8, 2021

Attention: Daniel Kingsbury  
Bruce County Planning Department

We received the Notice of Application, File Number: S-2021-002.

We reside at 36 Cutter Road, Lot 5, Plan 524.

We would like to be kept informed about the aforementioned proposed application.

We do have some questions about this application as it appears to have changed from the previous plan from years ago?

The information that has been provided is very confusing as there are a number of drawings from the old plan that are over 10 years old as well as the drawing with the proposed subdivision (and not the final proposed plan).

We would like to know the future of Cutter Road? We have maintained this dirt/gravel road portion of the road for the past 39 years that we have lived at this address. We have not had direct mail, garbage pick up or any road service/maintenance during this time. Our suggestion would be to make a turn-around cul-de-sac at the end of the existing pavement which would avoid having service vehicles having to turn around in neighbouring private driveways which presently creates a safety concern for many of the neighbourhoods, visiting grandchildren.

Also, are there plans to deal with the increasing water table issues that the residents on Cutter Road have had to contend with since there has been greater runoff from the top of the tenth concession? This increased water issue appears to be related to the increase in subdivisions in the area behind the Independent grocery store heading westward?

Access to the trails has been through a number of fire cuts along the north shore and I would hope that the access points would remain. They were first placed to allow access to the woods if there was ever a bush fire and that becomes even more important with residential housing being built closer.

We would also expect the new lots to be full serviced lots including sewer and water and the system could be extended to provide sewer to the existing properties maybe even easements through the lots to provide service to houses on Cutter Road. (The same as was done with the water system on Cutter to feed the houses on North Shore road.)

We are not opposed to a subdivision occurring behind our property but it would be nice to know what plans are being considered for greenspace as well as future road proposals and the increased water runoff concerns. Most of the proposed green space around our property is swamp land and we are sure the new lot owners will not leave that undisturbed (i.e., filling a swamp displaces water and displaced water needs to get to the lake somehow).

In conclusion we have 6 concerns we would like addressed in the proposal before the final approval is given.

1 - Maintain Cutter Road as a dead end and make it safe for vehicles to turn around (Cul-de-sac)

2 - Rectify the surface water problem that already exists on Cutter Road and also prevent from getting worse

3- Access to the trails through the existing fire cuts must be maintained

4- Assurances that the green space will remain as wood lots and not be cleared cut

5- Assurances that Phase 3 will be the last of the subdivision approved on these wetlands as agreed upon in the original application a number of years ago

6- The infrastructure in place to provide sewer and water to all new and existing properties affected by this application.

Regards

Wayne and Deb Kaufman

Tue 3/9/2021

8:49 AM



To: Port Elgin Planning

Subdivision 2021.pdf

33 KB

**\*\* [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.

Attention : Daniel Kingsbury

Re: File Number: S-2021-002

We have attached a letter that expresses some areas of concern that we would appreciate having considered with respect to the proposed application.

We would like to be notified of any public meetings or decisions that are made with respect to this application.

Regards

Wayne and Deb Kaufman

36 Cutter Road

Port Elgin, ON N0H 2C6



**\*\* [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.**

Attention : Daniel Kingsbury

We live at 25 Cutter Rd , Pt .Lot 49 ,which is the one between Lot 28 and 29 on your site plan .

Our concerns are as follows :

1. This area has a very high water table. Addition of any new lots will require a lot of drainage infrastructure to accommodate the new and existing homes in the area . Does this plan address and solve the surface water problem?  
The subdivision on the top of the hill continues to expand and adds water load to us at the bottom without being properly mitigated or controlled. This area cannot continue to be developed without a genuine water management program in place.
2. What is the plan for the fire lane that runs along the north side of our lot ? Will it become a walking path to the lake from the new subdivision? I see no continuation of this laneway past Acton drive that would give any access to the walking trail system to the north (which we currently have)
3. The proposal indicates there is about 30% total tree retention. Is this a requirement for approval? If it is, the trees on each lot should not be included as they cannot be counted on as any type of greenspace because the lot owners could clear their property thereby reducing this 30% number (if it is a requirement)
4. The studies that were completed to promote this project were done several years ago . Do they still apply today ? There certainly have been changes with all the new construction occurring in town and heading north , towards us.

We are not opposed to development. We just need to ensure this does not cause new problems for the existing residents of the area.

Finally , please keep us informed regarding this proposed development.

Regards ,

Wayne and Susan Dent

Fri 3/5/2021

6:24 PM



To: Port Elgin Planning

**\*\* [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.

Attn Planning Dept. Daniel Kingsbury

My name is David Smith. My cottage is at 34Cutter Saugeen shores. Lot 6 on the site plan.

I am quite concerned about this proposal.

Please keep me informed of all developments, meetings or decisions re the above.

I also have a questions re the site plans. There are two, one shows a wooded zone between Cutter and the new lots, the other does not. Which is correct?

I would also comment that the service plan and several assessment documents are out of date (15 years) and refer to the original plan, prior to 2010, which had a very different street layout and number/ type of structures.

Also are there plans included to provide sanitary sewer connections on Cutter, specifically to my lot?

Regards

Dave and Ellen Smith

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Sat 3/6/2021

10:45 AM



To: Port Elgin Planning

\*\* [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.

In regard to a new housing development planned for 10th concession to Fenton in Saugeen Shores.

How can we stop this mess from happening?

There is something very wrong when beautiful green space is torn down to build a subdivision.

Taking homes from wildlife is unacceptable.

Add my name to the list of people who oppose this destruction.

A Tax Payer

Debb Poff

Sent from my iPhone

**Date:** March 5, 2021 at  
8:10:25 AM EST  
**To:** bcplpe@brucecounty.ca  
**Subject: Protect  
Woodland trail**

The forested area that follows the coast of Port Elgin's shoreline, specifically the Biener woodland trail is a valuable ecosystem.

I was born in Kincardine and raised in Port Elgin. This is my homeland.

Do not cut down the forest and build houses/ subdivisions in its place.

Please do not do it!

I would not be able to stand the heartbreak each day knowing a sacred place from my childhood has been destroyed. If it were to be, I could not continue to live.

Despair.

There is so much land without trees on it that could be utilized.

I have faith in the human ability to be resilient,

Fri 3/5/2021

3:12 PM



To: Port Elgin Planning

**\*\* [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.

Hello

I've recently been informed that our trail system is in danger of being paved, gross. Please don't take out outdoor green space. I don't want to live in a place that Shiny and gold I want to live in a place that's green. We already have so many shiny new things here, its blinding. It takes away from what saugeen is supposed to be, shores, not asphalt.

A very poor concerned citizen that is almost to the point of being pushed out by housing and pavement.

Robin Cork

Sent from my Galaxy



Fri 3/5/2021

7:44 AM



To: Port Elgin Planning

\*\* [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.

I'm writing to ask you stop the construction of homes in green space in Saugeen Shores. The green space is being taken over too quickly also there is no need as there is room for development if needed on the already clear cut land.

Specifically talking about area south of 10th, west of Cutter.

Thank you Lori Bayes

161 Stickel

Port Elgin

Sent from my iPhone

June 15, 2021

# ATTN: D. KINGSBURY

COUNTY OF BRUCE  
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
1243 MACKENZIE ROAD  
PORT ELGIN  
ON N0H 2C4

Re: Subdivision File # S-2021-002

Dear Sir,

We have the following comments relating to the subject application draft subdivision plan which is currently available for review on the Bruce County web site.

Please be aware that we are supportive of development within the Town of Saugeen Shores. Such development is an important part of maintaining and growing a vibrant community such as we enjoy. We are also generally supportive of the proposed subdivision. However, all such development should be planned and approved with due regard for the environment and should not have a deleterious impact on existing properties and their owners.

We wish to identify the following areas of concern which we want to be submitted to, and be addressed, as part of the public comment process associated with the subject plan application.

We wish to be kept informed of the progress of the subject application.

# DRAINAGE

Drainage is a difficult and controversial subject. There are a plethora of drainage issues in the Saugeen Shores area. The Town initiated a Master Drainage Study in 2020 to understand and manage current drainage problems, as well as avoid future problems with drainage. A draft study was issued for comment 2020 <sup>1</sup>but requires significant work to complete satisfactorily. This study is ongoing. This study includes issues which have been identified in the new proposed subdivision area.

The proposed subdivision S-2021-002 is in an area which, as stated on page 11 of the associated 2010 drainage report<sup>2</sup>, is complex and difficult to predict.

Drainage within the Woodlands of Summerside, especially throughout the central part of the Woodlands is a very complex drainage system. Due to the numerous sand ridges and wetland areas throughout the central part of the site, it is difficult to accurately delineate drainage boundaries. Information contained in Map 1 is our best approximation of drainage patterns and drainage areas.

It will be important to ensure that downstream drainage systems that will direct water through the proposed linear development that is parallel to the North Shore Road, be designed with an increased factor of safety to account for the uncertainty with regards to drainage boundaries within the central part of the Woodlands.

Since this report was written in 2010 a storm water management pond has been constructed to the east of the proposed subdivision area. This pond was constructed to support a different

---

<sup>1</sup> Town of Saugeen Shores  
Master Drainage Plan  
GMBP File: 219020  
December 2020 (Draft for Review)

<sup>2</sup> Lord Elgin Estates Developments Ltd  
Woodlands of Summerside – Final Stormwater Management Report  
December 2010

development further to the east, closer to HWY 21 / Goderich Street. Water discharge from this pond has resulted in drainage problems over the area from the middle to the northern boundary of the proposed subdivision. The issues include chronic surface water flows north along Cutter Road, and west in the Hilly Lane vicinity of the North Shore Road. Many parts of this area are waterlogged and swampy. The ground has also become saturated such that basements and crawl spaces of existing homes are at risk of flooding from ground water.

The new subdivision plan proposes interceptor ditches in a couple of key places. These ditches will be designed to flow towards engineered culvert systems which ultimately discharge into Lake Huron. On face value it seems that the new ditches will indeed help to resolve existing drainage problems in the area, as well as facilitating drainage of the new lots, some of which are currently very swampy.

However, what if the proposed drainage system does not work as intended? What if there are unintended impacts on existing properties?

Given the complexity of the drainage situation, how will the Town hold the developer accountable for the correct function of the drainage system and for any corrective actions to prevent ongoing deleterious impact on existing property?

We suggest that some sort of fund be set aside and held in trust to resolve drainage issues for a period, say 5 years. If all is well such funds can be released back to the developer. This would be much more acceptable than the current situation where down-stream property owners are 'on-their-own' to resolve water drainage issues resulting from up-stream development activity.

In addition, we are concerned that drainage systems will only work as designed if they are maintained. How will the proposed new drainage works be maintained into the future, once the development is complete?

## WOODLAND PRESERVATION

The Applicant and the Town have had discussions on the preservation of some of the wooded area in which this subdivision is to be built. A 30% target for preservation of woodland has been laid out for the overall project, as well as allowing for 30% wooded areas on each of the 50 residential lots. The Town has facilitated this discussion by adjusting the width of the road allowance, and by allowing required drainage works to be constructed on town land.

However, once a future owner of an individual lot obtains title to that lot, what is stopping the lot owner from clearcutting their property as they see fit? As an owner of a partially wooded lot, I understand that it can be quite onerous to maintain a wooded area. Trees must be monitored and maintained, and in some cases, removal is necessary for safety reasons, e.g., for the recent plague on the ash tree population.

How is the Town going to monitor and enforce the 30% rule on each lot?

In our opinion a complaint-based process enforcement process will be ineffective and puts the responsibility and pressure on others to monitor for non-compliance. Will there be a 'planned-inspection' process of some sort which will hold individual lot owners accountable for meeting the intent of the woodland preservation plans?

What will be the guidelines for replanting, for example, after a mature tree is culled? What are the expectations for replanting to maintain the target 30% wooded area?

## CUTTER ROAD, UNOPENED ALLOWANCE

The location of the subject development makes good use of another strip of land from the current wooded area. The design layout is such that properties to the west of the new street will face the new street, leaving the unopened Cutter Road allowance in limbo to the rear of these lots. If the Cutter Road allowance is ever opened all the way to Fenton Drive, then it will merely

service the rear of the new lots. It seems, given the evolution of subdivision design in this neighborhood, that future investment in this unopened street is not effective use of resources.

It is suggested that Cutter Road be made into a proper cul-de-sac which ends at the end of the current paved road. The unopened allowance can be re designated trail or parkland and continue to be used for utility and drainage. A proper vehicle turn space can then be constructed at the end of the current paved road in Cutter Road which would allow safe turn around for garbage trucks, snowplows and other vehicles.

What is the current plan for the unopened Cutter Road allowance?

## IN CLOSING

To restate, we are generally supportive of the new development proposal.

We request that our concerns detailed above be addressed formally as part of the formal approval process.

We would like to continue to be kept informed of the progress of this application.

Thank you.

SINCERELY,

STEVE MCDUGALL & CAROL VAN DER MAADEN  
6 CUTTER ROAD  
PORT ELGIN  
ON N0H 2C6

## proposed subdivision file # S-2021-002

Susan Dunlop

Tue 6/15/2021 4:28 PM

To: Port Elgin Planning <BCPLPE@brucecounty.on.ca>

**\*\* [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.

Good afternoon,

I sent a previous message to you on May 25, expressing my concern about the drainage plan for the future subdivision behind my home at 84 Northshore Road, Port Elgin since we have had difficulties with flooding from that area in the past. A Mr. Daniel Kingbury sent my concerns to Steve Cobean at Cobide engineering. Steve informed me that part of the drainage plan for this new subdivision is the open ditch that the town dug behind my home in the access lane after the last flooding problem. My concern with this is that the access lane is full of phragmites. As I am sure you are aware, phragmites is a terribly invasive weed. Steve also expressed concern with the phragmites being there, as it has the potential to clog the drainage ditch, rendering it useless. I called the town of Saugeen Shores and spoke with Jay Pausner. My understanding was that he would get back to me as he was unsure who he should contact about the maintenance of the ditch and the removal of the phragmites. I have not heard back from him.

My concerns now are:

- 1) Who is responsible for the maintenance of the drainage ditch that runs behind my home in the access lane and
- 2) What assurance can you give me that the ditch will be maintained once approval of this subdivision is given?

I would appreciate hearing an answer to these matters.

Thank you in advance,

Sincerely,

Susan Dunlop

## Subdivision file #S-2021-002

Diane Glebe

Mon 6/21/2021 9:04 AM

To: Port Elgin Planning <BCPLPE@brucecounty.on.ca>

**\*\* [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.

I am wondering if the current access points that come from North Shore Rd and provide access to the open field (the utility corridor) will provide access to the subdivision and if yes will cars be allowed on the access laneways or will it be pedestrian only?

thank you

Diane Glebe



**From:** Daniel Kingsbury  
**Sent:** July 22, 2021 10:42 AM  
**To:** Jordan Archer; Robyn McIntyre  
**Cc:** Amanda Froese; Jay.Pausner  
**Subject:** RE: S-2021-002 Resident Question

Hi Jordan,

I've passed along your questions to the Town regarding the tree preservation with the Concession 10 right of way as well as the rationale for the pumping station.

It doesn't appear you were on the circulation list for the original mailout. It's likely that our list is out of date given how new your subdivision is. I've updated our circulation list so you'll receive future notices. You'll see that the public meeting already happened on June 21. However, public comments can still be submitted and will be considered by both staff and County Council, who is the approval authority for Plans of Subdivision. This application will be going forward to County Council likely in September. You can participate in the meeting by attending a delegation if you wish. Please let me know and I can forward you the information.

---

**From:** Jordan Archer  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 20, 2021 8:31 PM  
**To:** Daniel Kingsbury; Robyn McIntyre  
**Subject:** Re: S-2021-002 Resident Question

Thank you for the information Daniel.

What is the timeframe for the planning process associated with this plan? When is the next opportunity for the public to voice concerns?

Who can clarify the tree retention requirements along Concession 10? The development that I reside in was recently developed and the lots adjacent to Concession 10 have a 5 meter tree retention buffer that provides a natural feel to the neighbourhood. I would expect that any adjacent new developments would follow suit.

Why is a sewage pumping station being installed less than half a kilometer away from an existing sewage pumping station? How many lots would be serviced by this pumping station? All of the existing residents in the area are serviced on septic tanks, so if a new development is proposed it should be serviced via septic tanks or via the existing pumping station. Having a second pumping station within the same area is poor development and would be a blemish to the neighbourhood. If there was a second pumping station planned for this neighbourhood, then why was Lakeside Woods not planned to be included to be serviced by this pumping station?

Please advise on the above.

Jordan Archer

**From:** Daniel Kingsbury  
**Sent:** July 19, 2021 11:45 AM  
**To:** Jordan Archer  
**Subject:** RE: S-2021-002 Resident Question

Hi Jordan,

Block 61 is a utility block for a proposed sewage pumping station.  
All lots within the plan are proposed to serviced by sanitary sewer which are to run within the Acton Drive right of way  
The Tree Retention Plan does not indicate any trees along the northside of Lots 36 and 37 along Concession 10. There may be trees within the Concession 10 right-of-way that remain.

You should have received notice by mail if you live within 120 metres of the proposed subdivision.

Hope that helps answer your questions.  
Please feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.

**Daniel Kingsbury**  
Senior Planner  
Planning and Development

**From:** Jordan Archer  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 8:12 PM  
**To:** Port Elgin Planning  
**Subject:** S-2021-002 Resident Question

Hi Mr. Kingsbury,

I am a resident in Saugeen Shores and reside just across from the proposed draft plan of subdivision S-2021-002. I have a question related to the proposed plan. Specifically, what is planned for Block 61? Additionally, what are the sanitary servicing plans for this development? Finally, are there any tree retention buffers for Lots 36 and 37 that will run along Concession 10?

I was also expecting a letter notifying me of the public notice and was surprised to find out when I went online that the public meeting occurred over a month ago. Were notifications sent out to existing residents in the area?

Thank you,

Jordan Archer