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I live on [redacted] so the development has been planned for some years and rejected. It was a poor plan. One reason was an east/west road, that ran off the west road...but that was on a hill and drivers would be blind to the oncoming traffic. Now in a sense the whole plan is now turned around with the garages attached. An small access road is also planned which puts some space between the present properties and the planned one. The Huron properties were not complete when I moved here circa 1990. On the south side, about half the properties were not sold. One neighbor had an architect raise the house a few feet, because of ground water level. His basement windows are a few feet above ground. Mine was not...yet in May the soil, basement, was dry. I have also an emergency sump pump system, for obvious reasons. A neighbor to the north, had two. Apparently there was a watercourse to the lake somewhat originally. So basements in these houses may be problematic. The retaining wall, is a good idea. There is quite a drop from the originally railway path. I think it is a much better plan than the original. I might add the soil seems well for pine trees. A few were planted from a seedling, and are now so big, that one was cut down. One could have, and one person did, a forest in 20 years. Thanks. hope that helps.

Now if we could get better smoother roads. Very bad main street. The road in Dresden at that time behind the Iron Curtain, was much better. Realized (much later) it was the main Military road, from Russia to Germany. In '65 when I visited, everything in Dresden was dirty, decaying, and seemed like nothing had been done in 30 years. By the way there was no visible meat in the store fronts. The next year the whole system collapsed. Astonished everyone. By chance, I was back in another year. All the taxi's at the train station were Mercedes Benz. What astonishing changes. Freedom is taken for granted. Something I'll never forget. Have a good new year.

don and helga chapman.
Good morning Denise

Thanks for steering me in the right direction on this application for the development of the land behind my home in Thornbury. I live at [redacted], first I’m in favor of this parcel of land to be finally developed. I have lived here since 1985 and this must be the 4th or 5th try on this section of land. I have two concerns with the application Denise, first the density. I would be in favor in seeing roughly the same size lots as Huron st and Lakeshore drive.

I do have concerns with the proposed one way road system, there are lots of small parcels of land in Town looking for development. This would lead to planning issues in the future where developers can use this model of one way roads.

I hope this all make sense, thanks for the time.

Regards Brian & Nancy Kane
To the Town Council of Thornbury:

Good day, wishing you & your family health and happiness. Thank you for your tireless efforts to keep us & our town safe throughout this epidemic! I am writing to you in response to the Abbotts Subdivision Proposal (File#P2832).

The ‘Planning Justification Report 2019’ submitted states: ‘The PPS (Provincial Policy Statement) requires the wise use & management of resources to ensure that development patterns protect natural heritage features, the quality & quantity of water, agriculture, mineral & cultural resources. This section of the PPS was reviewed in light of the proposed development & generally, no natural resources are associated with the proposed site.’

The land in question, all life-forms living on & within the land, the air surrounding/sustaining the land, & the water table existing beneath it is a natural resource. A common tendency is to take this reality for granted because no matter how we take advantage of it, the earth cannot file a lawsuit in protest.

We are here, on this planet, for only a short time (a blip in cosmic time, really) & it is our responsibility to take care of & protect this living entity. Just as the Iroquois did 250 years ago & the Princess Point, Saugeen, Point Peninsula and Meadowood Cultures did 1000-2000 years ago (Archeology Report p.8). Do you really think we would be here having this discussion if they had not acted responsibly and lived a sustainable existence by preserving what they knew was theirs only temporarily?

Having a building/structure on every available surface, expanding vertically (coach houses on top of buildings) & underground (basements) is not considered sustainable; it is rape of the land. The excesses proposed necessitate all kinds of changes to the area: building a drainage buffer, a retaining wall, extensions of water mains, etc. This would not be necessary if the proposed development worked with and respected the land’s inherent capabilities and capacities. After all, everything works just fine now without our intervention.

All the reports on the study area are confined to lots 35 to 39 and do not take into account Bay St. & Victoria St. the road allowances requested to be opened. And yet these “roads” are home to a valuable ecosystem which includes a forest, animals, birds, insects, and more.

David Suzuki (the scientist) stipulates in an article: ‘... as long as that forest is intact, the plants photosynthesize and remove carbon dioxide from the air while putting oxygen back - not a bad service for animals like us that depend on clean air...tree roots cling to the soil, so when it rains the soil doesn’t erode ... The trees pump hundreds of thousands of litres of water out of the soil, transpiring it into the air and modulating weather and climate... the forest provides habitat to countless species of.... fungi, insects, mammals, amphibians and birds... So all the things an intact ecosystem does to keep the planet vibrant & healthy for animals like us are simply ignored in our economy... Nature’s services keep the planet habitable for animals like us & must become an integral component of a new economic structure. We must get off this suicidal focus on endless, mindless growth.’

The proposed “improvements” to the existing drainage ditch running along Bay St. are unnecessary: it already works well & the trees don’t need any help in water-diversion.

‘... the measure of how well a government or corporation is doing is its record of economic growth. But our home - the biosphere, or zone of air, water, and land where all life exists - is finite and fixed. It can’t grow. And nothing within such a world can grow indefinitely. In focusing on constant growth, we fail to ask the important questions. What is an economy for? Am I happier with all this stuff? How much is enough?’ David Suzuki

I leave you with a poem entitled ‘Spirit Walker’ by Nancy Wood

‘Spirit Walker, with long legs poking out of rain clouds
Along the mesa tops,
Listen to our prayers for understanding.
Spirit Walker, with strong arms embracing the wounded Earth,
We ask forgiveness for our greed.
Spirit Walker, with footsteps echoing like promises
Across the aching land,
Give Fire and Ice to purify us.
Spirit Walker, with tears that fall as Snow and Rain,
Heal our forests and our rivers,
Our homes and the hearts of all creatures.
Spirit Walker, heed the cry of every living thing
And bathe the Earth with harmony.’

with respect,
Eniko Herceg (daughter)
in collaboration with
Rozalia Herceg (owner)
I am writing to provide input in advance of the public meeting which has been scheduled for September 16.

By way of background, I am the owner/resident at [redacted address], a property which backs onto the proposed development. My parents built the home in which I now reside, with my children, in 2002. My family has been coming to the area for over 40 years, and has deep roots in the community. My late father, a member of the local Rotary Club, was a major fundraiser for the local healthcare clinic, and was the webmaster for the TBM website. We are highly invested in our love of Thornbury, and in preserving what makes it special.

It is my opinion that the proposed zoning by-law amendment from R1-1 to R2 is completely inappropriate for our neighbourhood. It would be entirely inconsistent with the neighbourhood’s unique character. It is a place where everyone knows each other (and their pets), people walk and ride bicycles (instead of using vehicles), and it is safe to allow your children to play on the street. These are the things that make Thornbury appealing to new residents; yet, all of this, and more, would be destroyed by what you’re proposing. Why would you intentionally create something that would destroy the very essence of what makes this unique community special?

Environmentally, we know that R2 would create serious drainage issues with the existing soil, not to mention a host of other problems resulting from turning a long-unused field into a high-density housing development. Why is zoning being changed to accommodate the development? The development should conform with the existing zoning. Surely there are better ways to develop this land, ways that don’t come with all of the risks inherent in the current proposal.

A transparent review/study of this proposal, to be conducted by an independent planner, working collaboratively with all stakeholders, is warranted under the circumstances. I would also like to receive more information on how to preserve my appeal rights. I am strongly opposed to this proposed by-law amendment and development.

Sincerely,

Christina Eaton

Sent from Christina’s iPad
September 15, 2020

To: The Mayor and Members of Council  
   Town of the Blue Mountains

From: Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association

RE: Abbotts Subdivision

Please include the comments below as public input regarding the proposed Abbotts Subdivision (Public Meeting, September 16, 2020).

Our concern is related to storm water management in the western portion Thornbury, an area that includes the site of the proposed Abbotts Subdivision.

Inadequate storm water infrastructure in this area is a long-standing problem. Many residents have sump pumps running 24/7. Standing water is common after rainfalls. Outdated ditches and culverts do not meet the drainage requirements of existing neighbourhoods, let alone proposed new developments.

These issues were highlighted recently in a presentation by June Porter to the Committee of the Whole on June 16, 2020. The presentation also addressed the critically important need to answer key questions about the current status and future development of stormwater management infrastructure for the entire western section of Thornbury, and to ensure that all proposed developments, including the Abbotts Subdivision, are required to meet the most up-to-date engineering standards. Our current standards, from 2009, are in the process of being updated and it is important that the updated standards are applied in all cases. Committee members indicated that they are familiar with these concerns and passed a motion unanimously requesting a report from the Town’s Operations Department.

Given the long and well-known history of drainage problems in this area, new developments – including the Abbotts Subdivision – should proceed only in the context of fully transparent plans and concrete commitments that guarantee appropriate storm water management infrastructure will be in place. No development should be approved unless it meets the most advanced engineering standards, reflecting changing climate conditions and low-impact design to minimize runoff.

The basic principles underlying this approach should guide the pace of development throughout the Town of the Blue Mountains.
September 15, 2020

Ms. Corinna Giles,
Town Clerk,
Town of The Blue Mountains,
32 Mill Street, P.O. Box 310,
Thornbury, Ontario
N0H 2P0

Dear Ms. Giles.

Comments and Requests for Information
Town of Blue Mountains Zoning By-Law Amendment File # P2832
Grey County Plan of Subdivision File No. 42-T-2019-02

1. Municipal Act, 2001 Requirements – Sale and Disposition of Land

Subsection 270(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 (Ontario) (the “Act”) requires that the Town of Blue Mountains (the “Town”) shall adopt and maintain a policy with respect to its sale and other disposition of land.

A critical aspect of the proposed development of the Abbotts Subdivision (the “Subdivision”) is that the Town is to effectively ‘contribute’ its land on which two road allowances are located for the Subdivision and, in effect, for the commercial benefit of the developer. By the proposal, the Town’s property will effectively subsidize the developer’s optimization of its land for its private development and sale purposes, and profit, by increasing the permitted residential density.

By the proposed arrangement, the Town is to ‘contribute’ the use of the road allowances for the proposed new road, sidewalk, service corridor and drainage and landscape buffers. This contribution of the Town’s property will benefit the developer as its own land will then not have to be used for
those purposes and can instead be developed and sold. To the extent that the Town contributes property, the potential density of the Subdivision is thereby maximized.

The Town is to effect this by granting an apparent perpetual right-of-way to the developer to use its road allowances for the benefit of its development. As such a right-of-way would be a disposition of Town property, the Municipal Act’s requirements apply. As such, the Act requires that the Town have (i) adopted a policy with respect to its sale and disposition of land, and (ii) complied with the requirements of that policy with respect to any grants of interest in the road allowances.

Please (i) provide a copy of, or link to, the Town’s official policy with respect to its sale and disposition of its property and (ii) advise of the steps it has taken to date to comply with that policy and will take going forward.

Please further advise if the Town has publicly tendered, or considered publicly tendering, for sale the property on which its subject road allowances are located.

2. Municipal Act, 2001 Requirements – Tree Canopy

The Town’s Official Plan mandates that it is a policy of the Town to implement measures to protect, enhance and expand the tree canopy in the Town.

Subsection 270(1) of the Act requires that the Town shall adopt a policy with respect to the manner in which it will protect and enhance the tree canopy and natural vegetation in the Town. Please provide a copy of, or link to, that policy.

The lands owned by the developer for the proposed Subdivision have already been substantially ‘clearcut’. However, this ‘clearcutting’ did not extend to the Town’s road allowances on which a substantial number of sizeable trees remain.

It is now contemplated that an additional 1.73 acres of old-growth trees be ‘clearcut’ from the Town’s property to facilitate the developer’s plans.

The proposed development contemplates further removal of trees after this roadway and sidewalk clearing. All trees located within the 2.5-metre landscape buffer on the Town’s roadway allowances
3. Official Plan - Dedication of Land

The Town’s Official Plan requires that a developer dedicate land for park and other recreational purposes of an amount not exceeding 5% of the land being developed or cash in lieu thereof.

The proposed Subdivision appears to utilize all of the developer’s property for the proposed lots. It appears that no land is being deducted and, in fact, it is the Town that is ‘contributing’ use of its land for the benefit of the proposed Subdivision.

Please advise what arrangements have been made in this regard, the total amount of land to be dedicated or cash paid by the developer, and the terms.

4. Initial and Ongoing Costs to the County and Town

The documents submitted for review provide no financial disclosure. It appears that the Town is proposed to subsidize the Subdivision by (i) contributing its property to allow for increased density, essentially for the benefit of the developer, and then (ii) to maintain the Town’s property and works thereon in perpetuity, essentially for the private benefit of the residents of the Subdivision.

As each of the Town and the County of Grey (the “County”) have revenue and expense-sharing arrangements, the proposed Subdivision may result in net ongoing financial outlays by each of them.

The following requests for information are accordingly addressed to each of the County and Town with respect to the proposed Subdivision.

A. Please advise of the total cost each of the County and the Town are to incur to build the proposed road, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, watermains, sanitary sewers, subdrains, light standards, water reservoirs, hydro and transformers, service corridor, drainage buffer, landscape buffer, etc. (together the “Private Works”), including design, engineering, supervision and construction costs.
4.

B. Please advise of the total amount the developer is, or will be, contractually bound to pay each of the County and Town for the costs in A. above and the terms of such payment(s).

C. Please advise of the estimated annual cost to each of the County and Town to service and maintain the Private Works and any rights-of-way.

D. Please advise of the total amount the developer is, or will be, contractually bound to pay to each of the County and Town towards ongoing maintenance of the costs in C. above and the terms of such payment(s).

E. Please provide a cost-benefit analysis comparing the capital costs to complete the Private Works with all development revenues received or to be received from the developer and advise whether the total amounts to be paid by the County and Town for the Private Works are to exceed their respective development revenues for the Subdivision net of planning supervision costs.

F. Please provide a cost-benefit analysis comparing the estimated annual cost to each of the County and Town to service and maintain the Private Works and rights-of-way with the tax revenue each is estimated to receive from the Subdivision’s proposed new units and advise whether the total amounts to be paid by the County and Town on an ongoing basis are to exceed related tax revenues from Subdivision residents.

G. Please advise if any amounts are to be paid to the Town for the intended ongoing use in perpetuity of the road allowances for the benefit of the Subdivision and the terms of any such payments.

Thank you for your assistance. I reserve the right to make any further enquiries.

Yours very truly,

Harry Burkman

C.C.’s by e-mail

Mr. Scott Taylor,
Grey County Planner,
County of Grey
595 95th Avenue East,
Owen Sound, Ontario
N4K 3E3
Ms. Denise Whaley,
Town Planner,
Town of the Blue Mountains,
32 Mill Street, P.O. Box 310,
Thornbury, Ontario
N0H 2P0
planning@thebluemountains.ca
Hello,

My name is Krista Currie and I am a full time resident of the Town of Blue Mountains, at [redacted] in Thornbury. My husband and I live in his family’s cottage right on the corner beside Bayside Villas. We are blessed to live right across from the beautiful Georgian Bay, and really love/appreciate all the mature cedar trees along the waterfront (Little River Park), and in our own backyard. Please note we are VERY concerned about the proposal that Abbott’s development wants to do with the old town road allowance. This would be devastating to not only our neighbours, but all the beautiful birds and animals that migrate and live in these trees. Please do NOT let them go through with this. This is a huge valuable part of Thornbury’s ecosystem. As well an immense amount of privacy could be lost for not only our family, and our neighbours on Lakeshore Drive, but also the residents of Bayside Villas.

We have seen so much growth and change in this town over the last 12 years. For the most part we are okay with it, and welcome the new families and businesses with open arms. Despite how overcrowded the beach area was this summer, it still made me happy to see people enjoying this beautiful place. We are all so lucky. However this new development does not sit well at all. Build the townhouses sure, but a new road seems to be stepping beyond what is necessary for this particular neighbourhood. We have roads that are already in place and effective, and another “paved paradise” would seem excessive in such a small neighbourhood. Why do they even need to do this?? Surely there is a way to build things ethically and environmentally friendly? The TBM needs to stop cutting down forests for development...it’s the trees and nature that make people want to here in the first place.

I am very concerned and would appreciate this being shared with the local Council.

Thank you.

Krista Currie
[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone
Sorry about this but I discovered a point that could be considered a factual error in my original submission please use this corrected version.

Thanks

Tom

On Sep 15, 2020, at 12:03 PM, Kim G wrote:

From: Tom Downer
Subject: Abbotts Subdivision
Date: September 15, 2020 at 9:56:54 AM EDT
To: townclerk@thebluemountains.ca

September 15, 2020

To Whom It May Concern

Re: Abbots Subdivision

My name is Tom Downer, I have lived in a variety of communities in the local area including Meaford, Collingwood and Thornbury since 1980, when I moved here to teach History and Geography at Georgian Bay Secondary School. Like many, I have witnessed the changes to the local economy and subsequent growth and development issues faced by municipalities and their residents.

While not opposed to development of the vacant land, I am opposed to the construction of the proposed one-way road extending Bay Street West to Victoria Street and south to Huron Street West.

The construction of such a road will require the clear cutting of 1.73 acres of bush consisting largely of mature cedars. Apart from an undesirable change to the visual nature of the surrounding neighbourhood, this plan would put a road on the front and back of all the properties along the south side of Lakeshore Drive West resulting in a substantial reduction of privacy and a significant alteration to the character of the property of current ratepayers.

LOFT, the planners representing the owners of the property, acknowledged this undesirable outcome in their application to purchase these unopened road allowances in April 2016. This letter was resubmitted in 2017 and 2018 Staff Reports. It appears that the least desirable plan with the most impact on local residents has been submitted.

The removal of mature cedar trees from the proposed roadway may have unintended consequences on drainage impacting home owners on Lakeshore Drive West. Homes with basements in this area require sump pumps to keep basements dry as a result of natural high groundwater flows. There have been multiple water main breaks along Lakeshore Drive West and surrounding streets as a result of freeze/thaw stresses on aging infrastructure. When water mains break, sumps are overwhelmed and basements flood. Apart from the current ditch/culvert system along the unopened Bay Street West road and one additional culvert there are no drainage structures along Lakeshore Drive. While the plan proposes a new drainage ditch along Bay Street West, the development itself will increase surface runoff


and potentially negatively impact existing high groundwater flows. Removing cedar trees as a component of the natural drainage can only exacerbate an existing issue.

I would oppose any significant alterations to Lakeshore Drive West to alleviate drainage issues that may result from this development.

The Crozier Consulting Engineers assessment on the impact of traffic flows as a result of this development requires additional comment.

The 11 and 15 total two way trips generated by a formula, generalizes the specifics that apply to Thornbury where the population more than doubles every weekend. I think most can agree that increased vehicle traffic will be greater than suggested.

Sincerely

Tom Downer

Town of the Blue Mountains
Dear Town Clerk,

We have lived in Thornbury for over 14 years, initially at [redacted] and in 2013 we moved to [redacted]. The old cottage feel of the tree-lined street with its full canopy is enjoyed by residents and non-residents alike. The Harbour West area is a uniquely attractive area in Thornbury that must be preserved.

As members of the Harbour West Concerned Residents, our primary interest is to ensure that any proposed development receives the necessary scrutiny to ensure that it is in keeping with the built form and character of the immediate surrounding properties. As ratepayers, our concerns are valid and should be respected when evaluating land development proposals put before Town Council. We fully understand and agree that the 1.7 acre site, known as the Abbotts Subdivision, needs to be developed. However, given its history, size and proximity to downtown Thornbury and the Harbour, careful consideration as to what is “appropriate” is of paramount importance.

There are several challenges with the site, namely:

- It was formerly a gravel pit,
- It was formerly a private dump,
- It was first clear-cut in 2015 and the again in 2017 without the need to obtain any permits,
- It is bordered by road allowances (Victoria and Bay Streets) which are heavily treed (native cedars) which combined with the existing ditches effectively manage storm water and drainage

The proposed development to create lots for 22 semi-detached residential dwellings including the elimination of the mature trees on Victoria Street and Bay Street West road allowances is outrageous. Furthermore, the current Residential One (R1-1) zoning is consistent with the existing built form and should be maintained to ensure the development is a “good fit” and maintains the “character” of this very desirable, prime real estate. The description of “Subdivision” is clearly more aligned with Suburban Cities than the Town of Thornbury!

On the Town of Blue Mountain’s website it states “Our Commitment to Engagement: Public engagement helps the Town do a better job to serve our residents and our community and is key to open and transparent government.” As a past President of two Ratepayer Associations in the GTA, my experience working with the Planning Department and Council has been much more open and collaborative than the Harbour West Concerned Residents’ have experienced so far. The simple fact that this proposal is the culmination of closed-door meetings between the Developer and the Planning Department, ignoring all input, concerns, and suggestions from the local residents, is truly appalling. When will the newly elected Council enact their commitment to its residents?
The Town’s vision as stated in its Official Plan is: “managing growth that will support and emphasize the Town’s unique character, diversity, civic identity, recreational and tourism resources, rural life style and heritage features and to do so in a way that has the greatest positive impact on the quality of life in the Blue Mountains”. We are aware that since 2016/2017, the Developer has been working with the Planning Department proposing a few different scenarios, none of which were ever presented to the public. Instead, as evidenced by the development proposal (the worst scenario) before us, the Planning Department unilaterally pushed its agenda to maximize intensification at all costs, ignoring all other aspects of the Official Plan and resident input. When will the newly elected Council implement their vision? Hopefully before Thornbury is ruined by reckless development projects.

We can’t understand why the Town of Blue Mountains believes that this application is even worthy of a Public Meeting. It smacks of a total disregard for the existing Harbour West community (ratepayers) who for the past several years have tried on many occasions to consult with the Town on what would be viewed as “appropriate development”.

We hereby request that the following be undertaken before any development proposal is considered:

1. Development of a Master Plan for the Harbour West area with specific focus on maintaining and enhancing the unique cottage and rural feel of the area.
2. As part of the above, in a fully open and transparent process, assess the suitability of this infill project for intensification by considering all criteria within the Official Plan.
3. Given the previous uses of the site, an environmental study/site assessment should be done.
4. A review of the site drainage with an emphasis on minimizing the damage to neighbouring properties and maximizing the retention of the established cedar forest (on the road allowances).
5. Conduct a detailed assessment of the risks and liabilities to the Town associated with stuffing two to three times the permitted density into an already ecologically compromised area.
6. Determine the true capital cost and operating expenses the Town will incur to build the necessary municipal infrastructure to essentially pave over what should remain a largely green space with the appropriate dwelling density.
7. Re-evaluate the current Planning directive that favours the Municipality to absorb the cost of construction and maintenance of the road allowance or sell to a developer versus other options such as selling some portion to the existing residents/homeowners who have oriented their living space under the assumption that road allowance (with its mature trees) will remain intact as it has for decades.
8. Establish by-laws that protect our tree canopy and prevent unfettered clear-cutting.

We are in favour of respectful development which is in keeping with the character and cottage feel of the area, and believe open public consultation will result in a win-win solution for everyone.

Regards

Helmut Hock, Catherine Howell
Members of the Harbour West Concerned Residents
To: The Town of the Blue Mountains and The County of Grey

Re: Abbotts Subdivision, County File #42T-2019-02, Town Of the Blue Mountains By-Law Amendment #P2832

From: Al & Keri Lockhart

Hello

We are property owners at _______________ Town of the Blue Mountains. We built our house in 1995 and have seen many changes in town since. The proposed Abbotts Subdivision is of great concern to us, we are opposed to the proposed zoning by-law amendment and plan of subdivision.

The Plan of Subdivision is to create 22 lots on a small 1.73 acre parcel of land. This high density is not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood. Refer to the draft plan map included in the application and you can see just how inappropriate this proposal is. Furthermore, if these 22 lots are created and developed, all existing trees/vegetation will be bulldozed, including on the road allowances. These trees define the uniqueness of the neighbourhood, it would be a crime to remove these old growth cedars.

The zoning by-law amendment is to rezone the lands from R1-1 to R2. We object to re-zoning the lands. The lands should remain as R1-1.

Further concern is of Bay Street West, the unopened road allowance which runs between the proposed subdivision property and the back lots of the Lakeshore Drive properties. It is on this road allowance that the majority of old growth cedars, and existing drainage path are located. This proposed development will wipe this out thereby ruining the character of the neighbourhood. If left as is, the road allowance would provide a good visual and audible barrier between any SUITABLE development on the subject lands and neighbouring Lakeshore residents. This road allowance also has a natural drainage course that provides suitable drainage, helping to protect Lakeshore property owners of water issues. The road allowance should not be a part of any proposed development and should remain as is.

We object to the proposed Plan of Subdivision and proposed Zoning By-law Amendment. Development must be suitable to the unique character of the neighbourhood without causing a negative impact to the neighbourhood.

Thankyou,

Al & Keri Lockhart
January 10, 2020

The Town of The Blue Mountains
Clerk, Corrina Giles
32 Mill Street
PO Box 310
Thornbury, ON
N0H 2P0

RE: Abbotts - Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, ZBLA (22 residential units)
All of Lots 35, 36, 37, 38 and 39 Southwest side of Bay Street
Town of Thornbury

Corrina:

As you are aware, based on my previous letter dated June 24, 2019, I act on behalf of Grey Condominium Corporation #11 (GCC#11) Bayside Villas located at 63 Bay Street West in Thornbury.

I have reviewed the following items regarding the Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and ZBLA.

- Draft Plan of Subdivision – Van Harten Surveying Inc.
- Planning Report – Loft Planning Inc.
- D4 Study – Peto MacCallum Ltd.
- Archaeological Stage 1 and 2 – Amick Consulting
- Letter from Loft Planning Inc. dated October 16, 2017 (Withdrawal of Request)
- Letter from HG Graham dated July 31, 2018 (Request for Sale)
- PDS.18.104 dated September 10, 2018
- Presentation to Committee of the Whole June 10, 2019

The following is a list of questions regarding the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision/ZBLA that GCC# 11 would appreciate additional clarification on.

1. Have the Planning Justification Report (PJR) and Traffic Opinion Letter considered the potential for 22 accessory apartments on the site (i.e. one accessory apartment in each semi-attached unit)?

2. Is there a conceptual site plan showing the functionality of the parking, building envelopes, etc. proposed on the 22 lot plan?

3. Further to question 2, if accessory apartments are being proposed on each of the 22 lots (as per question 1) is there appropriate parking available on the private properties off of the proposed one-way Right of Way? Alternatively, will on street parking be permitted?
4. Will the D4 Study be peer reviewed? The D4 study recommends that methane readings be taken in frozen conditions, will that be taking place?

5. Will Town engineering staff support a NEW one-way municipal street (ROW)? Does this scenario (i.e. a one-way street) conform to the Town’s engineering standards?

6. Further to question 5. Do the Town’s engineering standards require the proposed one-way street to connect through to Huron Street West or could the ROW just hammerhead?

7. Landscape Plan/Tree Preservation – Are any existing trees staying? Is there a proposed landscape plan yet showing proposed plantings in the landscaped buffer? If new trees are being planted, what kind, where and how large will they be? Can the landscaped buffer (2.5 m width in the proposed street cross section) be increased from 2.5 m to 5 m?

8. Would it be possible to close-in the proposed ditches and pipe the stormwater in order to permit a larger landscaped buffer?

9. The proposed street cross section shows lighting on the north and east sides of the proposed one-way street. Would it be possible to move the street lighting to the west and south side(s)? Is there a photometric plan available or will one be required prior to final approval?

My client reserves the right to object to the application(s) pending answers to the above questions.

I would also ask that my client (address below) and I be added to the circulation list on any further notices including any future public meetings related to the Abbotts development.

Grey Condominium Corporation #11
Bayside Villas
63 Bay Street West
c/o Sheridan Management
808065 Side Road 24, RR 2
Clarksburg, ON
N0H 1J0

Kind Regards

PASCUZZO PLANNING INC.

Andrew Pascuzzo, MCIP, RPP
June 24, 2019

The Town of The Blue Mountains
Clerk, Corrina Giles
32 Mill Street
PO Box 310
Thornbury, ON
N0H 2P0

RE: Request for Sale of Public Land
Victoria Street North, Bay Street West Unopened Road Allowances
Town of Thornbury

Dear Corrina:

I act on behalf of Grey Condominium Corporation #11 (Bayside Villas) located at 63 Bay Street West in Thornbury.

I have reviewed the following items regarding the Request for Sale of portions of the Victoria Street North and Bay Street West unopened road allowances.

- Letter from Loft Planning Inc. dated April 26, 2016 (Request for Sale)
- PDS.17.103 dated February 22, 2017
- Letter from Loft Planning Inc. dated October 16, 2017 (Withdrawal of Request)
- Letter from HG Graham dated July 31, 2018 (Request for Sale)
- PDS.18.104 dated September 10, 2018
- Presentation to Committee of the Whole June 10, 2019

I would also ask that my client (address below) and I be added to the circulation list on any further notices related to Road Closure proposal, including any future public meetings related to development on the adjacent lands (Abbotts).

Grey Condominium Corporation #11
Bayside Villas
63 Bay Street West
c/o Sheridan Management
808065 Side Road 24, RR 2
Clarksburg, ON
N0H 1J0

Kind Regards

PASCUZZO PLANNING INC.

Andrew Pascuzzo, MCIP, RPP

243 Hurontario Street
Collingwood, ON. L9Y 2M1
www.pascuzzoinc.ca
Re: Lots 35 to 39, Southwest Side of Bay Street, Town Plot of Thornbury

My wife and I moved into Thornbury about 15 years ago. We had already lived in the area but wanted to settle in the Town itself. We chose Thornbury because it had the charm of a small town. We believed that the Town would continue to develop in this manner and in most cases this has been the case but now development is changing the look of the Town and some of that development is eroding the charm. We are not against change but believe it should adhere to the Official Plan (see immediately below).

The Town has an Official Plan and therein is a section (A1.1) on page 15 entitled “Guiding Principles” which in point #5 speaks to the maintenance of the character of existing neighbourhoods “by ensuring that development and redevelopment is compatible, in terms of built form and street pattern, with the character of adjacent buildings and neighbourhoods and the scale and density of existing development”.

As residents who live beside the proposed development, we find the plan is not compatible with point #5 in terms of built form (semi-detached vs single family) which results in higher density than adjacent homes resulting in too many homes closer together plus the possibility of having coach houses over some or all of the garages (which are close to the backyard of existing homes and to our knowledge do not exist presently in the Town). The plan is compatible in street pattern but the proposed street is not standard Town width and therefore could be considered a condominium road whereby the maintenance presumably becomes the responsibility of the development.

It was also our understanding that the Town wanted/needed a Strategic Plan to set out development for the future. Given the present rate of development, this Plan is needed now. Would this proposed development conform with the Strategic Plan?

There is also the issue of increased traffic. The addition of 22 homes would definitely add to the traffic in the immediate area. There is a potential development on the north east corner of King and Lansdowne Streets which would add to the overall traffic in the area. The Town is also considering making Lakeshore Road a one way street running west from Elma to Lansdowne streets. This would add to the traffic on Lansdowne street, which already goes too fast in both directions. In effect, the impact of increased traffic cannot be examined just in terms of this proposed development.

We also cannot understand why there is only one proposed plan. A few years ago there was one option of a plan which had small homes on the development site and where the Town did not have to provide the unopened road allowance to the developer with the ensuing loss of the present green space. Why can there not be a better plan or plans which include a neutral planner working in conjunction with the Town planning department that would be more sensitive to the many concerns of local residents? The present plan was submitted to a small group of local residents more about 18 months ago in a meeting with a Town Planning employee and a planner for the developer. However, there were no options presented for discussion. Our group was very disappointed in this approach.

There are other concerns relating to the proposed development including the loss of trees and any habitat therein, drainage and the potential environmental impact of the former gravel pit. There is also the potential change in zoning from the current R1 to R2 with other concerns.

We trust that Council will be better informed after the meeting on September 16th.

Sue and Paul Roberts
Dear Town Clerk. Please say no to the removal of all the trees for this development. It will change the character of this area terribly. Thank you, Rob Robinson.

Resident, Thornbury.

Sent from my iPhone
September 14, 2020

Re: Town of Blue Mountains Zoning By-law Amendment File #P2832
County of Grey Plan of Subdivision File # 42T-2019-02

Town of Blue Mountains Council,

We are writing this note to lodge our opposition to the proposal to rezone the Abbott Subdivision from R1 to R2. We live on the property that is immediately northwest of the land in question. We are not against development, but, we do oppose both the type of development that is proposed for this site and the specifics of what is being proposed. We would like it to be developed appropriately respecting the unique character of the area.

Our general opposition to the site is based on 3 major issues

1. Water drainage – there are already significant water drainage issues between this site and the Bay every Spring and after any heavy rainfall. Eliminating the trees and paving over the land which currently absorbs some of the water will exacerbate the current issues tremendously.
2. Safety on Lansdowne Rd – Adding significant new traffic flow to Lansdowne will exacerbate an already dangerous situation. Anyone proceeding south on Lansdowne (either on foot or by car) currently hits a 50-foot total blind spot just before they crest the hill at King Street. This is dangerous for us every day. Adding more traffic to the area with the narrow road and steep pitch will greatly increase the likelihood that something tragic could occur.
3. Environmental impact – Judging by the numerous “mounds” on the site and the stories that I have heard from long-time residents, this area was an unofficial dump for years. No one knows what was dumped and buried there. Before any development is done on the site there should be an environmental impact analysis done to determine if development will release any toxins into the water table or environment.

Our opposition to the specific proposal for the Abbott property is based on the following issues:

• Density – After analyzing the other proposed development projects in Thornbury it appears that including potential coach house units, the proposed density per hectare in this development is ~50% higher than the average density of all the other projects in town. The density of this site is also more than double the immediately surrounding blocks of land. This high-density development is inconsistent with the unique character of the neighbourhood and will dramatically alter this charming pocket of Thornbury.
• Tree loss – Our understanding of the proposed layout for the property development is that all of the trees that surround the property will be destroyed. This will totally change the landscape of the entire neighbourhood and more importantly have a negative impact on water drainage and the environment.
• Coach Houses – we are very concerned that the Coach Houses will be added to the development and subsequently rented on a short-term (less than 2 month) basis. This will dramatically increase our issues with traffic safety, draw further on town services, not be in keeping with
anything else in the neighbourhood and not be helpful for the town’s long-term goal of providing affordable housing.

- Short-term rentals in general – regardless of whether there are Coach Houses attached to the units are not, the properties are all at risk of being used as short-term rental properties which will bring all of the problems outlined above.

- Road allowance – The current design for the development contemplates two one-way streets to enter and exit the property. This no doubt maximizes the number of units that can be built on the site. To create this, the Town would be ceding the road allowance to the developer so that they can maximize the use of their land without having to add their own cul de sac as virtually every other development in town has done. Having a wall of semis fronting onto the street will be counter to all other Thornbury developments and will not be conducive to creating a vibrant neighbourhood among the new residents of this development.

In light of our objections, our request of Council is the following:

i. The Developer pay for a Phase 1 Environmental analysis on the property and pay for any remediation steps that are recommended

ii. The Developer pay for a water drainage assessment on the property and pay for any remediation steps that are recommended

iii. The Developer pay for a sidewalk on both sides of Lansdowne from Bay Street to King Street or at least from Huron Street to King Street, to improve the safety of the street with the proposed traffic increase

iv. Council mandate that short-term rentals are prohibited on these lots

v. Coach Houses be specifically prohibited from the project
   a. If the Coach Houses must stay, that it is mandated that they be built without the capacity for a kitchen (plumbing for a second sink, electrical capacity for a fridge and stove)

vi. The Developer be forced to reduce the density of the proposed development

vii. The Developer redesign the development to include a cul de sac running from either Lansdowne or an extended Bay Street

viii. The Developer redesign the proposal to minimize the destruction of existing trees with a trunk diameter of greater than 1 meter

Thank you for your consideration.

Peter Samson and Cathy Williamson
My company is [redacted]  
I own [redacted]  
However I can't make it to the meeting

My feeling is as follows

I think they should be 1/2 as many homes and lots

Therefore I'm opposed to passing this as it stands

I feel it's crowding too many people into that small space when it's all larger single family homes all around that area

If I wanted to put a semi-detached home on my vacant lot #36 Huron St I'm very confident that would not be appropriate or approved by council

Please if it has to be developed make it 50-60 ft lots with single family homes

You have bought the Old IGA for low income housing and we have lots of semi-detached going in Napier St area. This should be kept single family homes in the Thornbury waterfront area

Thank you

Dave Shoots
We are writing in regards to the virtual public meeting being held September 16, 2020.

The planned proposal for this area is not in keeping with the unique landscape and community of the area. We are not against the development of this land but are against the plan as showing 22 lots being created. The lots are not consistent with the neighbourhood. One must also have a responsible development plan to protect green space along with all environmental situations on the property investigated and solutions to problems addressed prior to any development. Drainage has been identified and would be a serious issue in the area with this high density proposal.

We are definitely against the development as proposed and would like to have another option provided finding balance between all parties.

Thank you,

Isabel & William Thornhill
Submission to Public Meeting of September 16, 2020 regarding development application for

Lots 35 to 39 Southwest Side of Bay Street, Town of the Blue Mountains. (Abbots Subdivision)

My wife and I have owned our property on Lakeshore Drive since the 1990s rebuilding in 2004.

The density of residences supported by the existing Residential One (R1-1) encouraged us and
neighbours to invest in upgrading our properties, maintaining the unique nature of the area,
appreciated by both residents and visitors to Thornbury as part of the Great Lakes Water Front Trail.

The development proposal before you seeks to substantially increase density by 22 semi-detached
houses.

**Not disclosed in the notice for this meeting:** It is my understanding that the application, under R2
zoning, would permit the individual purchasers to have the option to construct a “Coach House”, which
could be a “Rentable Dwelling”. This would effectively increase the number of “Dwelling Units” from 22
to 44, worst case if everyone wants a coach house. This is an unacceptable distortion of the planning
process.

The proponent of this development was previously refused a lower density development plan and now
has the audacity to propose a significantly greater density than that which was rejected.

One must ask the vital question: Why do zoning by-laws exist? Answer: To protect neighbourhoods from
uncontrolled change without citizen input. If the council wishes to propose a new development plan for
the whole area, which this is not, then a more detailed process of proposals and citizen input would be
required.

In addition to the above it should be noted that no formal storm drainage plan has been developed. In
light of the commercial development that has occurred to the south of Bay Street with paving at
Foodland’s, LCBO and the Gas stations, much of the natural drainage has been eliminated. Additional
commercial development can be anticipated on the vacant land adjacent to the gas station. Drainage
back up caused our neighbours considerable damage resulting in successful financial claims against the
Town of the Blue Mountains.

**We submit that the proposed amendment to the By-Law for this development should be rejected.**
A proposal that complies with the existing zoning, that maintains the nature of the area, would find
support from us and, we believe, from the adjacent property owners. Still a viable business solution.

**Under no circumstances should Coach Houses be permitted.**

Cecile and David Turnbull
From: Tom Downer  
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2020 12:11 PM  
To: Town Clerk <townclerk@thebluemountains.ca>  
Subject: Re: corrected draft

Sorry about this but I discovered a point that could be considered a factual error in my original submission please use this corrected version.  
Thanks  
Tom

On Sep 15, 2020, at 12:03 PM, Kim G wrote:

From: Tom Downer  
Subject: Abbots Subdivision  
Date: September 15, 2020 at 9:56:54 AM EDT  
To: townclerk@thebluemountains.ca

September 15, 2020

To Whom It May Concern

Re: Abbots Subdivision

My name is Tom Downer, I have lived in a variety of communities in the local area including Meaford, Collingwood and Thornbury since 1980, when I moved here to teach History and Geography at Georgian Bay Secondary School. Like many, I have witnessed the changes to the local economy and subsequent growth and development issues faced by municipalities and their residents.

While not opposed to development of the vacant land, I am opposed to the construction of the proposed one-way road extending Bay Street West to Victoria Street and south to Huron Street West.

The construction of such a road will require the clear cutting of 1.73 acres of bush consisting largely of mature cedars. Apart from an undesirable change to the visual nature of the surrounding neighbourhood, this plan would put a road on the front and back of all the properties along the south side of Lakeshore Drive West resulting in a substantial reduction of privacy and a significant alteration to the character of the property of current ratepayers.

LOFT, the planners representing the owners of the property, acknowledged this undesirable outcome in their application to purchase these unopened road allowances in April 2016. This letter was resubmitted in 2017 and 2018 Staff Reports. It appears that the least desirable plan with the most impact on local residents has been submitted.

The removal of mature cedar trees from the proposed roadway may have unintended consequences on drainage impacting home owners on Lakeshore Drive West. Homes with basements in this area require sump pumps to keep basements dry as a result of natural high groundwater flows. There have been multiple water main breaks along Lakeshore Drive West and surrounding streets as a result of freeze/thaw stresses on aging infrastructure. When water mains break, sumps are overwhelmed and basements flood. Apart from the current ditch/culvert system along the unopened Bay Street West road and one additional culvert there are no drainage structures along Lakeshore Drive. While the plan proposes a new drainage ditch along Bay Street West, the development itself will increase surface runoff
and potentially negatively impact existing high groundwater flows. Removing cedar trees as a component of the natural drainage can only exacerbate an existing issue.

I would oppose any significant alterations to Lakeshore Drive West to alleviate drainage issues that may result from this development.

The Crozier Consulting Engineers assessment on the impact of traffic flows as a result of this development requires additional comment.

The 11 and 15 total two way trips generated by a formula, generalizes the specifics that apply to Thornbury where the population more than doubles every weekend. I think most can agree that increased vehicle traffic will be greater than suggested.

Sincerely

Tom Downer
Nov 15 - COW - “staff recommend Council not move forward with closing the road allowances and disposing of the lands. The lands would then remain as unopened road allowances and no further action would need to be taken.”

https://www.thebluemountains.ca/document_viewer.cfm?event_doc=1452

2018
July - HGR Graham Partners request purchase of unopened road allowance and incorrectly state Bayside Villas is not interested in purchasing any portion
May 23 - Deputation by Harbour West Concerned Residents
Sept 10 - COW “staff acknowledge that the rationale provided in attachment 2 of this report to have the Town consider the sale of these lands is valid, however staff understand that significant local concerns exist, and also acknowledge that at this time Council is in a “Lame Duck” period that does not permit Council to consider a request of this nature. At this time staff cannot support the consideration of stopping up and closing these unopened road allowances, or declaring these lands as surplus for future consideration of disposition of the lands. "
“staff would suggest that Town staff re-engage with the local residents on a preliminary basis to gather information from the local residents on whether this would be supportable as this could be of value in the future”

March 6 - Water main break King St W
March 11 Water main break. Lakeshore Road

2019
Feb 4 - water main break Lakeshore and Landsdowne
March - Formal pre-consultation LOFT and Staff
March 13 - water main break - Bay St W between Peel and Landsdowne
May 27 COW - LOFT left as they had another meeting to go to, Harbour West deferred response to delayed LOFT deputation
June 3 - Letter from resident
June 10 - Group deputation

2020
Feb 16 - Water main Break - Arthur between Bruce and Elma
Sept 16 - Public Consultation Abbotts

So here we are today. Where to go next?

Our goal is a profitable development that does not cut down any further trees, as Abbotts have already cleared their 2.5 acres. This is possible without creating a double lot frontage for current residents and without creating future maintenance obligation of a public road. Not only is it possible, it’s where LOFT started in 2016.

In a 2019 meeting (that Planning surprised our group by also inviting the Developer) there was a discussion of THREE options, yet Planning has favoured and only shown our group Option 1, with the full opening of the road allowance. If selling part of the road allowance (eg to abutting neighbours) requires a public meeting, so should constructing a road allowance, especially when it results in significant greenspace and forest loss.

I attended several meetings of the tree committee, inspired by the vulnerability of the trees in our area, especially to new development. For many reasons TBM does not yet have a bylaw to protect this 2.5 acres, or the abutting 1.73 acres of Unopened Road Allowance. If we did this Development could be a poster child to inspire better protections.

The Harbour Master Plan was cancelled when unexpected dredging costs were taken from the project. As I commented by letter at the July 2020 COW, there is no current date to complete a Harbour Master Plan. It makes zero sense to decide about roads without the full context of the area. We have historic high water, major drainage infrastructure problems, an over-touristed beach, an ancient cottage road, busting at the seams Harbour not to mention repairs for our Town’s #1 Visitor and Resident attraction, the Pier. Today I am asking Council to prioritize a Harbour Master Plan in advance of a decision on Abbotts Development and in the broader context of the purpose, deficiencies and developments grandfathered and planned for the area.

As a group we have met over 20 times, and met with the Town 9 times. We’ve met with 2 different heads of Planning, submitting our emails in advance, limiting our numbers, representing streets requested by Planning, deferring our deputations to Council at Planning’s request. We came with longtime local reports of a Quarry and
unofficial dump on the site, only to be told they didn’t exist or were not relevant pre-submission. We’ve met with the CAO, with two councils, reached out to other groups that might support us….we consulted our hearts out. We convinced the past Council to not sell the unopened road allowance and then staff advised them they were “lame duck”. We have met with the Developer eager to work toward a compromise only to be given the one, worst possible option selected by Planning, when the Developer brought 3 options to the table. At LOFT’s scheduled pre-consultation deputation May 27, 2019 our group waited for hours and LOFT left for another meeting advising they would reschedule. They did not. Our mission was to protect the mature cedar forest, and we are failing.

I am attaching a few photographs that give a good overview of the land and surrounding homes.

With regard to the income that will be generated by this project in taxes and development charges it is also a good example of Grey County pushing an infill on Town of the Blue Mountains without necessary infrastructure and taking a disproportionate amount so that residents of the Town of Blue Mountains are left with the infrastructure bill, but inadequate funds to support the necessary upgrades.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kim Harris-Gardner
Abbott Subdivision Public Meeting

June Porter
85 Lakeshore Drive West, Thornbury
September 16th 2020
Thornbury West
Drainage and Development
Abbotts Subdivision
Thornbury West faces **Major** Drainage Challenges and has had significant reports, 2016, 2019
With high development activity, primarily in the areas of Craigleith, Blue Mountain and Lora Bay, we identified as a primary focus the need to be completely transparent, engage with the community and keep people continually informed about the status of projects. This includes access to complete information on our website, including staff reports, public documents and the latest plans. We are coordinating efforts across town departments to make sure that we are not overextending ourselves with respect to services and infrastructure.

— Nathan Westendorp,
Town of The Blue Mountains
This document, a tool that the town uses to understand one aspect of municipal infrastructure namely the storm water system in a defined area. (May 4th 2020, email Operations, TBM).

These reports identified deficiencies in current drainage systems

However, they have NOT been referenced in Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Reports for the Abbott Subdivision, October 2019

Developers’ proposed solutions should be part of an overall master drainage plan to protect the town from future financial risk arising from development
Thornbury West Significant Reports, 2016, 2019

- Existing minor drainage systems are **deficient** under existing ‘zoned’ land use conditions, page 35
- Abbotts Subdivision: Lots 35 to 39, in the area of the report are **currently** R1 zoned
- Therefore future development and intensification applications requesting rezoning i.e. R1 to R2, especially when reviewed in the context of outdated 2009 Engineering Standards will only serve to increase the runoff to each drainage system and consequently magnify **known deficiencies** in the Town owned and managed minor drainage systems
Section 4.3.3 outline three (3) significant networks of undocumented stormwater conveyance infrastructure

Undocumented Drainage Systems 1 and 2 One and SWM infrastructure south of the Georgian Trail and north of Alfred Street are known to be deficient in that they take municipal drainage through private lands. Furthermore, flooding/undesirable ponding issues along Undocumented Drainage System 2 have been noted by residents.

System 3 is similarly deficient. A hydraulic analysis of the Lakeshore Drive and Lansdowne Street culvert crossings confirm the crossings do not have sufficient capacity to convey the 25 year design storm peak flows downstream without overtopping the road.
Trees Reduce Stormwater Runoff by...

- Current unopened road allowances adjacent to the Abbotts Subdivision have an abundance of trees which serve to promote watershed health water runoff and pollutants that reaches our local waters.

- Large, mature trees act like a pump, helping to improve the drainage.

- Trees reduce storm water runoff by capturing and storing rainfall in the canopy and releasing water into the atmosphere through evapotranspiration.

- In addition, tree roots and leaf litter create soil conditions that promote the infiltration of rainwater into the soil.
Stormwater Management in Ontario: Legal Issues in a Changing Climate

- Municipalities can be held liable for flooding damage that results from a negligent operational decision.
- Relying on outdated standards can be negligent if new information suggests that they should be reconsidered.
- Do not ignore information that suggests there may be a risk to people or property, since doing so is unlikely to be considered a valid policy decision and likely does not meet the standard of care for a municipality.
- To minimize risk, however, municipalities should at least “turn their minds” to stormwater related standards, processes and infrastructure, if information suggests that there may be increased risk to persons or property from those standards, process or infrastructure;
‘Ask’ of Council on June 16th was... Report to be released September 22nd

The ‘ask’ of Council was to know:
• What is the high level plan regarding drainage for Thornbury West?
• What are the Town’s objectives and guidelines for drainage for Thornbury West with respect to current and future development proposals given it could be upwards of 24 months before the Master Plan would be available for review?
• **What are the challenges rezoning i.e. R1 to R2 brings to proposed and future development proposals in the context of drainage?**
• How is the Town going to ensure the stormwater capacity meets not only the demands of today, but the potential demands of tomorrow?
• What are the actions the Town is taking to give predictability to the way the drainage issues will be dealt with now and going forward?

The ‘ask’ of Council was to have current and future development proposals
• Transparently resolve identified undocumented drainage systems (Thornbury Master Plan) on their respective development properties;
• Be required to meet the soon to be updated engineering standards as opposed to the current 2009 to ensure that changing climate conditions and low impact design for stormwater management are addressed (Goal #5, Strategic Plan 2015-2020)
Ask of Council...

- Not to support the zoning by-law amendment application to rezone the subject lands from the Residential One (R1-1) zone to the Residential Two (R2) zone to permit the semi-detached dwellings.
Hi Denise –

I am sorry for not getting back to you sooner. I did read the traffic report and still have concerns. I don’t know what form to put it in for council – but here is my issue:

- I live in the dead end of Huron St. West and have occupied the property for 25+ years through family ownership
- In the last few years there has been a substantial increase in car and foot traffic on Landsdowne St. N. in both directions
- There is a lot of speeding down the hill and explorers in general
- The increased volume of traffic from the development will only add to this and the associated safety concerns. The Traffic report only looks at weekday loads, when in fact most of these townhomes will be weekend traffic – with substantial influxes on Friday nights and through the weekend – that assessment should be done not glossed over. It is exceedingly dangerous to try to turn out of Landsdowne onto 26 East already – adding more cars wanting to do that will only be more problematic.
- If the town then adds in the approved development on King Street for 17 more townhomes the little stretch of Landsdowne N. will become a major thoroughfare – and may be further impacted by increased traffic on Lakeshore Rd.
- I don’t really have a solution and respect that the property developer has a right to do something with the land – but I think:
  - fewer homes
  - regardless of the number of homes some form of traffic calming
  - regardless of the number of homes a traffic light at Landsdowne and 26 makes sense.

Hope this helps.

Peter

New Bold Look. Same Bold Attitude. Check out the new www.optimussbr.com
Good Morning: Mr. Mayor and all Council Members:

I would like to first thank everyone for giving me the opportunity to speak this morning regarding the application before you this morning. My Wife and I are concerned Residents and part of the “Harbour West Residents Group” and we speak to you this morning on behalf of this Special Group of incredible neighbors and concerned residents.

My Wife and I live at [Redacted] at the knuckle of Lakeshore Drive and Landsdowne Avenue, fronting on the water. We have lived in Thornbury for the past 24 years and have been on Lakeshore Drive since 2017. We were so lucky to have been able to purchase a lot on this “Historic Street”, nestled in the heart of this special community. My goal this morning was to address the qualitative aspects of this special area and really wanted to talk to you about the unique character of both these 2 streets and the “Harbour Community”, in general, as this area is truly the “Jewel of Thornbury”!

“Genius Loci”, has its roots that go back to the ancient Roman Empire and translates in our modern era as “Spirit of Place”. I think about this term as it what really defines this beautiful waterfront community that so many come to visit and cherish its splendor. This special little Harbour Community embodies the history of the early beginnings of this Town and captures a character in its vernacular cottage type Architecture and cozy warm feelings that people embody as they stroll down streets like both; Bruce Street, Lakeshore Drive and Landsdowne Ave. Although not a huge area, which is why its charm needs to be protected, so it can be enjoyed by all, both Residents and Visitors who travel to our Community and continue to walk these streets as part of their daily routine.

The original Owner of my Home was a marine merchant carpenter by the name of “Arnold Ferris” and I have early photos of my house where he had built a captains steering wheel on his deck and erected the main mast of a ship with flags on his lawn with a big ships anchor, resting by its side. I have recently met his Grand Daughter, and she has told me of some incredible stories of what it was like living in the original 1,200 sqft bungalow with her 2 other Brothers and 1 Sister, and she has shared many photos with me. I tell you this, because I really need to have everyone truly understand how this area is not just another “R-1”, residential zone, but rather a very special community with streets that have names with faces and residents who have protected the sacred charm and beauty for not only its Residents but for all Visitors.

My little storey about my property, I’m sure is not the only early memories that others in our community could share with you, but at least I could share mine with you this morning to inject a face on this neighbourhood rather than hide behind zoning by-laws and other political rhetoric. We all need to take a moment and reflect on the history of this Harbour Community and carefully protect what little is left for generations to come and enjoy, rather than look at every development proposal as another opportunity to intensify and add more rental housing.
“Black Tusk Design” had it so right in its original Proposed Development Site Plan, back in February of 2006; they simply proposed 10 single family dwellings, built their own private road and did not attempt to leverage on the back of the Town, to use their unopened road allowance; and uniquely fit into the fabric of this community, which respected the existing community, its natural vegetation with an appropriate low impact development. Bravo: Black Tusk!!!

How did we move from that “10 Single Family Dwelling Concept” to a 22 Unit Semi-Detached Development with an additional 22 Coach Houses which could ultimately be an additional 22 Rentable Units, thus impacting this tiny Site to a potential of 44 Units? The “2006 Black Tusk Proposal”, is not much different then what has been recently proposed and approved by the Town in the past few years and works extremely well within its neighbouring communities and I am referring to the developments both off of Victoria Street, one being “Ashbury Court”, the other being “Thorncroft Court”. These are 2-examples of low impact single family dwelling developments that would be a much more appropriate fit for the proposed “Site” we are discussing today.

I also think this might be a perfect opportunity for Council to direct Planning Staff and other related departments to do a further study of our area to designate this very special area as a “R-1 Harbour Community”, like it has with its Commercial Harbour Plan, to re-evaluate how this special residential pocket gets further developed going forward, including this Application. I would respectfully recommend that this area’s character and history be persevered in every way possible and that policy be developed to address the Residential Fabric of this small pocket of Houses.

Let me take a moment to put all of this into perspective, so that we can all visually understand and relate to, as non-professionals, rather than talk about these numbers in quote “Planner and Official Plan terms” like “Units per Hectare’. I took the time to do a rough area calculation, and well my numbers might be slightly off, I would say they are very close, so we could all understand what the potential impact would look like in this small demographic. While I am not a “Surveyor”, but have a copy of the Original Survey of the Sub-Division plan for Lakeshore Drive, created in August of 1957; and I did a rough calculation of the area of the 23 Lots on both sides of Lakeshore Drive, based on the original Subdivision Plan and determined that excluding the area of the road known as “Lakeshore Drive, the approximate land area of the 23 Lots was roughly 5.74 acres; 2.32 Hectare’s. This translates into an average density of 9.9 units /Hectare. The current proposed development before you today, is on a 1.07 hectare parcel of land, excluding the Town owned street, which is half of all of lots on Lakeshore Drive, and is proposing a potential impact of 44 Units, should all purchasers elect to have a “Coach House” constructed. So without going too much further than this, you can see that the potential impact of this proposed development before you for consideration topples the current 9.9 units per Hectare to a staggering potential 44 units per hectare. This proposal would never fly in any municipality that I have worked on in my professional career of over 35 years.

I really do not think that comparing “units /hectare” from this development to other Town Developments, is a fruitful or appropriate exercise; as it truly undermines the significance of this special pocket of housing that embodies such Historical Character and undermines its true unique value to both the history of Thornbury and its natural heritage that ultimately needs to be preserved. I can stand here
all day long and tell you that I have read every section of the “Zoning By-Law and Official Plan”, a world that I live every day and tell you that a Re-zoning from R1 to R2 is totally ridiculous request and does not stand the “Litmus Test”, for both the vision of the “Official Plan” nor does it address any of the environmental and infrastructure concerns that this Town needs to carefully consider before making it easy for this Developer to just come in and leverage off of Town’s Real-estate, at the Tax Payer’s expense.

Let me be more specific, about how this proposal does not even come close to how the impact of its density will have on the existing infrastructure. At this point there is an enormous increase of sheet storm drainage on an already taxed system, as identified by a number of Professionals, both private and Town officials. There has been no talk, to my knowledge, about any “Green Initiatives” when it comes to containing and collecting storm water on site, like a “Super Pipe Concept” that collects and stores storm water on-site with a slow controlled storm release system in place to minimize the impact on an already taxed City Storm Drainage System. Grey water collection, bio swales or permeable pavers, to increase site containment of storm waters on site and thus easing the pressure on the City Storm Drainage burden. Other environmental issues have been identified, both in previous correspondences with the Town and though other Residents giving deputations today and range from a variety of issues like Tree/Vegetation issues that have been violated, in the absence of any Town Tree Removal By-Laws, soils investigations that have yet to reveal the soil characteristics, as we all know the past history of this Site being used as a landfill dump for a number of years. At a minimum I would ask for the developer to produce a “Phase 2 Environmental Audit”, since it is historically known what that this site was used for in its previous life. The proposed intensification of the Site is off the charts as it taxes every aspect of this small community from both a Character perspective and its Environmental Concerns that will, no doubt, tax the current Town Infrastructure and would require a very in-depth analysis as to how the impact of this Invasive Development will impact this area and its current infrastructure.

Since other Colleagues/Neighbours will be addressing these other areas of concern quite specifically, I do not want to overlap too much on these topics, but I do want to address a few further concerns that need to be considered as part of your evaluation as to the merits of this application for development.

I had eluded earlier, briefly, about the possibility of “Coach Houses” being constructed on each property, thus potentially doubling the number of 22 Dwelling Units to 44 Dwelling Units, as this was revealed in the “Loft Planning Justification Report, dated: November 2019’, listed as one of the provided documents to this Public Meeting. Although the zoning in both R1 and R2 Residential Zones would permit accessory structures on the same property, it was always believed that this provision in the Zoning By-Law would have been set out to provide Home Owners the ability to either construct a storage shed or garage for their own use, notwithstanding zoning compliance. Under Part 4.0 General Provisions of the Zoning By-Law, specifically 4.1 Accessory Apartments, it is clear that these Accessory Structures were not meant to be rentals, as they it is stated in the by-law that “Sort Term Rentals”, are not permitted. So my question is: “Why would the Planning Department ever entertain the notion that these Coach Houses would become another form of “Housing Opportunity” to assist in the rental issue confronting “The Town of the Blue Mountains”, knowing that it would be in direct contravention of its own Zoning By-Laws? I am the first to recognize that affordable rentals for our working community that supports the services that
we all rely on so heavily; is a big issue, but I think the Planning Department needs to develop an overall “Strategic Plan” to address this issue and not “Piggy Back” off New Residential Developments to accomplish this goal......seems like more of a desperate act, rather than a well-planned “Rental Housing Strategy Initiative”, to address this issue with some sound planning principals.

In that same Loft “Planning Justification Report, Dated: November 2019”, I believe it fails at almost every level it purports to comply with. While in its summary of the “Planning Act Requirements”, it may have regards for matters of provincial Interest, but they fail to recognize that in all cases these policies are broad based and do make reference to the specifics of “Local Municipal Policy” and more specifically the “Official Plan” of Individual Municipalities as well. In its Summary of Consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement of 2014, in my opinion it has not recognized the “Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan, Part “A” Community Vision, Strategic Objectives and Land Use Concept Plan”. It pretty much fails on all levels, as it relates to sections A3.2 Natural Environment and A3.4 Urban Community Character.

As far it its “Summary of Conformity to Recolour Grey County of the Grey Official Plan”, I will leave this for others to comment on, but I have not really seen anything convincing evidence in all the technical reporting, that I have read, that looks like anything special is being implemented on this site to address any of the storm water drainage issues and certainly there is no one being sensitive or shy about removing any, if not all, natural vegetation.

If some was to ask me how this Site should be developed, the answers would be quite obvious given all of the surrounding beauty and natural features and while it might not make the Developer a pile of money, the risks to our Community should far outweigh how the “Private Sector Development Community” should prosper from Land Development. I know, deep down, that this special wonderful Community and its Strong Council and Leadership will achieve all of its growth objectives and solve all it growing pains, including its “Rental Concerns” but it should not be at the expense of destroying already established thriving Communities that have worked well for all of its life time and have managed to take care of all of its Residents, and Victor’s alike.

I urge this Council to carefully weigh all the data and comments of a very “Heart-Felt Community” and send this proposal back to the Drawing Boards and urge this Developer to propose a more appropriate development that this Community will no doubt embrace!

Thank you all once again for your time!

Respectfully,

Jeffrey M. Swartz
To all those concerned:

My name is David Small. My family home is located on Lakeshore Drive and has been in my family for over 75 years. My Grandparents owned this property and subsequently my immediate family moved to Thornbury and into the home following their passing. I grew up as a child on this street and am owner of the property now after my father’s passing earlier this year.

I am addressing this Council to inform them of my concerns over the present development plan and to offer a solution.

I believe it is incumbent upon Council to think ahead and plan for long term consequences of any development. The nature of the most recent development proposal seems to have morphed into one driven by profit alone, (density of units, destruction of ancient cedars/opening of road allowance) and not taking into consideration the nature of the existing housing layout and character of the neighborhood in question. Previous plans had a much different layout and seemed to be more in line with and respect the existing housing layout. (See attached 2016 proposal as example).

I love where I live and the old cedars that still stand are not only beautiful and provide shade, oxygen and privacy, (and of course serve as home and refuge for all sorts of creatures) - but they provide a service that is invaluable with respect to drainage and erosion mitigation. Clearcutting the ancient cedars and opening up the road allowance for the sake of the present development proposal can be avoided (and should be) by simply allowing for a development plan that accommodates this, and one already exists. I believe this is not unreasonable to ask of any council, or developer. Further to this...it would also respect the existing home owners and the character of the neighbourhood, as well as preserve tree canopy and all that it brings. A principle being used in Canada and other countries with respect to land developments, and having its roots in Indigenous teachings is that of the Seventh Generation Principle. I believe this Council has a duty to consider the long-term consequences (not just tax $) when making any development decisions. Those trees on the road allowance will still stand in 7 generations if you allow them to, and you should, as a previous proposal exists that takes this into consideration.
The Seventh Generation Principle is based on an ancient Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) philosophy that the decisions we make today should result in a sustainable world seven generations into the future.

The Seventh Generation Principle today is generally referred to in regards to decisions being made about our energy, water, and natural resources, and ensuring those decisions are sustainable for seven generations in the future.

The Ontario Professional Planners Institute recognizes this and a quote from the 2019 Task Force is as follows: "Indigenous perspectives can inspire the future of planning by strengthening and adapting its tenets, structures, and functions. This is timely given wider concerns about climate change, the destruction of our natural environment, and the peril of our unsustainable ways."

With respect to the drainage issue - I have been provided with a copy of recommendations after an assessment was done in 2018. I will be attaching this document along with this letter to the Town Clerk. I want Council to acknowledge receipt of said document and that all have had the opportunity to study it.

Here is the link to the Drainage Plan done in 2018.
https://www.thebluemountains.ca/document_viewer.cfm?doc=544

I am more than seriously concerned with the lack of proper drainage plans for this area. I have seen first-hand what even ONE housing build can do to drainage across the street on Lakeshore Drive and how it can affect residents’ properties/basements in proximity. The assessment illuminates the need for proper drainage. The density of the most recent development proposal and the opening of the road allowance and clear cutting of the cedars will only exacerbate an already serious situation and I am not ruling out legal action (against Council) if the present plan is allowed to proceed and property damage and basement flooding is a result. A previous proposal, leaving the road allowance unaffected, would allow trees and soil to absorb and mitigate as well as reducing the asphalt footprint would go a long way to addressing these concerns as well as will embrace the Indigenous philosophy of 7th Generation Principal. It is a good solution - for allowing for development, and also respectful protection of the area in question.

Sincerely,

David Small
Public Information Centre No. 2 for the Thornbury West Drainage Master Plan Municipal Class EA

The purpose of this Public Information Centre is to:

- Consult with the public and affected parties
- Present the various drainage improvement alternatives evaluated
- Present the preliminary preferred alternative solution
- Elicit feedback and comment from the public

Public & Stakeholders should:

- Sign the registry
- Review the presentation material
- Ask questions of the Town and/or Consultant
- Submit a comment sheet providing your comments and feedback regarding the preliminary preferred alternative solution(s)
- All comments are to be submitted to the Town by September 28, 2018
Comments and information regarding this project are being collected to assist the project team in meeting the requirements of the Municipal Class EA process. These comments will be maintained for reference throughout the project and, with the exception of personal information, may be used in the final documentation and will become part of the public record.

The Town continues to enhance accessibility that is inclusive of all ages and abilities. The information presented at today’s Public Information Centre can be provided in alternative formats upon request. Such a request should be submitted to:

**Contacts**

Michael Campbell, C.E.T.
Construction Coordinator
The Corporation of The Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, P.O. Box 310
Thornbury, ON, N0H 2P0
Tel: (519) 599-3131
Fax: (519) 599-7723
e: cc@thebluemountains.ca
This Drainage Master Plan is a broad level assessment to assist in the development of preferred alternative solution(s) to address the drainage deficiencies in the Study Area.

This project is currently in Phase 2 of the Municipal Class EA process and is following the Master Planning Process.

Public consultation is undertaken as part of Phase 2 of the EA process.
Study Area
The Alternative Improvement Options being considered as part of this Drainage Master Plan are:

- **Alternative 1 – Do Nothing** (This alternative is being considered to provide a benchmark to gauge the physical, natural, social, cultural, and economic implications of the other alternatives)

- **Alternative 2 – Flow Reduction / Water Quality Improvement Opportunities**

- **Alternative 3 – Minor Drainage System Conveyance Capacity Improvements**

- **Alternative 4 – Major Drainage System Conveyance Capacity Improvements**
Flow Reduction/Water Quality Improvement Alternatives
Drainage System Conveyance Capacity Improvement Alternatives
The improvement alternatives have been evaluated with respect to their impact on the physical, natural, social, cultural and economic environments.

**Results of the Improvement Option Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>Alternative 1 – “Do Nothing”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 2B – Lot Level LID’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 2C – Linear LID’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Alternative 3A – Minor Drainage System Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 3B – Eliminate Municipal Drainage from Private Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 3C – Service Areas Absent of Minor Drainage Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 4 – Major Drainage System Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for Further Evaluation</th>
<th>Alternative 2A – SWMF’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 2D – Centralized LID’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 2E – Mechanical Devices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further evaluation was completed for Alternatives 2A, 2D and 2E to establish the preferred flow reduction / water quality improvement option for the study area.

- Mechanical devices (Alternative 2E) are the preferred water quality solution for the Study Area.
- Stormwater management facilities (Alternative 2A) and Centralized Low Impact Development measures (Alternative 2D) are not recommended for implementation.
## Preliminary Preferred Alternative Solution Concept Costing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>Mechanical Devices (OGS)</td>
<td>$1,643,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Minor Drainage System Improvements</td>
<td>$2,417,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Elimination of Municipal Drainage Entering Private Property</td>
<td>$298,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Service areas Absent of Minor Drainage Systems</td>
<td>$826,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Major Drainage System Conveyance Capacity Improvements</td>
<td>$2,779,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,963,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Funding from Development Charges, direct Developer Contributions, and/or taxation dependent on location and project circumstances
- Works to generally occur in conjunction with other Town works
Preliminary Preferred Alternative Solution
Areas of Notable Drainage Deficiencies
### Preliminary Preferred Alternative Solution Concept Costing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Option(s)</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1A – New Channel South of King St.</td>
<td>$1,108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B – Outlet to Little Beaver River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3C – Victoria St. and Arthur St. OGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 – Alice St. Diversion and Victoria St. Trunk Storm Sewer</td>
<td>$321,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alfred St. and Moore St. Storm Sewer Improvements</td>
<td>$216,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (3 Areas)</td>
<td>$1,645,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (Study Area)</td>
<td>$7,963,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Area 1 and 2 works are expected to proceed as part of a growth related project, while Area 3 will proceed as a standalone project.
Preliminary Preferred Alternative Solutions

**AREA 1:**
LITTLE BEAVER RIVER TRIBUTARY WATER COURSE
1:15000

**AREA 2:**
RANKIN'S LANDING
1:2000

**AREA 3:**
UNDOCUMENTED DRAINAGE SYSTEM
1:15000

**LEGEND**

- **Capacity Improvements**
  - Existing Storm Sewer/Culvert (to be removed)
  - Existing Storm Sewer/Culvert (to remain)
  - New Storm Sewer/Culvert
  - New Storm Sewer
  - Existing Maintenance Holes (to be removed)
  - Existing Maintenance Holes (to remain)
  - New Maintenance Holes
  - Check Valve

**THORNBURY WEST DRAINAGE MASTER PLAN**
**TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS**

**INDIVIDUAL PRELIMINARY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS**

C.C. Tatham & Associates Ltd.
Consulting Engineers
Next Steps

Following Public Information Centre No. 2, the following tasks will be completed in accordance with the Municipal Class EA process:

- Review comments received from the public, Town staff and interested stakeholders
- Revise the alternative improvement evaluation according to comments received
- Finalize the selection of the preferred alternative solution(s)
- Recommend the preferred alternative solution(s) to Council for adoption following the completion of the Project File
- Issue a Notice of Study Completion upon completion of the project which is expected December 14, 2018
Public Information Centre

Before you leave:

- Have your questions been addressed?
- Have you signed the registry?
- Have you completed a comment sheet?

All comment sheets are to be submitted to the Town by September 28, 2018.

Please feel free to contact the Town and/or Consultant any time should you have any further questions or concerns.

For additional Information visit the Town’s website at www.thebluemountains.ca or contact:

Michael Campbell, C.E.T.
Construction Coordinator
The Corporation of The Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, P.O. Box 310
Thornbury, ON, N0H 2P0
Tel: (519) 599-3131
Fax: (519) 599-7723
e: cc@thebluemountains.ca
Hello,

Here are my comments for the public meeting on the Abbotts Development C.2 Sept 16.

Thank you Mayor, Deputy mayor and Councillors. My name is Kim Harris-Gardner, and I grew up in Thornbury, Clarksburg, Christie Beach and Kimberley. I rented in the area with my family in a dozen places from Tyrolean to Ravenna. I raised my kids here and have lived on Lakeshore Drive since 2007, and for a time at Bayside Villas. I got involved with Harbour West Concerned Residents in 2016 when a group was forming to communicate with Town and Council about the Abbotts Development. While our group has functioned without titles, I am the unofficial keeper of the documents.

From my perspective the primary issue has always been the development consistent with the Official Plan and the preservation of the cedar forest, which is the 1.73 acres of unopened road allowance. If the public roads are constructed and maintained at taxpayer expense, the loss of trees will result in a loss of privacy, an intensification of drainage problems and fundamental change to the priceless experience of walking along Lakeshore Drive’s four season cedar canopy. In addition, the double lot frontage of roads for the current 8 homes and 10 condos is poor planning as it is undesirable for the current residents and expensive for taxpayers to maintain the roads forever.

I would like to give a history of the Harbour West Concerned Residents since 2016, and some of the Town and Developer actions during that time. Unfortunately, the past 4 years of consultations with the Town has pushed the developer and the residents farther apart to the point where today the option being presented is the worst option for the current residents, for the environment of the area, and for future ratepayers and the best option for the Developers in terms of profit.

**2016**

April 26 - request to purchase portions of the unopened road allowances of Bay St W and Victoria St South
“The current Abbotts land holding would permit a residential subdivision” and talks about “potential for the unopened road allowance to be opened as a maintained municipal public road, therefore creating double lot frontage for the existing residential homes along Lakeshore Road” - LOFT
June 27 COW - LOFT presents purchase request with three options
1. Subject lands only 2. Partial purchase of unopened road allowances 3. Purchase of all road allowances
Aug - group emails to town alerting Town to the Maple Leaf Quarry and unofficial dump on the developer site

**2017**

(Jan 4 - Town website archived earlier than this date, not available online)
Feb 17 - Water main break Peel St N and Bay St W
Feb 22 Staff Report - Unopened Road Allowances Bay Street West and Victoria Street North – Tammy Abbotts Proposal for purchase of lands
Error in size of property (650 sq m), Staff report cites R2, Developer cites R1 zoning
https://www.thebluemountains.ca/document_viewer.cfm?event_doc=1375
April 24 Stop up & Close Portions of the Victoria Street North and Bay Street West Unopened Road Allowances
https://www.thebluemountains.ca/document_viewer.cfm?event_doc=1390
May 15 -Blue Mountain Watershed Trust Action Committee Memo with the Mayor
Cedar woodlot, significant greenspace, environmental impact study should be carried
https://www.thebluemountains.ca/document_viewer.cfm?event_doc=1902
July 10 Deputation by Harbour West Residents, submitted Watershed Trust comments, Council supportive in comments
July 11 Abbotts 2.5 acres bulldozed, residents defending the Town boundary, County of Grey attended the 1 ha clearcut July 13 but since clearcutting had not all been done within 6 months no bylaw broken
October LOFT withdraws request to purchase road allowances
Aug 28 - group meets with CAO to discuss development and planned Harbour Master Plan
Sept 11 - COW deputation
https://www.thebluemountains.ca/document_viewer.cfm?event_doc=1340
Oct 16 - LOFT withdraws purchase request
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unofficial dump on the site, only to be told they didn’t exist or were not relevant pre-submission. We’ve met with the CAO, with two councils, reached out to other groups that might support us…..we consulted our hearts out. We convinced the past Council to not sell the unopened road allowance and then staff advised them they were “lame duck”. We have met with the Developer eager to work toward a compromise only to be given the one, worst possible option selected by Planning, when the Developer brought 3 options to the table. At LOFT’s scheduled pre-consultation deputation May 27, 2019 our group waited for hours and LOFT left for another meeting advising they would reschedule. They did not. Our mission was to protect the mature cedar forest, and we are failing.

I am attaching a few photographs that give a good overview of the land and surrounding homes.

With regard to the income that will be generated by this project in taxes and development charges it is also a good example of Grey County pushing an infill on Town of the Blue Mountains without necessary infrastructure and taking a disproportionate amount so that residents of the Town of Blue Mountains are left with the infrastructure bill, but inadequate funds to support the necessary upgrades.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kim Harris-Gardner
Concept Plan - Subject Lands Only
Draft Plan of Condominium

TOWN PLOT LOTS 35 to 39 BAY: W/S
FORMER TOWN OF THORNBURY
TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS

APRIL 2016
(ABBOTTS)
The Abbotts’ lands in red are approximately 1 hectare (2.5 acres). The road allowances of Bay Street and Victoria, shown in green, are approximately 0.7 hectares (1.73 acres).
March 10, 1977

Messrs. Karam, Jackman & Tannis
Barristers and Solicitors
328 Frank Street
Ottawa, Ontario

Attention: Ernest G. Tannis, Esq.

Dear Sirs:

Re: Lot 37, Southwest Bay Street, Thornbury

We represent Messrs. John Pearson, Douglas Hammond and Donald Ruthven who are the owners in trust on behalf of the Maple Leaf Gravel Club of Lot 37 in the Southwest side of Bay Street in the Town of Thornbury.

We understand that you represent one Kenneth Abbotts.

By deed dated the 13th day of February, 1925 and registered in the Registry Office of the Registry Division of the North Riding of the County of Grey as No. 2500, Joseph Abbotts, who was at that time the owner of Lot 37, conveyed that Lot to Messrs. Wellington Dinsmore, Robert Nixon, John MacKey and Issac Hoge as Trustees of the Town Line Gravel Club which was the former name of the Maple Leaf Gravel Club.

The present Trustees and their predeceassors have held title and possession of the property continuously since 1925.

They have also paid taxes continuously since that time.

For some reason unknown to us, the Town of Thornbury proported to convey Lot 37 to your client, Kenneth Abbotts. They have clearly indicated that they were in error in doing so as they had no title.
**TAX NOTICE INTERIM**

**MUNICIPALITY**
TOWN OF THORNBURY

**DATE OF DEMAND**
MARCH 15, 1979

**FOR YEAR**
1979

**MORTGAGE NO.**

**MORTGAGE COMPANY**

---

**NAME AND ADDRESS**

MAPLE LEAF GRAVEL PIT
C/O DOUGLAS HAMMOND
RR 1 THORNBURY ONT
NOH 2P0

---

**PROPERTY DESCRIPTION**

TP L35 TO 36 BAY WS
FR 264.00 DP 165.00 AC 1.00

---

**ASSESSMENT CODES**

RP - RESIDENTIAL PUBLIC
BP - BUSINESS PUBLIC
CS - COMMERCIAL SEPARATE
CP - COMMERCIAL PUBLIC
RS - RESIDENTIAL SEPARATE
BP - BUSINESS SEPARATE

---

**CURRENT TAXES DUE**

36.48

---

**TAXES ARE NOW DUE AND PAYABLE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS NOTICE AND THE BY-LAW OF THIS MUNICIPALITY**

N.B. - Where a sale has taken place in connection with a property against which taxes have been levied it is in the interest of all parties that notice is given to the assessment department of the new owners and their address.

---

**NOTICE**

The Ontario Municipal Act provides that in case any party shall refuse or neglect to pay taxes imposed upon him for the space of fourteen days after demand, the Collector may levy the same, with costs, by distress and sale of goods and chattels of the party liable to pay same.

---

**DETAIL OF LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS CHARGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>TAX AMOUNT</th>
<th>NATURE OF IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>TAX AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**U.S. PROPERTY OWNERS ARE REQUESTED TO REMIT PAYMENT IN CANADIAN FUNDS ONLY**
Letter Re: Abbotts proposal
From: Tim Peloso and Kathleen Wills. 96 Huron St. West Thornbury.

Please be advised that we both entirely support the sentiments expressed in the letters to TBM re this proposal from our neighbours: Harry Burkman, Jeffrey Swartz, Peter Samson and the Lockharts. We are not opposed to development but to the proposed density is without any dignity or grace to our cherished neighbourhood. In 2019 our group met with Loft Inc. at the TBM office. Ms. Loft expressed she had 3 planning options. We need to explore the other two. Opening either road allowance, we believe, would be disastrous environmentally and socially. Regards. Tim Peloso and Kathleen Wills