

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Comments regarding proposed subdivision
Date: August 9, 2020 10:09:13 AM

Good morning,

We recently received notice of proposed subdivision at 61 Alfred Street West
#42T-2019-03

Our concerns lie not with the proposed building rather with the lack of sidewalks along Victoria St.

With the completion of Ashbury Court and now with the proposed addition of 19 more units (for a total of 30 additional units) in recent times, increased foot traffic and the lack of sidewalks along Victoria St is a serious safety concern. Ideally sidewalks should be considered before adding additional families to the area.

Kind regards,
Katy Bell

[REDACTED]

April 5th, 2020

RE: Plan of Subdivision #42T-2019-03 61 Alfred Street West

Hello Denise

We were to have a discussion on the phone about this development a few weeks ago. Amid the various changes, I lost track of things and have decided that emails might be the best way to communicate for now.

1. When do we get actual input into this process; that is, when can someone be available to explain what is on the plans? For what interval do we have any hope of changing the plans in some way?
2. I have been told again and again that new development can't cause drainage problems for adjacent properties. Yet I have witnessed the reverse to be true in Orchard Drive backyards that are adjacent to and even north of, the Thorncroft development. How many photos do I have to take to prove that I don't presently have surface drainage problems!? Is the town prepared to offer me assurance that, should a problem develop, I will be covered for expenses and have remediation done? I say again, I do not presently have interior surface drainage problems and haven't had for 34 years.
3. Why not plan for 10 year events? It seems to me that these "major storm events" are going to be more frequent. 5 year events are going to be the new "normal". This idea of dealing with such events using "swales and overland channels" is planning code for allowing the surface water to flow onto adjacent properties!
4. I see in the plan that they propose "split drainage to maintain" the mature trees along the property boundaries. The swales are going to suffocate the roots at which point the trees will become unstable. Who will be liable if they fall? Can we have some sort of coverage from the town in such a scenario? How can I guarantee a future homeowner that he or she won't be liable for these possibilities? Why not hire an arbourist who will tell you exactly what should be done to preserve the roots and by extension, the trees!? I suspect that the surface area in which the roots are spread may be 14-20 feet. Maybe this area shouldn't be disturbed at all which would mean that the surface drainage should be toward the road completely. This might solve the problems of liability, surface drainage and tree maintenance!
5. What is involved in documenting the existing foundation? Shouldn't the developer or the town be responsible? If not, how detailed a record is needed?
6. They mention that they want the development to COMPLEMENT the surrounding neighbourhood. If this is true, then why the inclusion of semi-detached houses and townhouses in an area of bungalows? As well, then why raise these homes 2 or 3 metres so that they tower above the surrounding homes making it even more obvious that they don't fit into the landscape? If I was planning a house back there, I wouldn't even want a basement due to the drainage problems.

I hope that you can answer some of these questions or at least refer me to people who can.
You have my email. My cell number is [REDACTED].

Take care.

Anne Britton

February 28, 2020

To: Denise Whaley
Town of the Blue Mountains
CC: Stephanie Lacey-Avon, Dylan Stoneman

Topic: Plan of Subdivision #42T-2019-03 61 Alfred Street

I have resided at [REDACTED] since 1986. As a result, I have a very good idea of the various water problems that I and my neighbours have encountered over the years. I will restrict my comments in this letter to my own experiences.

I have two sump pumps; one of which works almost continuously during the spring thaw and any heavy rain event. Both are double sump pumps and both are backed by a stand-alone generator that I installed PRIMARILY because of the worry that a power outage during one of these rain events would cause a major flood in my basement.

I have been LUCKY. So far, I have not had a flood. BUT, I do know that any extra water from any other property would put my sump pumps over the edge of their capacity. This reality brings me to my concerns with the proposed development. If the ground is RAISED, where is all that water going to go other than to my and my neighbors' properties?!

I have only had time to scan the document related to flood control but I didn't see a mention of any sort of mitigation for Orchard Drive. I could well have missed something. If I did, I would really appreciate being enlightened. If I didn't, then why isn't it mentioned?

In addition, I have mature pine trees along my property line. If this disruption causes them to die and fall over, is the town or the property developer planning to pay to have them removed? Will they pay to replace them? Will they put up some other barrier between me and my new neighbors?

There is also an underground spring along the back of our properties which is partly why the trees have done so well. It is also why we have water problems along with the clay soil. Was there any mention of these complications?

All in all, I have to be opposed to this development until I can see concrete proposals for flood control and water containment for me and my neighbours whose backyards will be directly affected by these proposals. In addition, I want to know that, should the very worst happen and my property is adversely affected by this development, I will be financially compensated for damage completely. As a long term resident, I will know that this damage will have been the consequence of the new development and NOT the result of my actions or decisions.

Please consider this letter notice of my opposition to this proposal in its current form. As events progress and I have more time to look at the documents that have been provided, I will write again. Please feel free to contact me should you be able to answer my questions or to discuss my concerns.

Regards.

Anne Britton
[REDACTED]

To: Denise Whaley
Town of the Blue Mountains
CC: Stephanie Lacey-Avon, Dylan Stoneman

Topic: Plan of Subdivision #42T-2019-03 61 Alfred Street

I have lived at [REDACTED] since May 2012. I am in receipt of your proposal that was mailed to residents in the area. I called the planning department in the fall when the proposed development signs were posted and received no call back. While I live in Thornbury, I work in Owen Sound and find that your meeting times are restrictive for working people to attend. I would appreciate some consideration being given to meetings held in the evenings or on weekends so that all concerned home owners and residents have the opportunity to attend.

My first concern regarding the proposal is DRAINAGE. If you walked the back of the properties on Orchard Drive during this time of the year you would notice that drainage has changed since the building of the Thorncroft Cres. development. There is definite pooling and ponding of water. The development proposal indicates that the new property will be elevated to 1.0 to 1.5 metres above the current grading. I would ask why? Since there is a known "perched water table" I believe it is your responsibility to assess if this will impact the current residents. If it is decided that this development is to proceed I would want to ensure that the Town or the Developer will have insurance to protect your current tax payer base.

I am also the owner of several mature pine trees on the property line. I am concerned for their well-being. Any damage to the root system or the trees themselves could result in significant property damage to my home, a new homeowner or my existing neighbours.

I moved to Thornbury as I felt it was a well planned, small community. Have the necessary traffic and sidewalk assessments been completed to ensure the safety of pedestrians? I walk down Victoria St. with my grandchildren and my dogs and have noticed an increase in traffic and cleanliness of the street. This is your job to ensure that your residents have safe streets to enjoy.

I was part of a growing community prior to my move up here. I have seen there can be significant benefits and detriments to the original community. Any development must demand the consideration of EXISTING tax payers as well as the potential influx of new residents. I would ask what these fifteen new homes will bring to our existing neighbourhood? I am very concerned about my property valuation. I fear that this development will only bring unwanted water to the properties that back onto this site.

I would ask that consideration for this proposal be delayed at this time until you can provide assurance and a plan that will protect the current residents' investment in their homes.

Regards,

Cindy Dudley



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: 61 Alfred St. Proposed Development
Date: September 10, 2020 10:43:54 AM

We are the property owners at [REDACTED]. As you know a public hearing regarding the proposed Carey Development is set for September 30th. For us to evaluate the proposal we need some information and documents well in advance of the September 25th submission date.

Our concerns are with respect to site drainage and the necessity of sidewalk installation on the east side of Victoria St. from Alice St. to Napier St. We recognize that any sidewalk installation would be partially in the vicinity of the proposed development.

DRAINAGE ISSUES

It is trite law that no entity has the right to alter water flows to create a nuisance to the detriment of our property.

A public hearing was conducted at the municipal offices in the fall of 2017 to review a draft engineering plan for the drainage issues in our area including the lands of the proposed development. The draft was to be revised and sent to the Town. Please provide us with the revised drainage Plan and confirm it's recommendations have been incorporated into the proposed Carey development.

The development property to our north has been evaluated for water table issues. If a report has been prepared with respect to this investigation please provide it. If the proposed plan alters the existing surface drainage please provide us with the particulars as to how surface drainage will be carried out.

SIDEWALK FROM ALICE ST. TO NAPIER ST.

The proposed development adds additional pedestrian and vehicle traffic to Victoria St. south of Alfred. Victoria St. is one of the busiest avenues in Thornbury for pedestrian and vehicle traffic. There is a clear issue of pedestrian safety which cries out for the installation of an east sided sidewalk from Alice St. to Napier St.

Is there provision for this sidewalk installation at the west side of the proposed plan? If the Town is to carry out the work from Alice to Napier when will this be done?

May we please hear from you well in advance of the September 25th date for written submissions.

Regards,

Christine and Lawrence Foy

[REDACTED]

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF 61 ALFRED STREET BY CAREY HOMES LTD.

SUBMISSIONS OF LAWRENCE AND CHRISTINE FOY

[REDACTED]

TO COUNTY OF GREY PLANNING DEPARTMENT and

TOWN OF BLUE MOUNTAINS DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS, PLANNING

SEPTEMBER 14, 2020

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Plan should be rejected because

1. **There is no storm water drainage capacity for the property.**
2. The proposed overland drainage with a grade raised up to two meters does not account for current drainage patterns of the abutting Thorncroft Court properties. If approved the Plan allows potential overland flooding of these Thorncroft properties and the potential liability of Carey, Grey County and the Town of Blue Mountains.
3. Raising the proposed grade by up to two meters for basement installation is incompatible with the existing grades on Thorncroft Court and Orchard Dr. **The buildings on site should be constructed on slabs on the existing grade.**
4. The proposed overland catch basin on conveyed lot 5 contravenes the Thornbury West Drainage Master Plan of March 29, 2019.
5. The request for semi-detached and row homes does not consider the sight lines at the site only look onto detached homes on Ashbury Crt., Thornbury Crt. and Orchard Dr.
6. **Orders Requested:**
 - (1) Any Plan must be deferred until 900 mm storm water piping is installed on Victoria St.
 - (2) The Plan must not increase site grading for structures beyond existing grade.

1. There Is No Storm Water Drainage Capacity for the Plan

The Crozier Report of September 2019 indicates at points 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 there is no current storm water capacity for the Plan on either Victoria St. or Alfred St. West. The existing capacity of Victoria will be further taxed as construction continues at Thornbury Meadows.

If the Plan is approved before the expansion of either or both storm sewers overland flooding of the site and adjacent properties on Thorncroft and Orchard is assured in a major rain event or by accelerated snow or ice melt.

We are in an era of climate change with rain storms of high intensity and longer duration. Above freezing temperatures are now a common winter event. The proposed Plan will cause overland flooding at the site and pollutants will be discharged into the Little Beaver River and directly into Georgian Bay.

Any Plan must not be approved until adequate storm water capacity for the site has been **installed** by the Town.

2. The Proposed Overland Drainage Does Not Account for Current Drainage Patterns of the Thorncroft Court Properties

The Crozier determination regarding existing external drainage of Thorncroft at 5.1.2 of it's report is incorrect. All the abutting Thorncroft properties drain front to front and rear to rear. Site examination shows the rear of 2 and 4 Thorncroft drain west to Victoria while 6 and 8 Thorncroft drain at the rear easterly to Orchard. There is a private catch basin at the north east corner of 8 Thorncroft draining the southeast portion of the Plan and 6 and 8 Thorncroft. It is unknown where this water discharges however the downslope indicates probably onto an Orchard property.

This private catch basin at 8 Thornbury was pointed out to Town and Engineering staff at the public meeting to discuss the Thornbury West Drainage Master Plan. No reference to this catch basin is made in the Crozier Report or in the Drainage Master Plan prepared by it. Two photographs of this private catch basin will be included with this submission. The Carey red survey stake is visible in the photos.

There is inadequate provision in the proposed Plan to deal with the existing drainage at the rear of 6 and 8 Thorncroft to the northeast of these homes.

3. Raising The Proposed Grade By Up to Two Meters is Incompatible With the Existing Grades on Thorncroft Crt. and Orchard Dr. Structures Can Be Build on Slab Using the Existing Grade.

Paragraph 5.1 of the Crozier Report indicates the site is to be raised 1 – 1.5 meters above existing grade due to a high ground water level. Figure 5 of the Report indicates the current drainage routes on the site. There is no indication in figure 5 of water flows to the private catch basin on the north east corner of 8 Thorncroft.

Figure 6 of the report is the Post Development Drainage Plan. Hand drawn arrows on the Figure indicate eastbound water flows at the juncture of the site with the rear of 6 and 8 Thorncroft. There is a proposed high point of 200.2 meters on the site dropping to a low point of 198.27 meters at the juncture of the site with the northeast corner of Thorncroft.

This Plan therefore calls for the site to be raised almost two meters above the existing grades on Thorncroft and Orchard. The proposed raised grade will be higher than the existing rear fencing of 6 Thorncroft. The proposed site and its structures will tower over the Thorncroft and Orchard lands and residences. They are incompatible with these established neighborhoods.

The proposed site grading at the rear of the structures on the southeast area of the site will have to be very steep to drop two meters from the 200.2 meter high point to the 198.27 meter low point at the south east corner of the site. This will be conducive to erosion and overland flooding of the 6 and 8 Thorncroft and Orchard properties during storm or snow melt events.

The proposed site grading is unnecessary and must be rejected. The rational solution to deal with the groundwater issue is to **require slab construction on all units** without any basement excavations. Slab construction will not require changes to existing grading. Thorncroft Meadows and AppleJack are both above grade construction presumably due to water table issues.

4. The Proposed Overland Catch Basin on Conveyed Lot 5 Contravenes the Thornbury West Drainage Master Plan of March 29, 2019

A catch basin is proposed at 5.2 of the Crozier Report for the backyard of Lot 5. This proposed installation is contrary to Section 5.3.2 Alternative 3B Page 35 of the Drainage Master Plan. Installation of municipal catch basins on private property is to be avoided. Flooding of Thorncroft and Orchard Properties may result if the property owner of Lot 5 does not maintain free water flow into the catch basin. The owner has no enforceable obligation to maintain it. Carey, the County and the Town may be liable if flooding occurs.

5. The Plan For Semi Detached and Row Homes Does Not Consider the Sight Lines at the Lot Only Look Onto Detached Houses on Ashbury, Thorncroft and Orchard

The view from the site to the north is to the BVCS. To the west the site looks to detached houses on Ashbury the east side looks to detached houses on Orchard and to the south detached homes on Thornbury.

The proposed housing is not visually compatible with the existing views of detached homes land contravenes the Design Guidelines of the Town.

6. Orders Requested

1. Any proposed Plan must be deferred until the 900 mm storm water drainage pipe is installed by the Town on Victoria St.
2. No increase in grade beyond existing is to be allowed for structure construction in the Plan.

All of which is respectfully submitted

Christine & Lawrence Foy



PAGES 6 AND 7 ARE PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE PRIVATE CATCH BASIN LOCATED ON THE NORTH EAST CORNER OF 8 THORNCROFT COURT WHICH IS NOT IDENTIFIED IN THE CROZIER REPORT. THE RED STAKE IS A SURVEY MARKER FOR THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE CAREY LANDS.





From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: Re: Zoning by-Law amendment Application P2832
Date: September 29, 2020 9:36:39 AM

To the attention of the Town Clerk;

To the Town Clerk:

I am a registered owner of [REDACTED] Thornbury On. and have the following comments on the proposed Zoning By-law amendment and proposed Plan of Subdivision as set out in your Notice of Public Hearing recently forwarded to nearby Owners.

- 1.) A comparison of this Proposal to the four most immediate cul-de-sac developments in the adjacent area shows that the density under this Proposal will be more than double that of the adjacent Cul-de-sacs. This will greatly increase the problems faced by existing cul-de-sac owners namely :
 - a.) Snow removal and storage.
 - b.) Garbage removal,
 - c.) On- street parking particularly where there will be many more driveways, many side by side.

2.) This development is more likely to attract younger families a proper objective in any community to-day. The Beaver Valley school is already experience significant pupil enrolment and it questionable if there is future capacity.

Respectfully Submitted, David Macdonald

From: John Orr <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2020 1:55 PM

To: Town Clerk <townclerk@thebluemountains.ca>

Subject: 61 Alfred St. W., Thornbury, ON - 19 unit plan of subdivision and zoning by-law amendment

Regarding 10 a.m. meeting on Sept. 30, 2020:

Please note our comments regarding the above at 61 Alfred St. W., Thornbury and include them in the above meeting:

- Traffic study done by Grey County on Aug. 30, 2019 (Project #1284-4979) is outdated as doesn't reflect current high density proposal;
- Infrastructure not adequate to accommodate such a development;
- Already poor road condition of Victoria St. to sustain increased traffic for additional vehicles at such a development;
- Deplorable condition of Victoria St. south of Alice - shouldn't be considered a municipal road;
- Victoria St. south of Alfred - no curbs or gutters, very narrow shoulders, open ditches, pedestrians are forced to walk on the road (definite safety issue);
- Current proposal is not compatible with existing neighbourhood. East, south and west of the proposed development are single detached residences. Planned semi detached and row housing are not in keeping with the many detached homes in this area (especially in the new development on Ashbury Court) - therefore diminishing the property values of our detached homes.

Regards, John and Valya Orr ([REDACTED], Thornbury)

From: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Subdivision #42T-2019-03-61
Date: February 27, 2020 6:14:07 AM
Attachments: [Drainage.docx](#)

Good morning

I received in the mail, a notice of proposed development #42T-2019-03 61 at 61 Alfred St Town of Blue Mountains. In response I would like it noted that I am not comfortable with this development going forward until I am comfortable about drainage.

I have quickly reviewed parts of the plan and am submitting this written correspondence to show my concern. I will also be submitting more opinions at a later date once I am able to review this more but wanted to be on record as showing my disapproval. This is very time consuming to be able to give full feedback at this time

In the report it states under wetlands - There are no wetlands.

I have lived at my residence for 30 years and know that you could wade up to a foot in the backyard over a considerable area in the spring. I thankfully knock on wood have not had water in my basement but know my neighbours have. If any development creates the result of my basement in the future getting flood damage I will pursue action

I have enclosed a cut and paste of what the study shows under drainage and what I can understand.

First of all it states the site will be raised 1.5 m. I don't understand . If property is elevated it means water is flowing somewhere

Second it shows water will flow through storm sewers. Again what does that mean. On Orchard drive our water overflow goes out into the street. Come to my house now and you will see a huge puddle of water at the end of my driveway while my neighbour has a hose spewing water on to the street. Why is this water not contained on Orchard Drive?

Third. It shows drainage out to Victoria and Alfred Street meaning any other drainage goes onto the lots on Orchard Drive causing us more water problems.

I would appreciate if someone could GUARANTEE 100 % that the properties on Orchard drive would not be affected by this development and if there are problems we are compensated properly and what compensation would that be

Regards

Steve Pendleton

[REDACTED] Thornbury

Our office has reviewed the Geotechnical Investigation Report, dated August 1, 2019 by Peto MacCallum Ltd. (PML), which will be submitted under separate cover. It is understood that the Site will require topsoil to be stripped to a depth of approximately 0.7 to 1.0 m. PML identified the presence of a perched ground water table 1.3 to 1.5m below existing grade on July 8th, 2019. PML will be conducting year-long water table monitoring program to confirm the seasonal high ground water table. Based on the initial results it has been assumed that the Site will need to be raised between 1 to 1.5m above existing grade to provide clearance between the basement slab and the seasonal high groundwater table.

5.1.2 External Drainage Based on As-Constructed drawings received from the Town, there are no external flows being conveyed through the Site as the adjacent lots from Thorncroft Court and Orchard Drive are graded with rear-to-front drainage. The adjacent lots on Orchard Drive have a row of mature trees that are located just outside the property limits of the Site. It is our understanding that all efforts should be made to maintain these trees.

5.2 Proposed Drainage Proposed post-development drainage conditions are depicted in Figure 4, which include preliminary grading, swales, existing and proposed storm sewer locations and sizes. Minor storm events up to and including the 5-year storm event will be conveyed via appropriately sized storm sewers. Major storm events (greater than a 5-year storm event) will be conveyed by overland flow routes via roadways and overland channels/swales. It has been assumed that the majority of the lots in Ashbury East will be graded with split drainage and side yard swales, which will convey stormwater towards either the internal roadway or rear yard swale. Lots 1, 2 and 3 will be graded with rear to front drainage, similar to the adjacent lots on Thorncroft Court, and convey run-off to the internal storm sewer system via side yard swales. Lots 4, 5, 6 and 7 will be graded with split drainage to attempt to maintain the existing mature trees along the east property line. The rear yards will drain towards the proposed rear-lot catchbasin located in the backyard of Lot 5 and flow/drain into the proposed internal storm sewer system. As shown in Figure 4, the Site will be split into two catchments. Proposed Catchment 1 will drain towards the internal roadway, which will convey runoff to Victoria Street South. Runoff from minor storm events will be collected by the internal storm sewer system and major storm events will be conveyed overland via the internal roadway. Proposed Catchment 2 will drain uncontrolled to the existing Alfred Street West roadway and storm sewer system. As the Site drains into existing storm systems downstream, Crozier has completed a preliminary capacity assessment of the following infrastructure: 1. Victoria Street South Storm Sewer; and 2. Alfred Street West Storm Sewer.

September 26th , 2020-09-26

To: Corrina Giles, Town Clerk; Denise Whaley, Town Planner; Stephanie Lace-Avon, Grey County Planner and Town of the Blue Mountains Town Council

Re: Plan of Subdivision #42T-2019-03 and Zoning By-law Amendment P2832

This letter is being written for the purpose of being read at the September 30th Public Meeting about the above property. We, the undersigned, are residents of 106, 108 and 110 Orchard Drive, respectively. We are concerned about the conservation of our row of mature trees that are located along the border of our properties backing onto the proposed development. These trees are a mix of softwood and hardwood trees; many of which are over 30 years old. The stature and girth of these trees form a natural privacy barrier which is of value both to us and to any future property owners. But, they will need to be conserved which will take proper planning and probably ongoing involvement by a professional arborist. We intend to peruse both the town's bylaws and those of other municipalities in order to advocate for the best possible practice.

As well, we need to be convinced that we will be insured against future calamities, such as tree falls, should the worse happen due to improper or inadequate conservation methods. It is a credit to the town that it has associated itself with tree conservation recently through the Tree Trust. We hope that this decision shows an alignment of our interests when the measures are being put in place for the protection of our trees.

As you are aware, we are very concerned about the management of surface drainage. We have begun to document the present state of our properties for comparison with their condition both during and after the development. Since our properties are dry during the year, we expect to be informed of measures taken to protect our properties from surface drainage. The proposal for a swale may be problematic due to its proximity to the tree line; consequently, more elaborate measures may be needed or the swale location changed. Again, we expect to be insured against future calamities such as water pooling which happened on other Orchard Drive properties after the Thorncroft development.

In general, we expect our properties to be maintained and, if necessary, restored, to their original states. Until we know the answers to our questions and concerns about tree conservation and surface water drainage, we have to object to the proposed development at the present time.

Sincerely

Steve Pendleton



Anne Britton



Cindy Dudley



Rick and Julie Tipping

Thornbury, On
N0H 2P0

September 14, 2020

Mayor and Council
The Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street,
Thornbury, Ontario
N0H 2P0

To the Mayor and Members of Council

Re: Proposed Development at 61 Alfred St.

At this time, I feel obliged to join with those residents who are expressing their concerns regarding the densification of extremely small parcels of land within established neighbourhoods. I am taking special exception to the proposed development of 61 Alfred St.

Also in reading "The Review" it appears there is a significant portion of the electorate that is vehemently opposed to the rate of development and the form many of these projects are taking.

- I'm aware of the Province's guidelines for densification, intended to slow the consumption of land, arguably make housing more affordable and maximize the profits for the developers.
- This project currently proposes ten semi-detached and nine town homes on a 1.3 hectare parcel.
- The property is surrounded on three sides by mainly single family bungalows and the Community Centre and park to the North.
- Also, just to the West is the Apple Jack development of over one-hundred and eighty town homes with additional townhome developments located to the North and to the West.
- I would think the densities for this area are more than adequate and this project should reflect that of Ashbury Ct., Orchard Dr., Pyatt Ave. and Thorncroft Crt.
- A partial environmental assessment was completed prior to the sale of the property to the current owner. It was determined there is contaminated soil on the property resulting from the breakdown of DTT. The assessment recommended further investigation on the remainder of the lot. I was advised by the MOE that several of the readings should result in the removal of the material to a regulated dump site. I asked Town staff if a more comprehensive study would be completed on the remainder of the property by the new owner. The developer's consultant advised staff that according to records only the area where the contaminated soil is located was used for agricultural

use and no further investigation was required, thus saving the developer additional expenses both with study costs and possible additional removal of contaminated soil. In speaking with long-time residents, I was informed that the adjacent properties were once apple orchards. Back in the day over-spray was very common and I believe there may be additional areas of contamination. Soil contamination should be of great concern to Council and staff. Extensive soil testing of any development lands previously used for agricultural purposes should be considered and testing be mandatory. The health of the residents should be paramount and protected at all costs. I was surprised and concerned that Town staff would accept this response and not order a complete assessment.

- Mature white pines are located in the rear yards of several of the Orchard Drive properties. Given their proximity to the rear lot line, I believe its safe to say the roots are well into the proposed development. These trees are irreplaceable. The proposed plan indicates the construction of a drainage swale that has the potential to significantly damage the root systems. Trees are resilient and it could take several years to show signs of decline and the developer will be long gone. The resident is then burdened with the cost of removal and a desirable property asset is lost. They are not replaceable in our lifetime. This is only one example and there are many more small plots of land within the Town under the same development pressure.
- Developers seem intent on destroying the very character of the precious neighbourhoods that make Thornbury so desirable.
- If this project is permitted to proceed as proposed, it will have a dramatic and negative impact on adjacent properties, affecting property values, privacy and quality of life.

In conclusion:

1. I would ask that the application for rezoning of 61 Alfred St. be denied.
2. I am requesting a thorough soil examination of the 61 Alfred St. development property to ensure the levels of chemical contaminants are below acceptable levels and that contaminated soils are removed and disposed of at proper facilities.
3. Please respect and protect the character and quality of life that residents enjoy in their respective neighbourhoods and stop the intensification with these small in-filling projects.
4. I suggest a qualified arborist be employed to assess tree health, the extent of root spread and to bring forward a plan to protect these trees prior to project approval. Also, during construction within the designated area, the arborist should, on a daily basis, inspect the site to ensure all protective measures are being adhered to.
5. I strongly suggest that staff consult with Cohen and Masters (cmtrees.com). Tree bylaws for various major cities and towns are available. Methods for tree evaluation and protection are readily available and can be adopted completely or in part. I was advise one method of determining root spread was to measure out two feet from the

tree base for every inch of diameter. If this is correct, roots will be well into the development and the proposed rear lot line swale has the potential to significantly damaging this root system.

6. Many suggest that development brings increased employment and yes with growing population comes increased demand for services in the long term but does not necessarily bring construction jobs. With respect to Ashbury Ct., the developer/builder (Carey Homes), this is not the case. Majority of the sub-contractors and suppliers were from the Kitchener/Waterloo area. Lumber was delivered from Home Hardware St.Jacobs.
7. Many streets show signs of extensive base failure and warrant reconstruction. Sidewalks lacking in many areas are a safety issue especially for children and an aging population.
8. Uncontrolled and rapid growth has the potential to over-whelm the Council, staff and residents and create many problems we are not prepared to deal with.
9. I am also requesting a recorded vote of Council be taken regarding all development issues. The electorate needs to be aware of each councillor's position regarding development.

Respectfully (a concerned citizen)
Rick and Julie Tipping

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Plan of Subdivision - 16 Alfred
Date: February 28, 2020 11:01:38 AM

Good morning. I am a resident of [REDACTED] Thorncroft Ct. My wife and I purchased the property approx. seven years ago from the builder (D. McCoombe). After a partial review of the Geotech report, I found several issues of concern. The report states, based on Town as constructed docs, that all properties drain into the court. I suggest this info is incorrect. In fact all properties on the north side appear to have split drainage. A visual of my property suggests, a minimum of the rear yard including two down spouts drain north onto the adjacent property. I assume the water spills onto the property in question and finds it's way to the Victoria ditch. This does give rise to concerns regarding the accuracy of the Town's records and/or subdivision grade control and/or verification by the Town or its representatives. I suggest drainage grades on these properties be confirmed before finalization of plans. In addition, the report recommends the overburden be removed and the property then raised one to one and half meters above existing. In reviewing the proposed drainage plan, this appears to be the case. Please verify

Thank you
Rick Tipping

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: 61 Alfred St. Thornbury
Date: September 28, 2020 11:49:20 AM

We as residents backing on to the 61 Alfred St. development, Thornbury, would like to address the lack of documents regarding the water table on the property. There has been a year of monitoring of the site and the study that was completed June/July 2020 has not been posted on the website documents. This document is very important to the residents of the area when addressing details in the zoom meeting on Sept. 30/20. We would hope that this document is posted before residents and Town discuss this development. High water tables and previous studies suggest that the buildings will be raised significantly taking away our privacy as we are all in bungalows as the reports state that they could be raised 5 + feet. Drainage and tree preservation is important to all members of this community.

The high density for this lot proposed is VERY concerning as traffic, school enrolment, garbage, park usage have increased over the last year in the area to make this a very concerning development. Traffic in the area of Victoria st. in particular starts some mornings at 5 a.m. and the traffic on highway 26 makes you wonder how far are people driving to employment to live here.

Please provide this document prior to the zoom meeting on Sept.30/20.

Julie Tipping

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: file#42T-2019-03
Date: February 24, 2020 4:42:11 PM

Hi Denise and Stephanie,

My name is Barrie Wykes and I live at [REDACTED] which backs on to the subject property at 61 Alfred Street West. My question is why this proposal has changed from the original plan of 9 lots with Bungalows to a mixed use combination on 15 lots? Was this a directive from the TBM or was this change at the request of the builder? Are the Townhouses and Semis to be 1, 2 or 3 stories? Which lots will be used for these units?

All of the surrounding residents feel that the original proposal for 9 lots with Bungalows is far more in keeping with all the neighboring streets of Thorncroft Court, Ashbury Court, Pyatt Court, Pyatt Ave. and Orchard Drive. As we prepare our comments on file #42T-2019-03 it would be very helpful to know the reasoning behind this decision to change what seemed like the perfect use Plan, to something far less desirable.

Thanks ,
Barrie

[REDACTED]