

Presentation to County of Brant Planning and Development Services Meeting, June 1, 2021 regarding File Number: ZBA21-21-DN
Presented by Bruce Harschnitz, [REDACTED].

Thank you, Chair Miller, councillors and members of the planning committee, for allowing us to speak at this meeting.

My name is Bruce Harschnitz and along with my wife Marian live at [REDACTED]. We moved here in 2009 at which time the residence at 241 Langford Church Rd, the subject property, was not even constructed yet.

At that time, the well on our property was already a very low yield well, and has continually supplied less and less water, to the point that we are forced to purchase water on a monthly basis compared to every third or fourth month. That is with just two people in the house hold and we are also very water conscious and conserve water whenever possible.

Since moving here, six homes have been built in the vicinity with two more lots being developed as we speak. Water is a major concern for us and all the other existing residents and why we feel this change in zoning should not be approved.

When the original owners of the farm property at 237 Langford Church had looked to sever off parcels of land, it is our understanding that a water well study was conducted. Because of the lack of supply and negative affect on existing surrounding wells, only two lots were allowed to be severed – the subject lands at 241 Langford Church and 245 Langford Church. That should be enough to prevent more lots from being created since they would be on the same land this study had been conducted on.

Since then, just two years ago, 237 Langford Church was granted permission to sever a parcel of land on the edge of their property bordering 241 Langford Church to construct a residence for their parents who also worked on the farm. This has added more demand to the water table.

When we spoke in opposition to that application, and the concern about more lots being allowed along McBay Road, we were assured by members of council that we had nothing to worry about because no lots would be created along MacBay Road because it was not zoned for it. We hope the county stands by this assurance made during that application process and does not allow this change to create more lots.

We also have concerns about the minimum distance separation exemption that will also be required. Obviously official plans and zoning requirements have established these limits to ensure as much protection as possible from agricultural operations. Allowing more development within these limits also increases the potential for contamination of drinking water supplies. These setbacks have been developed for a reason, please uphold them, or they become meaningless.

We realize 237 Langford Church was granted permission to create a building lot on their existing property, but it was for occupancy by immediate family that was also working on the farm. That is not the case with the application before you for to create these two lots.

Traffic is another critical issue along this stretch of McBay Road. There has been a steady increase in traffic accessing Six Nations of the Grand River via this road. Until a few years ago, the speed limit was 80kph and vehicles were routinely travelling well in excess of that. Approximately two years ago the speed limit was reduced to 60 kph just south of the Langford Church/McBay Rd intersection, just meters from where these lots would access McBay. Traffic heading south toward Painter Rd are still going well in excess of the speed limit, and regularly passing other slower vehicles in front of our property. When turning right (north) out of our own driveway, we constantly have to creep out carefully and watch for speeding vehicles on our side of the road passing others. The intersection has had numerous accidents, likely due to speed, including a significant three car collision just 3 weeks ago. Adding two more lots along McBay Road in this location will only increase the traffic congestion and accident rate.

Thank you for taking these factors into consideration and we hope that they are significant enough to warrant not approving the zoning change.