

Public Comments

From: Peter Ens

Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 11:16 PM

To: Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub <bcplpe@brucecounty.on.ca>; Peter Ens

Subject: Bruce County Public Meeting Notice, May 16, 2022

**** [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.

County of Bruce Planning and Development Department

Re: Bruce County Public Meeting Notice

Local Official Plan Amendment L-2021-014

Zoning By-law Amendment Z-2021-071

I am writing this email on behalf of my mother, Irene Ens.

The purpose of this communication is to provide input for the Bruce County Planning Meeting regarding Local Official Plan Amendment File #L-2021-014 & Zoning By-law Amendment File #Z-2021-071 scheduled for May 16.

Currently and for the past 47 years, Mom has lived at #16, Bruce Road 25, Port Elgin. This is a large lot (1.62 acres) with large upscale home and a two-storey 1100 square ft garden shed. The property includes 65 mature trees, a 60 x 100 ft vegetable garden, numerous shrubs, bushes and flower beds.

We fully support the building of 4-storey apartment buildings in Saugeen Shores, as there definitely is a shortage of affordable housing in our community. However, we object to the location for the construction of the two 4-storey apartment buildings proposed in this Local Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.

The Bruce County provided Location Map and Site Plan shows the south side boundary of the apartment buildings property would border along approximately 200 ft of the 250 ft backyard of Moms property. We feel constructing 4-storey apartment buildings beside my mothers large property is inappropriate.

The 3 and 4-storey apartment buildings that currently exist in Port Elgin are bordered and surrounded by streets, commercial businesses, playgrounds/green space, vacant lands, townhouses, condo/row housing, duplexes/triplexes. None of these current apartment building properties are located beside single family homes- let alone beside large lots with large upscale homes like my mothers.

In our opinion, the construction location of new apartment buildings in Saugeen Shores should continue be buffered by streets, commercial business, playgrounds/green space, vacant land. Then, transition to townhouses, condo/row housing, duplexes/triplexes

properties before transitioning to single family homes, then out to larger size lots/properties.

We believe there are many locations in Saugeen Shores that are more suitable to new apartment building construction. Therefore, we ask Bruce County to reject this Local Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.

Thankyou for your consideration.

Irene Ens, Peter Ens

Sent from Mail for Windows

From: Peter Ens

Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 11:30 PM

To: Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub <bcplpe@brucecounty.on.ca>

Subject: Request for Decision Notification on File #s L-2021-014 & Z-2021-071

** [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 Bruce County Planning Department:

This written request is also on behalf of my mother- Irene Ens.

Please notify me via email of the decision of the approval authority on the proposed applications: Local Official Plan Amendment L-2021-014 and Zoning By-law Amendment Z-2021-071.

Additionally, please notify my mother- Irene Ens of the decision, via mail. My mothers mailing address is #16, Bruce Road 25, Port Elgin, Ont N0H 2C5.

Regards,

Peter Ens, Irene Ens.

Sent from Mail for Windows

From: Murray Becker

Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 12:47 PM

To: Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub <bcplpe@brucecounty.on.ca>; Murray Becker

Subject: Local Official Plan Amendment File # L-2021-014 and Zoning By Law Amendment File #Z-2021-071

** [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.

To Whom it may concern:

We would like to object to - Local Official Plan Amendment File # L-2021-014 and Zoning By Law Amendment File #Z-2021-071.

We just built a new home on 14 Bruce Road 25.

We might not have built here if we had known that these very large and very tall apartment buildings might be built this close to our lot line.

We do not think that this should be allowed.

Thank You

Murray and Kathy Becker

May 13, 2022

RE: May 16 Planning Meeting

Dear Council Members:

I'm writing on behalf of "United Housing For All" speaking in favour of Local Official Plan Amendment File #L-2021-014 and Zoning By-law Amendment File #Z-2021-071. United Housing for All is a joint committee created in 2021 by members of the Port Elgin and Southampton United Churches, to help the Town address our community's affordable and attainable housing crisis. Membership is open beyond our churches to others in the community. To date, UHFA has approved two goals: 1) To assist in educating our community about housing issues and possible solutions to those challenges, and 2) To advocate for positive actions which mitigate and, over time, put this crisis behind us.

We believe that these amendments are consistent with efforts of Town of Saugeen Shores' town council and other local government bodies to proactively address our town's housing crisis. Higher density developments represent important measure to increase our attainable and affordable housing capacity. One hundred twenty-four units represent a modest, but important addition to Saugeen Shores' rental properties.

Its proximity to the Goderich Street corridor makes the development attractive to potential residents - both people in the workforce and people who prefer to live near shopping, restaurants and health care providers.

Several members of our committee live, or have family living within walking distance of the proposed development. Consistent with our committee's second goal, they have informally monitored neighbourhood residents' commentary regarding the proposed project. They report that negative comments have been minimal in comparison to developments recently before the Planning committee and full Town Council. Those comments have been confined to increased traffic concerns, a topic which inevitably arises when new developments are proposed. The natural egress via Concession 25 to Goderich Street should largely mitigate those concerns by directing the bulk of new traffic away from existing subdivisions.

In sum, this represents a relatively straightforward decision. We support approval of both amendments.

Mark E. Havitz
Chair, UHFA
324 Albert Street South
Southampton, ON N0H 2L0

From: Becky Gibbons
Sent: 30 May 2022 13:33
To: Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub <bcplpe@brucecounty.on.ca>
Subject: Regarding File Numbers: L-2021-014, Z-2021-071

**** [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.

Respected Members of Council

I am a resident of Saugeen Shores, specifically Bruce Road 25, where the above named amendments are currently on the table to decide upon. I can only speak officially for my husband and myself, but I can say with confidence that many of my neighbours share the same feelings and opinions regarding these proposed amendments.

My understanding is that the current zoning allows for the building of apartment buildings. Our concerns are with the proposed amendments of increasing the population density for the area, while at the same time decreasing the parking for this increased population. While I recognize that there is a need for increased rentals in the area, I question why these amendments are necessary. My only conclusion is that it increases profitability for the developer.

1. Why couldn't the developer build only one apartment building, thereby eliminating the need for the amendments?
2. Perhaps the buildings could be only two or three stories high, again eliminating the need for the amendments.
3. Why are the apartment buildings positioned such that the balconies of the units are facing the existing neighbours' backyards? Why can they not be turned 90 degrees so that the balconies are facing the future development of the adjoining vacant property? My guess is that the current landowner is aware that this positioning with respect to his planned housing development would be undesirable for future sales for himself.
4. There have been apartment complexes built in other sections of the town, and more development currently happening by various developers. Why must they be crammed into one small parcel of land?
5. As a resident and homeowner directly across from the adjoining vacant property, I have great concerns that this property will be developed in the same manner. The developer has stated that his intent is to build single family homes on this land, but what is to stop him from continuing to ask for amendments to increase the population here as well, and build more and more apartment buildings? Once the precedent is set, then that opens the doors for more and more of this type of development.
6. During the online meeting it was stated that there would be a road from this property connecting to Bruce Road 25. Again I wonder why there is a need for this when there are

other roads that will be carried through to Bruce Road 25. (eg. Stickel St., Bruce St, Ridge St.)

Can you be specific as to where this road will be? Will the proposed road come straight through directly in front of an existing residents living room? Can you please inform the residents of Bruce Road 25 exactly what the layout of both of the planned developments are? We have no idea yet it is happening directly across the road from us.

Additionally, Bruce Road 25 is the “go to” alternate to and from Bruce Power. As a resident I can tell you that an avenue for additional traffic on our road would not be positive. At times the traffic is back to back starting at 3 pm and continues non-stop until around 7 pm.

We are not short of land here, like Toronto where they must go “up”. So I sincerely wonder why this is being considered in our beautiful area. To be clear, I am not opposed to continuing development, particularly in housing, but I respectfully question why this is even a consideration.

I believe that the lack of resident participation in the online meeting is most likely the result of technology issues rather than lack of interest and/or concerns. Had the meeting been in person where locals could attend, you may have had a substantially greater expression of questions and objections.

I welcome a response from someone who could answer these questions for me. Perhaps I am too late to make a difference by sending this email with our concerns, but nonetheless I felt it was important.

Becky and Geordie Gibbons
25 Bruce Road 25

Sent from my iPad