



The Corporation of the Township of Seguin

Addendum

Council Meeting Monday, November 4th, 2024 in the Township of Seguin Council Chambers and Electronic Participation


05. Public Meeting:

- Addition to item a) Consent Application Nos. B-2024-0017-H and B-2024-0027-H and Zoning By-law Amendment Application No. R-2024-0024-H (Ellery) of correspondence from Brian Bobbie and David Purdy.



Fw: Consent applications B-2-24-0017 and B-2024-0027-H

From info <info@seguin.ca>
Date Fri 2024-11-01 1:04 PM
To Craig Jeffery <cjeffery@seguin.ca>
Cc Andrea Spinney <aspinney@seguin.ca>

 1 attachments (107 KB)

BBobbie Submission Oct 31 2024.pdf;

From: Brian Bobbie <bbobbie2@hotmail.com>
Sent: October 31, 2024 5:02 PM
To: info <info@seguin.ca>
Subject: Re: Consent applications B-2-24-0017 and B-2024-0027-H

Dear Mr. Jeffery, please accept the attached written submission on the above noted file, and my request to speak inperson at the Nov 4 2024 Council meeting on the subject. Address and other required details are on the attachment.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Regards

Brian Bobbie
2 Kennedy Road, Seguin
m: 416-806-3330

31 October 2024

Township of Seguin
c/o Mr. Craig Jeffery, Clerk
Seguin Municipal Office
5 Humphrey Drive, Seguin, Ontario, P2A 2W8
Via email: info@seguin.ca

Re: Consent applications B-2-24-0017 and B-2024-0027-H

Dear Council,

I am a neighboring property owner directly to the north of the subject property, and respectfully make this submission to Council regarding the above-noted files. I have several questions, comments and requests of Council, as follows.

Questions:

What is the final plan for development of the proposed 3 properties? By approving this zoning bylaw consent amendment today, is Council sufficiently protecting the environment and natural heritage area sufficiently, and considering the *orderly development* of the property without any Plan of Subdivision being submitted?

Comments:

As Council is aware, Seguin's current Official plan dated December 2022, section B.3.1.1, provides its Planners and Council significant authority to protect its most pristine lakes and surrounding environs. Clear Lake, adjacent to the subject property, is a groundwater-fed, over threshold and highly sensitive lake trout lake, as designated in Appendix 1 of the OP. Clear Lake is arguably the most sensitive to human development in the municipality.

Terry Ellery, the proponent on this consent file, is a self-admitted professional Developer and is Principal of Granite Homes of Guelph. In his consent application, and in my congenial discussions with him, Mr. Ellery has not yet specified what development is planned for the 3 proposed lots. As shown in the application, proposed Lot 2 backs and sides onto the Rocky Crest golf course, making it highly capable and appropriate for development of multiple homes backing onto that prestigious golf course. Section B.12.1 of the OP places the onus on Council to consider the orderly development of township properties, and that properties deemed both *capable and appropriate for division [in future] into numerous Lots, or where there are indications that the scale of development could go beyond that for which the consent process is intended, a Plan of Subdivision shall be required by Seguin.*

Further, the proposed RU and RU-65 amendments appear to avoid the more stringent tree-cutting limitations and natural heritage preservation restrictions of SR-zoned properties that are also

surrounding and impacting Clear Lake. Even a 300m setback may not be sufficient to protect the lake, depending on the actual plans for development.

Without a Plan of Subdivision, Council appears to be working blind when being asked to consent to a zoning amendment without the information Council needs to make an informed decision. It's possible that a thoughtful, non-adversarial Plan of Subdivision and Environmental Impact Study can suitably protect both the environment and our natural heritage, and help the neighbours in a cooperative way embrace any future property development that's preferred by the proponent on this land.

Asks:

The proponent appears to be in no hurry for use or disposition of this largely vacant property. I ask that Council and the Planning Department apply the environment-first principle and to use the authority that the OP intentionally provides to keep the bar high on that test, out of reasonable caution. I ask Council to a delay decision today on the amendment, and to use its authority under the OP to request a Plan of Subdivision acceptable to the Planning Department and visible to the public, and/or require an EIS acceptable to Council and the Lake Association, on this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brian Bobbie', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Brian Andrew Bobbie, C.Chem.

Local property address: 2 Kennedy Road Seguin Township

Mailing Address: 2240 Westman Road, Mississauga, ON L5K 1M5

Bbobbie2@hotmail.com

416-806-3330

David M. Purdy and Kathleen Orysiuk

153 Clendenan Avenue

Toronto, Ontario

M6p 2W9

To: Seguin Township Council care of Craig Jeffery, Clerk

Date: November 4, 2024

Re: Zoning By-law Application R-2024-0024-H and related Consent Application; 128 Clear Lake Road

We are third generation Clear Lake residents and own the original Kennedy properties at 24 Kennedy Road, very close to the subject property. We are intimately familiar with the south east end of Clear Lake and the woodland/wetland property at 128 Clear Lake Rd.

First, we express support for the concerns outlined in the October 31, 2024 letter submitted by Brian Bobbie. Brian is an experienced environmental scientist and has served voluntarily as lake steward of Clear Lake for many years. He is also the owner of the property directly across the road from 128 Clear Lake Rd. We strongly support Brian's conclusion that a decision on these applications should be deferred until a much more thorough environmental analysis is completed.

128 Clear Lake Road is an 81 acre property situated in a critical location at the head of Clear Lake and these applications bring with them a number of significant environmental sensitivities. In particular, the Retained Lot extends to within about 25 metres of Clear Lake, and is sloped so that it drains entirely into Hall's Pond and its surrounding wetland and then into Clear Lake, which is a sensitive lake trout lake. The wetland and drainage issues do not appear to be well understood. We do not understand why the analysis does not recognize that at least part of the Retained Lot should in fact be designated as EP land.

The severed lots represent an important part of the rapidly diminishing number of uninterrupted woodland/ areas between Clear Lake and Lake Joseph and are particularly important given their immediate proximity to Rocky Crest golf course, which already creates a significant squeeze on wildlife habitat. These are important Natural Heritage System areas and should be assessed and protected in a manner that recognizes the spirit and intent of the Official Plan

We submit that if any property in the area should demand a comprehensive environmental review prior to development, this is it. A thorough environmental impact study should be completed.

We understand that the owner/developer and the planning department had agreed to accept development setbacks of 300 metres from the lake and 50 metres from designated EP areas. Based on discussions with other neighbouring property owners, we took some comfort that this would address at least some of the issues with respect to the Retained Lot. We learned late last week that that is not the case.

We found the Staff Report (which we only became aware of on October 31) confusing. The planning department (Taylor Elgie) provided some clarification in a telephone conference with several concerned neighbours on November 1st. We now understand that the lake setback will provide no protection at all with respect to the Retained Lot, and is in fact negated by technical exceptions. In effect, the proposed applications would create a lakefront building lot, without even the usual lake setback and vegetation buffers. This is entirely unacceptable to us.

The Staff Report noted that no public comments or objections had been received. We believe that this is because the public did not have understandable information (especially with respect to the setback exemption for the Retained Lot) in sufficient time to react. Had the situation been understood sooner, we are sure there would have been a great deal of concern expressed by the Clear Lake constituency.

For this reason, we are suggesting not only that Council should defer its decision, but that there should be an extended period for public comment once there is a clearer picture of what is being proposed and how the environmental issues are going to be dealt with.

Yours truly,

[signed]

David M. Purdy and Kathleen Orysiuk