

## Proposed Zoning Amendment

File Number: ZBA2-22-KD

Location: 283 McLean School Road

Applicant: IBI Group

Agent: Hugh MacNeil

Good Day Members of Council,

My name is Wade Smith, property owner of 286 Mclean School Road, residing here since 1971.

It is not my effort to waste council's time by re-analysing or re-visiting the neighbours' already thorough job of looking at by-laws & rulings. [REDACTED] have done a fine job.

However, there are 3 glaring misgivings that follow:

1. Without the old-fashioned application for zoning change signage posted at said property, residents know nothing of this decision. Beyond that not 100% of adjoining property owners were notified. Is council aware of this?
2. Was County council aware that on 4 separate occasions, including yesterday, being Wed. January 26<sup>th</sup>. Multiple vehicles & persons having said "representing the county" either in being trespass because I don't remember county vehicles parking in my yard. Besides that, they would be properly flagged and workers with ID. Something is amiss.
3. Today's concerns I will leave to the neighbours. Concerns of tomorrow is set on the precedence you set today. If we allow that gate to open, what is to stop the next businessman to "chew off a couple of more acres" and possibly IBI Group for having St. George North.

In conclusion, 40 years ago Dad fought for my rights for what I wanted to do on the farm. Now I will do the same for my boys. Me against the gate, leg around the post. The bulls won't get out Dad!

Regards

Wade Smith

Jan. 28/2022

To whom it may concern.

I am a resident on McLean School Road with significant concerns for our wildlife and community. I have pulled specific examples from the various documents the county has provided, and placed questions accordingly.

I am also in agreement with the concerns already submitted by our road community.

Please find my concerns addressed below:

#### Policy 1.1.5.4 Rural Lands in Municipalities

Development that is compatible with the rural landscape and can be sustained by rural service levels should be promoted---***No such properties currently exist on McLean School Road--- properties directly linked with no natural features delineating property lines***

#### Policy 4.2.2.3 Natural Heritage System

Within the Natural Heritage System for the Growth Plan:

a) New development or site alteration will demonstrate that:

i. There are no negative impacts on key natural heritage features or key

hydrologic features or their functions;--***There is NO WAY to guarantee 'no negative impacts'***

ii. Connectivity along the system and between key natural heritage features and

key hydrologic feature located within 240 metres of each other will be

maintained or, where possible, enhance for the movement of native plants and

animals across the landscape;---***how can this be if property owners decide to put up a fence. A new fence on the property with barbed wire has already been erected and altered the travel patterns of wildlife and forced them onto the road (coyotes, deer and fox noted)***

iii. The removal of other natural features not identified as key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features is avoided, where possible. Such features should be incorporated into the planning and design of the proposed use

wherever possible---***Duck unlimited ponds—you add 3 more wells and septic systems, you WILL alter the landscape and the natural features***

#### Policy 3.7.2 Rural Residential – Land Use Policies

- (i)The proposed development has access to potable water, and such supply does not adversely affect adjoining properties; ---***Has a test well(s) been done to see if more wells can be sustained? The summer of 2021 had near drought conditions---more wells, more stress on the natural water features with impact on wildlife and current residents***
- f) Lots created within this designation must be consistent with the size and nature of surrounding lots while being consistent with the minimum size and frontage requirements of the Zoning By-law.- *The Zoning By-law amendment is intended to establish the Rural Residential Zone upon the area proposed for the new lots and to recognize a slightly **deficient lot frontage for Lot 2 and Lot 3.**of 1.3 hectares (3.2 acres), that will ultimately form three new lots on the west side of the property, fronting on McLean School Road. The new Lot 1 will have a proposed frontage of  $\pm 52$  metres ( $\pm 170$  feet) and an area of  $\pm 0.5$  hectares ( $\pm 1.2$  acres). Lot 2 will have a proposed frontage of  $\pm 37$  metres ( $\pm 121$  feet) and an area of  $\pm 0.4$  hectares ( $\pm 1.0$  acre). Lot 3 will have a proposed frontage of  $\pm 35$  metres ( $\pm 115$  feet) and an area of  $\pm 0.4$  hectares ( $\pm 1.0$  acre).*

#### Policy 4.2.3.1 Key Hydrological Features, Key Hydrologic Areas and Key Natural Heritage Features

- A 30-metre and 22-metre wooded area buffer has been respected along the of proposed Lot 1 in relation to Natural Heritage Features. Despite the Growth Plan requirement for key natural features to be buffered by a 30m Vegetated Protection Zone (VPZ), a portion of Lot 1 includes a reduced 22m VPZ as recommended by the EIS consultants in order to allow for development components required by the landowner with no negative impacts.---***what is considered an negative impact? Who decides this? You change the slope etc. and runoff with change and have impact, you create noise and it disturbs nesting and wildlife travel routes. Minimum requirement of 30mVPZ is NOT being met***

- Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020) Planning Conclusion: The proposed lot creation conforms to the policies set out in the Growth Plan for the GGH (2020). Accordingly, the following summarizes appropriate planning notions applicable to 283 McLean School Road:

- Maintains the Natural Heritage Systems located on the property---***not happening if minimum VPZ is not met, extra allowances of other deviances from the minimum such as the deficient lot frontage, the building envelope being place INSIDE the NH zone***

#### Policy 3.7.2 Rural Residential – Land Use Policies

- The retained parcel of land has adequate lot area of 76.6 ha, will maintain the existing agriculture land use activities and single detached residential dwelling along with its associated accessory structures. MDS assessment confirms that the subject lands are not impacted by surrounding livestock operations and a wooded area buffer is being maintained for proposed Lot 1 to protect the wooded area along the western property boundary.—***maintain as in keep or maintain as in have the dwelling livable?—currently not inhabited. How are the back of the property lines going to be separated from the livestock that is kept directly behind the lots? There have been previous occurrences of times when the livestock have escaped and been found on the road.***

#### Policy 3.16.4 Natural Heritage System – Significant Wetlands

Natural Heritage Features have been identified on the Subject Lands and the features are located within proposed Lot 1 severed area. There is a woodland feature identified 2m east of the western boundary of Lot 1 and a 30-metre and 22-metre irregularly shaped wooded area buffer has been proposed as established through consultation with NRSI, The County of Brant and the Grand River Conservation Area (GRCA). No development is proposed within the Feature(s). It is important to note that all environmental and ecological functions and features on the site will be preserved. Continued consultation with the County of Brant and the GRCA will be held to ensure all requirements are met. Additional native plantings will be placed in the Vegetation Buffer as further protection of the adjoining NH lands. A Consent Agreement with the County will insure that proper grading and plantings will occur to minimize any further impact—there WILL be impact during the building of structures, wells and septic. It may be thought that the environmental features and ecological functions will be preserved---***when you disturb during a build, you disturb for a lifetime. The draw on the***

**resource of water alone will have a massive impact on the surrounding ponds, natural vegetation, and wildlife of significant importance as noted above.**

- a) All unevaluated wetlands in the County should be assessed, if not already done so, in order to determine if they are significant, prior to any development proposals being approved. ***It is naive to think that causing great change in one area will not have an impact a few meters away***

#### Policy 3.16.4 Natural Heritage System – Significant Wetlands

Planning Comment: Natural Heritage Features have been identified on the Subject Lands and the features are located within proposed Lot 1 severed area. There is a woodland feature identified 2m east of the western boundary of Lot 1 and a 30-metre and 22-metre irregularly shaped wooded area buffer has been proposed as established through consultation with NRSI, The County of Brant and the Grand River Conservation Area (GRCA). No development is proposed within the Feature(s). It is important to note that all environmental and ecological functions and features on the site will be preserved. Continued consultation with the County of Brant and the GRCA will be held to ensure all requirements are met. Additional native plantings will be placed in the Vegetation Buffer as further protection of the adjoining NH lands. A Consent Agreement with the County will insure that proper grading and plantings will occur to minimize any further impact---***so there WILL be impact. And planting some native plantings will NOT minimize it. That is not even a band-aid solution. It is creating a problem with no solution for the environment***

Figure 3-3 Excerpt from Schedule C – Natural Heritage System Features and Development Constraints depicting the Subject Lands NHS Features – ***all of the proposed lots are in groundwater recharge areas---what impact does this have on the environment to add 3 more dwellings?***

Figure 3-2 Excerpt from Schedule B – Transportation Plan depicting the Subject Lands Road Classification -as a Rural Local road. -***Heavy trucks with construction equipment, sound, runoff etc will influence the ecological features as well as the privacy and rural setting of the current residences***

***2 additional lots were already proposed and approved of at 247 Mclean School road. This will make 5 new wells etc on the road. That WILL carry a significant impact. Has this been considered in the zoning change with the implementation of 3 new lots?***

*Turtles—spent millions to install fencing on Hwy 24 to prevent turtle death from vehicles. There is significant crossing of the turtles to gravel nesting sites from north to south during turtle nesting season. Construction and additional residences will cause more traffic to endanger turtle crossing to nesting grounds.*