

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, September 12, 2022 8:17 PM

**To:** Mayor Aina DeViet <[deviet@middlesexcentre.ca](mailto:deviet@middlesexcentre.ca)>; Councillor Sue Cates <[cates@middlesexcentre.ca](mailto:cates@middlesexcentre.ca)>; Marion Cabral <[mcabral@middlesex.ca](mailto:mcabral@middlesex.ca)>; [mcabral@middlesexcentre.ca](mailto:mcabral@middlesexcentre.ca) <[mcabral@middlesexcentre.ca](mailto:mcabral@middlesexcentre.ca)>; Middlesex Centre Planning <[planning@middlesexcentre.ca](mailto:planning@middlesexcentre.ca)>

**Subject:** 6, 10, and 14 Elmhurst Street development in Old Kilworth

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the Middlesex Centre email system. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you are 100% sure that the email is safe.

To Whom it May Concern,

\*\* Please include this letter when you read the others at your next council meeting when you discuss this plan.

I am writing to inform you that I do not approve of the proposed development plan for the property located at 6, 10, and 14 Elmhurst Street in Old Kilworth. The Developer's team shared an updated plan with local residents during a Zoom meeting on September 7. This plan includes 30 townhomes and 15 single storey condo units, all of which will be located on approximately 5 acres of land. My arguments for disagreeing with the proposed plan and other related concerns are as follows (in no particular order):

1. Zoning and Density – the property is not currently zoned for this higher density and if it were to be re-zoned, it would set a precedent for other Developers who have been buying up land immediately to the north and east of this property (Sifton and Drewlo). 30 townhomes and 15 single storey units is far too many on this land. The surrounding streets in Old Kilworth were established many years ago and many homes sit on generous sized lots with ample trees and green space. It doesn't suit the neighbourhood. Rather than building 45 units, it would be a better use of the land to construct 10-15 regular detached homes.
2. Water and Sewer Service – the property is not currently serviced by municipal water and sewer. The Developer said that their plans are to run water lines and sewers along Parkland and then north on Elmhurst and into the development. I have seen other municipalities charge each homeowner to run water and sewer by their house (even if the homeowner chooses not to connect to it). For example, in Mount Brydges when a Developer had to run water and sewer down an older unserviced street just to get to the new properties, all existing homeowners along that street were charged \$17,500 to run it past their house, and it was another \$10,000 to connect to the service. Why should existing homeowners have to pay almost \$30,000 just because someone wants to develop the land nearby? If the final decision is to run services down Parkland, either the Developer should pay for it or the municipality; the homeowner never asked or voted for it. This could also open the municipality to legal action since some people in Mount Brydges have engaged legal counsel to fight having to pay

for something they didn't want.

3. Traffic – adding 45 units could potentially increase the vehicle count by 90 (+ visitors and couriers) on that small parcel of land. There is no left turn allowed onto Elmhurst when traveling west on Glendon, which means people coming from London would need to travel down Kilworth Park Drive, then east across Parkland, and then onto Elmhurst to gain access to the new development. Turning left onto Glendon from Elmhurst is also a challenge and unsafe. So now with 45 additional units, we will now have bottlenecks at the top of Elmhurst trying to exit onto Glendon, and constant traffic going along Parkland to get to Kilworth Park Drive. Parkland is an older street without sidewalks, lighting, and is also quite narrow. The residents do not want a wider street and lighting, however, if the plan were to reduce the number of units from 45 to 10-15 regular houses, it would greatly reduce the impact to traffic on the streets bordering the development.
4. Access point to development – there is only one entrance/exit to the development. This one entrance/exit is also the ONLY entrance/exit for pedestrian traffic. If people living in the new development want to access the streets surrounding them, they will need to use this one entrance/exit. Unlike other developments that are placed within neighbourhoods, there are no paths or walkways for residents to gain direct access to the nearby streets easily. The layout of the plan has the new development completely isolated from the rest of Old Kilworth.
5. Impacts to existing water wells in the area – although many residents in Old Kilworth have drilled wells that are 100+ feet deep, there are still many residents with shallow wells (even along the north side of Parkland). The amount of construction and movement of soil and earth could negatively impact the water levels in our wells and render them dry. The cost of a new well is approximately \$15-\$20,000. It should be made clear that if there are negative impacts to existing wells, the Developer or municipality will pay for all repairs and/or the drilling of a new well. The Developer's team said that they did a study of the wells in the area and there would be no issues, however, they are misinformed because the well records for our area are incomplete and inaccurate. In the 60's and 70's when wells were being installed, record keeping was not at its best. For example, the well for my house is not on the map where my house is actually located, it's far up the street on another lot. They are all mixed up and it's difficult to determine where each well is actually located. Stainton Well Service can attest to this. Therefore, any study the Developer has done on the wells in our area is invalid due to the improper record-keeping of wells.
6. Green space / park land – the new development has little green space or park land. The Developer's team informed us that instead of designating a certain portion to park land, they went with the option to pay the municipality money so they could maximize the number of units in that space. If I understand correctly, the municipality is then supposed to reinvest that money in green space or park land elsewhere in the community. Where will that go? There isn't any more land to use in our neighbourhood. It won't be anywhere nearby and will require the residents to drive to wherever the new green space will be. As mentioned in point #4 above, the new community would already be isolated from the rest of the neighbourhood, and now they won't even have any sizeable green space or park land to enjoy. This does not make sense. People will be crammed into this small area, with small lots and no backyards (townhomes), and not have anywhere nearby they can use to enjoy the outdoors. Profit maximization successful! However, the happiness of residents is a FAILURE.

Sincerely,

Jason and Suzanne Young

