

Attachment 19 – Comments from members of the public Public Meeting, October 27, 2021

- I am curious as to what processes and procedures will be put in place to mitigate traffic congestion on the bridge as this will be just prior to the bridge and the single exit right turn only lane.

This is of concern as it's similar to the exit off of old river road which I have witnessed multiple occurrences of people whooshing up traffic to turn left while heading east bound even though there is no less than 5 signs within a 100 foot range.

- Please use this email as formal notice of our opposition for rezoning for the development of 6, 10, 14 Elmhurst Street. We oppose changing the zoning from Urban Residential First Density exception 3 (UR1-3) to a new site-specific 'Urban Residential Third Density (UR3-x) zone.

The community streets cannot handle this much development within the existing neighbourhood. It will cause concerns of increased traffic, access/exit points, traffic safety within the neighbourhood, and increased school populations that would go to parkview elementary.

- We understand the focus on in-fill & affordable housing, but changing from 3 homes to 56 is unacceptable; there seems to be no or little readiness for the process & consequences of this kind of build.

A great deal of caution is needed here so we don't all say later 'we should not have allowed this'

Referring to the vision for Middlesex Centre

"A thriving, progressive and welcoming community that honours our rural roots and embraces our natural space."

This proposal is in direct contrast; This kind of build is not who we are or who we want to be!

This feels like a cash grab for the developer & for Middlesex with increase in tax base, and I am very concerned that the community feel of Old Kilworth community will disappear if this is approved even at half of what the developer is requesting.

This type of high density residential build should happen in a new area where those moving in are aware and would welcome this high density section ; not in a well established area with large lots to accommodate septic requirements, and where residents have had no inkling or desire for such an influx

Why not something more beneficial such as a Seniors residence, which we know is an increasingly urgent need?

Attachment 19 – Comments from members of the public

Public Meeting, October 27, 2021

There must be consideration of the wildlife & natural habitat of that acreage in a time of climate change & biodiversity concerns; will there be a transparent study on the plant & tree life on this land? and potential native artefacts underground (numerous arrowheads & other such artefacts were found when our home at 42 Elmhurst was being built)

Negative impact on water systems as this area is still on well & septic; serious concern with run off & impact during and after build; will there be a transparent study done on this?

Significant & negative increase in traffic both in Old Kilworth, on Glendon and the upper section of Kilworth Park Drive; our roads in this block (Elmhurst & Beechnut) are much narrower than the norm; extra traffic brings great concern for public safety; this is a serious safety issue for our families; young children & less able bodied adults will be at risk walking in this area due to the traffic

This block (Elmhurst & Beechnut, starting at Parkland) has minimal services from Middlesex Centre - no sidewalks, no sewer or municipal water, no street lights, all which fit well with our living here - and we would not like this to change. I am concerned that with at least 100 new residents in this condo community, this would all change.

Sadly, it is my understanding that the developer mis-represented his intentions to one of the sellers, and that person now regrets selling their home to him. This does not bode well for a transparent process, and perhaps I am naive about how this all works.

I sincerely hope that Middlesex Centre will not approve this zoning change for Old Kilworth and that should it proceed to the Ontario Tribunal, that they be made aware of all of our concerns. Should you wish clarification of any of my concerns, please contact me.

- Does the planning department have any traffic concerns with Elmhurst having no left turn allowed from Glendon Rd.

Diverting traffic to this development from Kilworth Park Dr. is not safe nor appropriate throughfare for this scale of proposed development. Access in and out of proposed development should be direct and self servicing from elmhurst without creating an endless loop around Glendon, kilworth park, elmhurst and parkland.

- I am writing to express my strong opposition to the plan of condominium application, the official plan amendment application and the zoning by-law amendment application at Elmhurst St and Glendon Dr.

Attachment 19 – Comments from members of the public Public Meeting, October 27, 2021

I am asking the Municipality to retain the existing zoning and not to approve the application to change the zoning to higher density.

Old Kilworth is a small and unique area. It has a special rural feeling and a really strong sense of community that the typical subdivision does not have. Many of our residents are nature enthusiasts, birders and hikers who take great pride in their neighbourhood.

A zoning change to higher density and much smaller lot sizes would impact the neighborhood negatively and most importantly set a dangerous precedent for others wishing to capitalize on splitting lots in the neighbourhood for development purposes.

This proposed development will be detrimental to the area. Higher density residential housing will cause traffic and safety problems, increased noise, destroy local wildlife habitat, and potentially lower the property values in the existing community.

If we assume the existing zoning was put in place to protect the integrity of our neighbourhood, it would not make sense to abandon this concept in favour of higher density development. Because there is sufficient land elsewhere for higher density residential use, there is no need to rezone this neighbourhood.

I would recommend that Council consider alternatives to higher density residential housing such a public park, garden, family picnic area, children's play/recreational area, etc. Perhaps there are provincial and/or federal grants available for this kind of development.

I urge you to oppose the proposed rezoning. I know my opinions are shared by many who have not managed to attend a meeting or write letters and emails.

- We are longtime home owners in old Kilworth Heights and are strongly opposed to the proposed zoning change and also the proposed condominium development. This is a quiet semi rural street of older homes on large lots with mature trees and an abundance of natural flora and fauna. In our view, this proposed higher density housing (replacing 3 single family homes with 56 condominiums!) would have a detrimental effect on our neighbourhood.

The increase in population alone would put an increased strain on our local environment and destroy the ambience of Old Kilworth which is currently a hidden gem for both older and younger generations.

There is already traffic congestion on that corner. So, adding more than one hundred vehicles (1-2 vehicles per household plus visitor spaces) to the problem is also a concern.

Attachment 19 – Comments from members of the public Public Meeting, October 27, 2021

There are other disturbing facts about this proposal. Although LSD Consultants has a local office, Sweid Holdings is based in Dubai. Do they have our best interests at heart? Is Sweid Holdings also the purchaser of the properties on the northeast section of Elmhurst Street where houses have been bought or are listed “for sale”. Is this just the beginning of a more expansive future project/rezoning request?

Please listen to your constituents. As our council you have the opportunity to stop this now. We prefer the current zoning designation that discourages the aforementioned developments that would, in our view, significantly and negatively alter our unique community.

- 1. Please identify the proposed water and sewage routing supporting the Condominium Plan.
- 2. Please identify the proposed drainage plan for area. A number of existing residences are currently lower than the proposed site.
- 3. Please identify the type of perimeter barrier proposed for this site. Will it be the lowest costing 4’ chainlink fencing, 6’ framed vertical steel fencing, or a wall?
- 4. Please consider closing the existing direct Elmhurst to Glendon intersection. As a stoplight at Glendon and Kilworth Park Drive has already been approved; using that should greatly minimize the potential for accidents. Even if a No Left Turn sign is erected (from Elmhurst); a high percentage of drivers will ignore it, potentially duplicating the accident prone bridge a few metres East. Any access (in, or out) at this intersection will create accidents as Eastbound traffic suddenly appear at speed over the hill (between Kilworth Park Drive and Elmhurst).
- 5. As our schools are currently at full capacity; what’s the plan for the additional children?
- 6. As Kilworth currently does not have adequate Fire Department support; with this new development, plus the currently developing 1,000 (or so) homes West of Kilworth: when will this urgent priority be addressed?
- 7. If any development is scheduled for this site; the wildlife that use every square foot of the proposed site throughout the year should be given priority as many deer, raccoons, etc. traverse Glendon Drive at dawn and dusk to utilize both sides. Baltimore Orioles nest in the mature trees and feed among the sumacs during the summer and fall: which will be removed during the site development phase.
- In addition I would like to submit the following comments **against** the proposed re-zoning.

I am opposed to the re-zoning at 6, 10, and 14 Elmhurst St. 56 Condos are way too many. I believe zoning should remain the same for the following reasons:

Attachment 19 – Comments from members of the public Public Meeting, October 27, 2021

1) **Middlesex infrastructure can barely keep up with the existing development**, and we don't know the full extent of the impact as approved development is still in progress. Therefore, it would be foolish to proceed to add more development before even knowing that infrastructure can handle the existing developments. The impacts on the following infrastructures need to be carefully considered before allowing any new development:

- **Power grid.** As you know our local power grid needs repair and has resulted in several blackouts over the last year. Adding strain on it will not help.
- **sewer and water facilities** to my understanding are at ore nearing capacity. Will you be upgrading that first?
- **Schools are overflowing** and have very little capacity and will cause more division as Parkview is at capacity and Delaware has so little space (As you will recall it was a messy and heated process that we don't want a repeat of).

2) **Dangerous traffic conditions:**

- the proximity of the 52 condos to the bridge poses many threats to public safety with increased traffic so close to this historically dangerous intersection.
- the proposed left hand turn lane on Glendon will add dangerous traffic at an already dangerous intersection. It will also increase traffic on Elmhurst street which has many children (including a deaf child, if the sign placed on my yard is accurate)
- Turning onto Glendon from Elmhurst is dangerous. Left hand turns take quite some time during busy times of the day, and drivers are already forced to make quick and sometimes dangerous turns. The existing hill and forest make it difficult to see, making even right hand turns challenging. (I understand those trees represent a significant wildlife area and cannot/should not be cut down). IF development is allowed there, that intersection likely needs to be closed for safety.

3) **Environmentally significant area and reducing green space along a green corridor**

- we need more, not less green space. Keeping these large properties intact helps preserve habitats for the deer, coyotes, foxes, and birds, as well as endangered plant life that thrive in these spaces, even in our yards, that are near the river.

Attachment 19 – Comments from members of the public

Public Meeting, October 27, 2021

- Developers should first redevelop spaces that are already covered in cement and/or are run down, not virgin land.

4) **The community as a whole is extremely opposed to this development** and will do everything in our power to fight it, including legal action. After discussion with many neighbours, we are primarily concerned about the following two items:

- we **do not** want increased municipal services:
 - we don't want or need water or septic services. Our own are fantastic.
 - we don't want street lights. They increase light pollution and there is no need for them here.
 - we don't want sidewalks and the burden of increased cost and time for upkeep
 - some of our retired residents on fixed incomes (and likely others) could not afford the forced and unjust cost of adding them.
- we do not want increased traffic that will change our neighbourhood and the safe place it is for kids right now.

And finally, changing the zoning paves the way for other development, and as I've made clear, we do not want that. The houses proposed, if I understand correctly, are not what I would consider affordable housing, so the argument for that falls flat.

- I realize this proposal is financially attractive for the municipality but the monetary influx is not worth the damage to the fabric and environmental significance of our community.
- it has come to my attention that there could be condos built behind our home. I cannot be at the upcoming meeting as I work out of town. I do not want condos up on the hill looking down at my family in the pool or back yard or being able to look into my bedroom windows at the back of my property. We bought our home twenty years ago for the lot and that backs onto a nature setting and we don't want to lose the look as we have spent a considerable amount of time and money on our property.
- I can see that the plan is not in my back yard as of yet. However I do see the land behind me is now up for sale and was wondering if this project has or will be extended to the lot behind my property.

I just want to clarify to you the only issue I have is my property has a hill at the back rather steep one and any building plan would have new residents looking

Attachment 19 – Comments from members of the public

Public Meeting, October 27, 2021

into my yard and we are against that unless the hill is lowered to a level where no one is looking down into our house.

- I am responding to you regarding the above stated proposed zoning by-law amendment for location: 6, 10, 14 Elmhurst Street, Komoka.

I write to advise you that I object to the proposed official plan amendment and the associated proposed re-zoning.

The basis for my objection include the following:

1) **WATER WELLS:** Lack of study on disruption or contamination of existing water wells in the neighbourhood and liability to parties that engage in an activity that would cause such disruption or contamination.

2) **TRAFFIC:** Increased vehicular traffic cannot be handled safely by either the current road design or roadway system that facilitate ingress and egress to the sub-division adjacent to and near the above mentioned properties. The additional of 100 plus motor vehicles using the existing road system, that would service the proposed homes, will be a disrupting force that will challenge the safe road use for all users. Simply entering onto a roadway should not be a fear producing activity for a driver, cyclist, or pedestrian. I am concerned about the development of a road safety issue. Currently a healthy relationship exists between the users of the local residential streets.

3) **SETBACK FROM PROPERTY LINE OF EXISTING RESIDENTS:** Concern with elevation and setback of a proposed residential unit and site lines from that unit onto and into an existing owners home.

4) **CONFLICT IN PROPOSED LAND USE - REZONING DENSITY:** An official plans exists. This prescribes the allowable land uses to the above mentioned location. Had medium density housing been part of the original plan then the existing subdivision adjacent to the above mention location would have be developed in a manner to accommodate a different type of zoning. The lands of 6, 10, and 14 Elmhurst Street can be redeveloped the same way any property on the adjacent streets can be redeveloped. The applicant, seeking rezoning, in this case, is far too ambitious. This proposed intensified development does not have appropriate infrastructure support. The manner in which the proposed development sits on the lot is a source of conflict.

- We are concerned about how the municipality plans on making the traffic flow safe. Its already very unsafe leaving the neighbourhood with the increased traffic flow created from other large developments. Traffic lights, proper road widths ... curbs and sidewalks are all necessities.

The plan is also very unclear as to where the other 30 units are going or how configured. The 26 appear clearly on the proposal.

Attachment 19 – Comments from members of the public
Public Meeting, October 27, 2021

Also is the designated greenspace to remain as greenspace?