

---

COMMENT - 108 Caverhill Cres - Opposition to Application for Zoning amendment

---

From Laura Webb <[REDACTED]>  
Date Tue 2025-01-14 8:21 PM  
To Clerk <Clerk@middlesexcentre.ca>  
Cc Daniel Webb <[REDACTED]>

**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.

Please accept the following as our comment for your consideration on the above application. We look forward to receipt of this email.

To: Municipality of Middlesex Centre, Middlesex Municipal Planning Services, and Councillors of Middlesex,

Municipal planners have continued to tell residents that provincial policy paves way for 'any houses anywhere'.

This narrative upsets the very fabric of our villages and any control we have in shaping our communities. We understand federal and provincial housing directives but we outright oppose the short-sightedness of proposals like this and this proposal in particular. Let us not forget the long-term impact these policies will have on our small communities. The proposed zoning change and 10 townhouse development is extremely excessive for this single-dwelling-intended lot and PI Homes is purposely aiming to maximise their profit over any quality of living in our rural community.

As neighbouring residents directly affected by this potential development, we urge both municipal planners and Councillors to refuse this planning proposal to re-zone. **This application fundamentally breaches current zoning; contradicting all past Municipal directives given and the future planning of 108 Caverhill Crescent. This lot has always been intended for a single-dwelling home and is part of a future municipal development plan and therefore cannot be characterised as infill. We hope you will consider the following important facts during the review of this application:**

1. **There is a Restrictive Covenant registered on title to Lot 16 (108 Caverhill Cres) and many properties in our subdivision (lots 1-24 33M-715).** Pemic Komoka Development Corp, the development company who facilitated our subdivision, in no way intended for this particular lot to be developed into anything other than a single-dwelling home. Current zoning restricts construction of anything other than single-family dwellings, and neighbouring homeowners recently purchased and built their homes knowing that this zoning is in place. Furthermore;

2. **A Municipal draft plan was approved and registered in 2006 and 2017 for the future planning of 22685 Komoka Rd., and 108 Caverhill Cres was specifically designed and given setbacks for this fundamental purpose.** This re-zoning proposal would eliminate the possibility of extending Caverhill Cres to Arthur Street and contradicts the municipal's intentions and advice given on all matters related to 108 Caverhill Cres over the years. This zoning amendment proposal will cease this future development plan and good urban planning would take these connectivity concerns and land into account. This townhouse proposal will create undevelopable parcels of 22685 Komoka Rd. and create the backlotting of townhomes onto a local road. Moreover, 22685 Komoka Rd. sits on an incline to a train crossing and increasingly busy road. The already approved future development plans should be considered and maintained as they continue to reflect our municipal policy and future development plan, whereas this application does not. In addition to this;
  
3. Lot 16 (108 Caverhill Cres) has its own lot-specific zoning and its existing zoning has a setback distance from the southerly property line of 38 metres – precisely the width needed to create 2 additional lots identical in width (seen in Blocks 104 and 105 of the approved draft plan) which, in the future are to be forward-fronting lots onto Arthur Street. These setbacks were imposed specifically for the future development of 22685 Komoka Road (as indicated in point 2 above). **ALL previous building application submissions for 108 Caverhill Cres and past potential lot purchasers were guided and regulated by these setbacks. Contracts, lawsuits and municipal correspondences reaffirm that interested parties were required to follow these municipal directives and zoning rules.** Just last year a single-family dwelling building application was submitted for 108 Caverhill Cres. The Municipal's intention has always been that Lot 16 (108 Caverhill Cres) was to have a single dwelling only.
  
4. Three properties that adjoin 108 Caverhill have water issues. 135 Prince Street and 130 Arthur Street experience flooding and have had house damage. Similarly, 22685 Komoka Road which also borders 108 Caverhill, experiences pooling of water along the fence-line of this proposed development site. Many houses downhill on Prince St., have faced basement flooding, despite having catch pits in their backyards. Additionally, the catch basin at the corner of Prince and Duke Streets often has large stagnant pooling water on the road. Caverhill Crescent properties also experience flooding and waterlogging that does not drain as was intended to do. While the municipality is aware of these ongoing water issues, they have yet to address the underlying causes. Further investigation into the excessive water problems in the neighbourhood is needed, prior to any development on this lot. The narrow setbacks on this development, lack of greenspace for water drainage, close proximity to neighbouring properties, and the already existing drainage issues of adjoining properties will only exacerbate the problems these neighbouring properties face.
  
5. This proposal and development plan are excessive in every respect. Multiple significant exceptions to zoning standards would be required; all shoe-horned into a contained, tear-shaped lot that has inappropriate, too-narrow, unsafe access for medium density use.

We are told by private planning firms that each municipal planner is interpreting policy differently and it is being applied differently across development applications which is concerning, and concerning for current development in the pipeline. These independent planners have also told us that proposals like this are usually only seen in very urban areas, not rural towns like

Komoka. This application is a significant departure from what residents of Komoka expect. This is over-intensification and precedent that I know we all do not want to set.

Laura and Daniel Webb & Family

