

ZBA3-22-KD-23 Beverly Street

My name is Ralph Paling. My wife, Darla Paling and I own the property at 27 Beverly St. E. in St. George, Ontario. We have owned this property since August 1, 1983. Below are the concerns and comments that we have about the proposed development of 23 Beverly St. E. in St. George.

Parking

- 77 units but only one exterior parking space per unit. Most households have two or more vehicles.
- No street parking allowed?
- Visitor parking. 15 proposed vs 27 required.
- Why is all the visitor parking provided at the entrance to the development? It should be located at strategic locations within the development, similar to that of 53 Beverly St. E.
- Visitor parking noise (car doors slamming, loud discussions, etc.) and light pollution late at night
- The residents of neighbouring streets already occupy most available parking spaces. Its unfair to those residents to lose the parking in front of their house to residents of the proposed development.

Garbage

- One location for all 77 units for garbage disposal. A long distance for those residents in the northerly section of the development to bring their garbage to the bins.
- Prefer to have multiple, centrally located (within the development) locations for garbage bins.
- Garbage not put into the bins properly will end up in the yards of 27 Beverly St. E. due to prevailing westerly winds.
- Garbage not properly disposed of will attract unwanted pests. (raccoons, skunks, rats, etc.)
- Noise pollution from bin lids slamming as garbage is placed into bins.
- Smell from rotting garbage from 77 households will be extremely unpleasant for the adjacent neighbours.

Drainage

- 23 Beverly St. E. sits several meters higher than our property. As stated in the Stormwater Management Report surface water flows from the north of the property to the south directly in line with our property.
- Our concern has to do with the management of ground water and surface water.
- How will the county ensure that in the future ground and surface water contaminants will not affect our property? What are our rights after the developers are gone?
- Historically, there was a pond in the southeast corner of the property which was filled in in 1983 when the present factory was built. This pond was/is fed by several aquifers in the property. The pond is gone but the aquifers remain.

- Presently, heavy rains result in the flooding of the western lawn on our property. You can see water bubbling up out of the ground from the parking lot at the north/west corner of our property. This is due to a clogged drain that the owners of 23 Beverly St. E. have failed to address.

The Wastewater treatment plant in St. George is presently at capacity. The Planning Justification Report states: [Until such time as the County Planning Justification Report 11 23 Beverly St E, Brant County January 2022 has completed the EA process and expanded the wastewater treatment plant capacity, it is appropriate to utilize a Holding "H" provision, in accordance with the County's Official Plan. The 'H' could only be lifted, and development proceed, when servicing capacity is available for the proposed development. With the use of a Holding "H" provision, the proposed development can satisfy this criterion.](#) Can the Council please provide more details as to what this "H" provision means and the timeline for the expansion of the Wastewater Plant.

Building Design

- We feel that 77 Medium density housing units do not fit in with the existing neighbourhood style of a quaint rural country village. People are drawn to St. George specifically for this reason.
- We would prefer to see fewer higher quality construction units in a mixture of single family homes and single-story condo units.
- This would allow for more greenspace, visitor parking, and garbage collection within the proposed development.
- Single-story condo units would provide more privacy to those neighbours on the perimeter of the property. In our case, a two-story home build on land several meters higher than our property would eliminate any privacy we might have in our back yard regardless of any privacy fencing that would be built.
- In several document landscaping around the perimeter of the property is mentioned. However, no details have been provided. We would request that more information is provided to the adjacent neighbours who will be affected.
- I was not able to find any reference to perimeter privacy fencing in any of the documents. We would request that the developer include suitable privacy fencing using maintenance free materials to ensure compatibility with the architecture of adjacent buildings.

Quality of Life

- A proposed development project of this size and nature is going to impact the Quality of Life for all neighbouring properties. Construction noise, traffic, dust, and garbage are a concern of all of us.
- Many of the surrounding neighbours are retired. That means that they will not be going to work during construction hours but will have to live with the reality of what is going on next door.
- The arborist report recommends the removal of the majority of the trees on the existing property. We would ask that the developer review that report and make every effort to save as many of these trees as possible rather than just clear cutting them all.

- The impact of the removal of all of the trees hasn't been discussed. How does it impact the privacy of the neighbours, CO2 emissions, the loss of wildlife, etc. We would ask that the Council survey the existing neighbours or hire an independent environment study to consider these issues.
- We are also concerned about those trees that are on our property but that the root ball may extend to the proposed development property. We have a Walnut tree in our front yard that is over 150 years old. It is one of the largest trees in St. George. What is the developer going to do ensure that these trees are not harmed during construction or in the future?
- Presently, most of us look out our back yards to trees and green spaces. For the foreseeable future that view is going to be replaced with heavy equipment, construction materials and mounds of dirt. Hopefully, as this development progresses our properties will be improved with architecturally pleasing privacy fences and landscaping that is acceptable to all of those involved.
- Due to the uncertainty of the timing of this project we would ask that Council provide those affected with an estimated timeline for the completion of this project. Is it one year, two, three years or more?
- Property values in St. George are at an all time high. This village is a highly sought-after destination for many families wanting to get out of the larger urban centers in the surrounding areas. However, for those of us adjacent to this proposed development our properties have lost considerable value with this announcement and will not be marketable until this project is complete.

Conclusion

Progress is inevitable. What form progress takes is not up to us individually to decide but our opinions should be taken into consideration. I ask that you listen to our concerns and act upon them appropriately. Furthermore, I ask that we all treat each other with respect and remember that this is not just business as usual. This is our life and is very personal. Together, I hope that we can create something that will improve the Quality of Life for all of us.

Regards

Ralph & Darla Paling

From: [WOODS](#)
To: [clerks](#); [Planning](#)
Subject: Fwd: 23 Beverly Street East St George - Gary and Sara Woods
Date: Thursday, June 2, 2022 9:06:19 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Re : File ZBA#-22RC- 23 Beverly Street East St George

We live and own property directly attached to this project, as we reside at 23 Reid Street.

We have a few concerns and questions regarding this potential project and have listed our questions/concerns below:

- Since this is a rezone from Special Exemption Prestige Industrial to Special Exception Residential Multiple Density Holding - therefore NOT zoned residential how can this development already be included in the current water, waste, and sewer maximums?
- If there is already a limit requiring 27 parking spaces for such a development, then why would council even consider amending this requirement as both traffic flow onto a very busy main Highway and narrow and already full neighbouring streets, certainly will NOT allow ANY street parking. We are strongly opposed to a 77-unit development and stress that the number of units be reduced to allow adequate parking for all residents.
- We have green space backing up to this development and strongly request that the development pay for and place a maintenance free high fence (at least 6 feet) to block entry to existing properties. We also request that this be completed early in the building process to help with construction noise, dust, safety and privacy.
- We also have concern with the number of units due to the volume of traffic entering and exiting onto one main highway that is already too busy.
- We question the building design - Medium Density Units. This design does not fit with the current existing housing designs in St George and suggest

single family or single-story units, with more green space and visitor parking. Remember this is a small village and new building should reflect that.

-

Please keep us updated on this project.
Thank you Gary and Sara Woods

-