

Attachment 3. Summary of Public Comments and Responses

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|--|--|
| May 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petition with 39 names opposing subdivision proposal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received |
| P. Nelson Apr 18 2022 May 24 2022 May 26 2022 May 30 2022 June 3 2022 June 9 2022 June 16 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly object to the proposal Aware property eligible for development and recognize the owner’s right to make an application. Are there any detached homes? How many are townhomes? How many semis? Any multi-unit groupings? What is the average lot width? <p>Incompatibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on Oxford Dictionary definition for incompatibility (“The condition of two things being so different in nature as to be incapable of coexisting”), the proposal is incapable of coexisting and is not compatible with existing multi-generational, single detached homes in the surrounding neighbourhoods on MBR and Cedar Beach Rd. <p>Density:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal includes 86 new homes on 3.4 ha resulting in density of 24.3 units per ha. The existing MBR neighbourhood includes 17 units over 3.8 ha resulting in a density of 4.5 homes per ha. Proposed density is more than 5 times greater than the existing neighbourhood. This is overly aggressive & unreasonable. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A portion of the subject lands have been identified and designated for residential purposes since at least 1991 in the Township and Regional Official Plans (OP). The revised plan proposes 63 units, consisting of 21 single detached, 6 semi-detached and 36 townhouses. The average lot frontage for the singles that back onto the existing homes are 12.2m (40 ft). The revised plan includes 18 singles and 6 semi-detached units backing onto existing MBR. The OP requires new development to be compatible with existing neighbourhoods, which does not necessarily mean the exact same lot size. There is currently a range of lot sizes in the existing surrounding neighbourhoods and the proposed lots would be considered compatible with this area. Revised proposal includes 63 homes resulting in a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township’s OP permits a minimum density of 15 units/ha with an average density of 20-25 units (OP 5.2.3.4). |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>P. Nelson cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feel the incompatible density differences do not represent good planning. <p>Development's Built Form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In contrast to the low level, built form on large, single family lots on MBR and Cedar Beach Rd, the proposal is requesting a jammed together collection of 86 homes • While provincial and municipal guidelines encourage a mix of home types, do not believe they meant 57% of the least compatible structure type (towns), followed by 40% of next least compatible (semis) & only 3% of the most desirable unit type. • There are more compatible, less impactful mixes of built forms, lot sizes & heights. • What are the intended building materials, aesthetic finishes, neighbourhood sensitivities or any other information to show what the proposed built form will actually look like? <p>Affordable Housing Mix:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This development is only considered affordable compared to adjacent single family homes on large, lakefront lots; but the proposed homes are not typical affordable home size, shape, grouping or configuration, typically initiated by or supported by government supported housing initiatives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed singles and semis along MBR provide an appropriate transition to the townhouse units along the east side of the development. • The revised plan proposes 63 units in total, consisting of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 21 single detached (33%) ○ 6 semi-detached (10%) ○ 36 townhouses (57%) • The plan provides a mix of housing types, which conforms with the policies and permitted built forms in provincial and municipal policies. • The Builder will be required to provide detailed architectural drawings of all residential units to the Township for approval prior to any building permits being issued. Residential design will be subject to review by a control architect at the owner's expense to ensure development satisfies Township's design criteria, and compatible with surrounding residential area in terms of architecture and materials. • Affordable housing is defined in planning policy documents based on the cost of housing in relation to annual household income or average purchase price of resale homes. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>P. Nelson cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more palatable mix approach would be primarily single detached homes on decent sized lots, along with a sensible number of semi-detached and townhomes to create an acceptable, less impactful, more compatible mix of new homes, in a livable, green new neighbourhood. <p>Overland Drainage Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The natural overland drainage patterns for the lands are westward from Moorlands Rd through the development parcel, collecting in a culvert below MBR and flowing by way of a natural drainage swale in a northwesterly direction across 44 and 48 MBR before discharging into Lake Simcoe. • Confirm the real overland drainage characteristics before any additional hard surface/drainage features are constructed. • The proposal calls for the burying and concrete pipe encasement of the natural overland drainage courses. Who proposes to interfere with natural drainage courses, and build on top of those natural features? Trust that LSRCA, MNR and MOE will not allow the proposed drainage approach. • Proposal suggests the developer can trespass and use 2 private properties at 44 and 48 MBR for stormwater management. • What about future overland drainage implications at any new upstream developments if existing drainage courses are buried and encased? Concern | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The range of building types and mix of lot sizes proposed will accommodate a variety of households and incomes. Townhouse units provide more affordable home ownership options compared to single detached units. • The revised plan has adjusted the unit mix with more single detached units and fewer townhouse units than initially proposed. • The Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report has been reviewed by the Township, Region and LSRCA and provides an overview of the existing and proposed drainage for this area. • The drainage pattern and characteristics were confirmed in collaboration with LSRCA. • The revised proposal includes an open naturalized swale with landscaping. • Existing drainage from the agricultural lot will continue to drain through the swale and across 44 and 48 MBR as it currently does and drainage from the new subdivision will be directed to a stormwater pipe on Thorah Conc Rd 5 • No easements or pipes are proposed on 44 or 48 MBR, which should see a reduction in peak flows and volume of stormwater because flows from the |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>P. Nelson cont.</p> | <p>regarding potential overland flooding if the buried/encased piping overwhelmed by increased upstream drainage water or becomes plugged and could cause flooding on existing MBR properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question the effectiveness of jellyfish filters and ongoing responsibility, cost and performance assurance. Any/all related maintenance requirements and costs should be with the developer; not Brock Township or MBR homeowners. The developer should not be allowed to pass off any future responsibilities for potential drainage damage by providing cash in lieu compensation. • Does owner intend to simply flip any development approvals they receive and sell the land to a new developer/builder? <p>Traffic Impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All vehicle traffic movements created by the new development should be accommodated and contained within the new development and not allowed to spill over and adversely affect existing MBR traffic movements, or the present walkability, bikeability, quality of life aspects of MBR and Cedar Beach Rd. • What about increased pedestrian safety risks from significant vehicle traffic along MBR/Cedar Beach Rd from development? | <p>new subdivision will flow to a storm sewer on Thorah Conc Rd 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipalities may include some initial maintenance costs as part of the subdivision agreement process. Long term maintenance will be up to the Township as various facilities would be added to the Township's assets (similar to infrastructure, pipes & stormwater management ponds) • The Township cannot prevent the owner from selling this property. The conditions of draft plan approval will guide construction of the subdivision regardless of the ownership or who ultimately builds the homes. • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township and Region and the Township's engineering consultant. The study concludes the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by the development doesn't add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>P. Nelson cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A cul-de-sac design at the south end of the new subdivision would be preferred rather than a connection to existing MBR • If/when emergency vehicle access is required, temporary access could be provided by a locked, traffic control gate, or removable bollard features; there is no need to have full time vehicular access from the new development road onto MBR • The detailed traffic study by IBI Consulting is extensive but there are a few key errors. • Exhibit 2.1. Study Roadway Characteristics lists both MBR and Cedar Beach Rd as on-street parking prohibited. This isn't accurate as there are no "No Parking" signs & vehicles regularly park here. • The speed limits on MBR and Cedar Beach Rd is 40 km per hour, not 50k per hour as presented in the IBI report. | <p>for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan includes a sidewalk along the new road and a multi-use trail along Thorah Conc Rd 5. • Provincial and local planning policies direct communities to be connected by integrating new developments with existing neighbourhoods. • The proposed road connection to MBR helps to improve interconnectivity between neighbourhoods from an auto and pedestrian perspective. • The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. • Road connections are better with respect to municipal operations, waste pick-up, snow removal and emergency services access. • The purpose of a traffic study is to model existing conditions, a future with the development, and a future without the development to determine the impact of development. The scenarios are modelled using industry standard tools & an agreed-upon methodology. While speed limits and parking restrictions impact how road users interact with the transportation network, these elements are not likely |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>P. Nelson cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assume the incorrect no parking assumptions changes whatever available roadway capacity calculations were made? • Exhibit 6-2 notes only 5% of new trips from the development will go north and return along Cedar Beach Rd/ Parklawn Rd. Vehicle trips into Beaverton proper from MBR and along Cedar Beach Rd/Parklawn are a huge majority of vehicle movements generated from the MBR neighbourhood, perhaps as high as 50% or more of the generated trips. • There is no mention of the development's traffic impacts along Parklawn Rd on the way into town, including 2 entrances to the Edengrove seniors' development. These are large oversights in the Traffic Report. • The report keeps mentioning Beach Rd, which is referred to as Durham Rd 23 or Lakeridge Rd - never heard of Beach Rd terminology for this roadway? | <p>to have significant impact on the outcome of the traffic modelling as the Region and Township require it to be conducted. It is expected that a revised model with slightly varied speed limits and parking restrictions would result in the same conclusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study area was discussed with and confirmed by review agencies prior to conducting the study to ensure the study provides decision-makers with required information about the impact of the proposed development. • In determining an appropriate study area, the focus is on areas where development trips are most concentrated, and impacts will be most pronounced. While vehicles associated with the development have origins and destinations beyond the immediate area, the % of total traffic which these vehicles make up, and the resulting impacts, becomes smaller as distance from the site increases. • Trip Generation estimates were obtained from ITE Trip Generation Manual 11th Ed - an industry standard to calculate vehicle trips based on land use type and intensity. The manual is based on real-world observations and provides trip volume estimates for the |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>P. Nelson cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very low trip production numbers assumed for this development. With an average of 2 cars per household; which would be 172 vehicles in this case (based on original proposal of 86 units); only 49-56 vehicle movements are predicted in the peak morning and evening hours which is only 30% of expected development vehicles; what about the other 70%? • Has the proponent and/or Brock Township carried out a detailed examination of the accumulative effects of all new traffic from residential subdivisions on south Beaverton roadways and intersections? • There will be a large increased traffic impact on Thorah Conc Rd 5, Cedar Beach Rd, Parklawn Rd and intersecting roadways and we don't believe these impacts have been adequately addressed • Does the proposed offset intersection at the new road and Thorah Conc Rd 5 represent efficient, sound and safe traffic engineering? The new road/intersection should be located further east to lessen the traffic movement challenges or be purposely aligned with Cedar Beach Rd if that is a doable, safer solution. • Should there be improvements at the presently difficult, offset intersection at Thorah Conc Rd 5 and Reg Rd 23, including turning lanes, improved vertical alignments, or a signalized intersection? | <p>highest 60 minutes of activity on the adjacent road (i.e. "the peak hour").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While many households have more than 1 car, not everyone travels every day or travels during the peak hour. Actual observations on an average day - which ITE is based on - would be lower than the equivalent of 2 vehicles per dwelling or a similar assumption. • The study includes the impact of other area developments, plus an additional compounded growth rate to account for increase in through traffic volume from unspecified origins. • The revised plan includes a reduced offset for the proposed intersection of the new road and Thorah Conc Rd 5 and an all way stop control at this intersection. The revised plan and traffic study were reviewed by the Township's engineering consultant. • The intersection at Reg Rd 23 & Thorah Conc Rd 5 is under the Region's jurisdiction. The Region has no plans for improvements and will continue to monitor the function and operation of the intersection. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>P. Nelson cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With so many homes built closely together; assume there will be very little free space available for on-street parking. Most homeowners use garages for storage, leaving them short of adequate personal vehicle parking space, never mind visitors and service vehicles. Ensure adequate resident and visitor parking is provided. • Ask that backyard gates and/or material loading/unloading is not allowed along the existing MBR and no development generated parking should be allowed along MBR either during construction. <p>Environmental Implications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment lost in favour of the proposed development and see no reasonable effort in the proposed design to compensate for the natural losses. • Any new development should include purposeful green spaces and park spaces within the new neighbourhood. <p>Buffering Features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tree Report notes that more than 50 trees are recommended for removal. This represents a large tree canopy reduction and a loss of positive air quality. • The Restoration Plan shows little or no new tree buffering along the west, backyard property lines of the new homes. There is no clear indication of any privacy fencing or tree buffering along MBR to lessen the visual impact of development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed single and semi-detached lots include 3 parking spaces per lot with at least 2 in the driveway. The design of the neighbourhood and sidewalk location have been taken into consideration to facilitate at least 2 cars in the townhouse driveways. • Draft plan conditions include the requirement for a 0.3m reserve along existing MBR to restrict access. Construction access will be off Thorah Conc Rd 5. • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region's peer review consultant. The assessed impacts can be avoided or mitigated through effective stormwater and environmental management measures as outlined in the EIS. • A park block has been included in the revised plan. • While approx. 50 trees are proposed to be removed (of which 25 are in poor condition or ash trees), the landscape plan includes the preservation of existing trees wherever possible, including trees along existing MBR and along the east side of the proposed park block. Over 100 new trees are also proposed to be planted and a |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>P. Nelson cont.</p> | <p>Community Services Impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At a low average of 3.5 persons per new home, there will 300 or so new residents. These people will require all traditional municipal services, as well as education facilities, emergency services, health care attention, policing, recreational programs and shopping/business-based services. Have these needs been assessed by any experts during review of this proposal? <p>Basements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be basements in the homes? • If basements aren't possible due to high ground water levels, this shows the site's unsuitability for traditional housing. Is that an underlying reason for such tall built forms being requested, incorporating traditional furnace/services/storage basement areas above grade instead? • Having no basements may also contribute to a large amount of outdoor storage buildings; taking away from less cluttered, well manicured yards, and having a "storage area" appearance instead. • A reasonable number of basementless retirement homes with common green spaces, recreational gardens, a meeting/ activities building, exercise pool and | <p>naturalized swale block is proposed with landscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applications have been circulated to a number of agencies that help to provide services (including the School Boards, the Region, Durham Region Transit, etc.). All service providers take proposed developments into account as part of their planning processes. The Township has taken all draft approved and proposed developments into account as part of the Recreation Master Plan process. Commercial uses typically follow residential development as the market expands. • Basements are not contemplated as a result of the groundwater table. Groundwater table levels do not indicate unsuitability. The site is designated & zoned for residential uses. • The proposal is for residential uses in line with the Official Plan. The proposal includes green space in the form of parkette, a naturalized open swale, as well as a trail and sidewalk. • Accessory structures may be permitted in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Township's Zoning By-law similar to any other residential property in the area. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>P. Nelson cont.</p> | <p>perhaps a small pond with walking trails would be a much more palatable proposal. Mature Neighbourhood Guidelines”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer’s planning consultant, SGL Planning and Design Inc, assisting Whitby with zoning updates to help address and mitigate the impacts of new development applications in mature neighbourhoods. Since these are mature neighbourhoods, feel that the SGL/Whitby info is relevant and includes recommendations related to compatibility & sensitivity to existing neighbourhoods. High density applications should be encouraged at appropriate sites on major arterial roads with adequate public transportation & other community services. Take these comparable recommendations into consideration during this review. <p>Greenbelt Lands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposing 1 estate home in the Greenbelt that has no defined size, location, layout or access/egress points. The undefined nature of this home is concerning and request provisions in the bylaw to define what can be constructed on this lot. • Natural overland drainage/ponding areas should be defined as a separate area of the Greenbelt lands to avoid future interference and destruction of these features during any future development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGL Planning and Design Inc. was retained by Whitby to prepare recommendations for an amendment related to infill and intensification in mature neighbourhoods, such as severing an existing large lot into 2 or redeveloping large lots for multi-unit housing. The study was related to existing neighbourhoods in Whitby, which is a different municipality with its own unique existing and built form context. It’s not necessarily a direct comparison to the site in Beaverton, which represents the development of vacant land in a designated Greenfield Area, not infill in a built-up area. • Revised plan denotes the remaining agricultural lot within the Greenbelt outside of the subdivision plan. 1 single detached dwelling is permitted in accordance with Rural Buffer (RB) zone requirements. • A naturalized drainage swale is proposed, which will improve drainage conditions in the Greenbelt lands while maintaining existing agricultural use. Portions within the Greenbelt are regulated by LSRCA. Any development or site alteration within the regulated areas would require a permit from LSRCA, which would review any impacts to drainage. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|---|--|
| <p>P. Nelson on behalf of MBR Residents Group May 30 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not dispute the landowner’s right to proposal, but certainly not the type of over impactful development being asked for. • Have engaged M. Sullivan of Professional Planning Firm LandPro Solutions and P. Lombardi of Siskinds Law firm. • MBR Group determined, informed and resourced to continue formally resisting any incompatible development applications. We will not sit back and be neglected or taken advantage of. • No community consultation prior to the application being submitted • Applicant initially indicated there would be 14 homes • Incompatibility definition - unable to coexist • Extreme density, more than 5 times the density of MBR is requested along with a lopsided mix of built forms • Disagree that the proposal “transitions and blends well into the MBR community” and “is appropriate for the neighbourhood”. • Tightly packed density and 30-40’ tall built forms are not compatible with or respectful of the long term MBR enclave of single-family, low-level homes on wide, lots. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • Under the Planning Act, public consultation is not required until an application has been received. • No previous applications were made for this site. • Revised proposal includes 63 homes resulting in a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township’s OP requires a minimum density of 15 units/ha. This development provides a mix of units that conform with the policies in the Township’s OP. • The revised plan includes 18 singles and 6 semi-detached units backing onto existing MBR. These single lots are typically 12.2m or larger in width. • The singles and semis proposed along MBR provide an appropriate transition to the townhouses along the east side. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| MBR Group cont. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage is a huge issue; including the proposal to bury and encase natural overland drainage courses This is a shocking suggestion; especially when assumptions are made about intruding upon 2 private properties and leaving behind a maintenance right-of-way across the properties as Brock's responsibility. • Ask landowner to cease & desist repeated lobbying efforts of the 2 property owners. • Lake Simcoe water quality impacts are of great concern from a runoff and control perspective. Proposed jellyfish filters need expert maintenance going forward and should not be Brock's or MBR homeowners' responsibility. • Development traffic should be accommodated, controlled and contained within the development lands themselves. Increased traffic will have large impacts on Cedar Beach Rd, Parklawn Blvd, and all the way into Town. Our review of the traffic report confirms it contains several | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report has been reviewed by the Township, Region and LSRCA and provides an overview of the existing and proposed drainage for this area. Existing drainage concerns have been considered. • Revised proposal includes a naturalized swale and will not bury or encase this feature. • Existing drainage from the agricultural lot will continue to drain through the swale and across 44 and 48 MBR at it currently does, which is required per LSRCA policies, while drainage from the new subdivision will be directed to stormwater pipe on Thorah Conc Rd 5 • Municipalities may include some initial maintenance costs as part of the subdivision agreement process. Long term maintenance will be up to the Township as various facilities would be added to Township's assets (similar to infrastructure, pipes & SWM ponds) • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The study concludes the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>MBR Group cont.</p> | <p>inaccuracies and should be rejected as unreliable for its intended purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several significant environmental concerns including negative impacts on the present natural sanctuary for many small animal and bird species, as well as the removal of more than 50 trees from our green canopy, disturbing natural drainage patterns and water absorption characteristics, along with no real efforts at including significant green or natural recreational features in the proposed new neighbourhood. This type of ungreen development should not be welcomed or approved. • Adequate buffering for any development should be provided, including good sized | <p>the development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed road connection to MBR helps to improve interconnectivity between neighbourhoods from an auto and pedestrian perspective. • The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. • Road connections are better with respect to municipal operations, waste pick-up, snow removal and emergency services access. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region's peer review consultant. The assessed impacts can be avoided or mitigated through effective stormwater and environmental management measures as outlined in the EIS. • A park block has been included. • While approx. 50 trees are proposed to be removed (of which 25 are in poor condition or ash trees), the landscape plan includes the preservation of existing trees wherever possible, |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>MBR Group cont.</p> | <p>trees and shrubs, enhanced naturalized separations, as well as aesthetically pleasing privacy fences where required. The presently proposed buffering features are light and significantly inadequate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant community services burdens created by new 300-person development; services already lacking in Beaverton. • “Affordable housing” - it’s only today’s real estate market that would make the new homes sound affordable when compared to other built forms in the area. • The proposed built forms are not traditional affordable units put forward by municipal housing authorities, and there is no confirmation within the proposal that these homes meet the criteria established by the province for affordability. • The Nelsons & MBR Group homeowners strongly object to the present proposal. • Request landowner withdraw incompatible application and come back with appropriate community consultation and a | <p>including along existing MBR and along the east side of the proposed park block. Over 100 new trees are also proposed to be planted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applications have been circulated to a number of agencies that help to provide such services (including the School Boards, the Region, Durham Region Transit, etc.). All service providers take proposed developments into account as part of the planning processes. The Township has taken all draft approved and proposed developments into account as part of the Recreation and Master Plan process. Shopping and commercial uses typically follow residential development as the market expands. • The range of building types and mix of lot sizes being proposed will accommodate a variety of households and incomes. The townhouse units provide more affordable home ownership options when compared to single detached dwellings. • Noted. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|--|--|
| MBR Group cont. | <p>revised proposal that actually respects and compliments the MBR/Cedar Beach Rd neighbourhoods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failing that, ask that Brock Council turn down the present application. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landowner has provided a revised plan that proposes 63 units in total, consisting of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 21 single detached (33%) ○ 6 semi-detached (10%) ○ 36 townhouses (57%) • An in-person statutory public meeting was held on May 30, 2022. |
| D. Belanger Apr 19 2022 Apr 27 2022 May 1 2022 May 4 2022 May 15 2022 May 30 2022 Mar 16 2024 Mar 17 2024 | <p>Concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downstream sanitary analysis determined sewage system can accommodate the proposed development without any upgrades is contradictory to what Mayor Grant stated in Brock Citizen April 28/22 • Hydrological Evaluation notes several potential short term and long term impacts affecting groundwater system and surface water system. What direct impact will this have on existing MBR homes? Monitoring to assess contaminants? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Servicing allocation is provided on a first come-first serve basis, so construction depends on the timing of other developments in Beaverton. A condition of draft plan approval requires the Township and Region to be satisfied there is adequate water and sewage capacity available and allocated to this development prior to final approval and registration. • The Hydrological Investigation report recommends an erosion and sediment control (ESC) plan and a spill prevention and response plan during construction. These are standard requirements on any construction site, to prohibit the release of sediments and other potential contaminants during construction. Routine monitoring will be required to assess the ESC measures on the construction site to ensure they are maintained and are in working order to prohibit the release of any sediments during construction. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>D. Belanger cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cash in lieu compensation - what does this mean? ● Traffic Study – where is the dedicated northbound right turn lane at Thorah Conc Rd 5 and Osborne St to be implemented and why is it not needed? Layout of the intersection at Reg Rd 23 and Thorah Conc Rd 5 is dangerous and proposed housing and increased traffic will have an even more negative impact ● There are already several issues with this intersection, trying to manoeuvre the steep hill can be challenging at present. Also, the left hairpin turn from Reg Rd 23 westbound onto Thorah Conc Rd 5 is dangerous now and adding hundreds of more vehicles could make this already bad intersection even worse. ● Concerned construction vehicles will use MBR if road connected. ● Located partially within a designated growth area - what does this mean? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mitigation measures are required to ensure post-development infiltration levels match pre-development levels or a combination of measures, such as low impact development measures. Only after all reasonable efforts have been made to meet the infiltration deficit then cash compensation may be considered in accordance with LSRCA's Water balance Recharge Offsetting Policy. The funds would be used by LSRCA towards other projects. ● The traffic study speaks to a potential right hand turning lane on Osborne St/Reg Rd 23 at Thorah Conc Rd 5. As this is a Regional road this would be up to the Region. The Region has no plans for intersection improvements. While the study notes the traffic volumes meet warrants, the level of service operates at an acceptable level. The Region will continue to monitor the function and operation of the intersection. ● Construction access will be off Thorah Conc Rd 5. ● Only a portion of the subject property is within the urban boundary (i.e. a designated greenfield area identified for growth) while most of the lot is within the Greenbelt Protected Countryside where development is not |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>D. Belanger cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Township’s and Region’s Official Plan are not in sync. • Range of Housing Options - the proposed housing style, configurations and lot sizes are not consistent with surrounding area • Nearby Activity - 10.67-12.19 m lots, 12.6-16.2 m lots, 6.1-16.2 m lots - where are these located? The proposed lots are even smaller at 6-7.5 m. Not at all in keeping with surrounding homes, lots and area architecture. • The subject site is located within Intake Protection Zone (IPZ). • Indirect impacts could include introduction of invasive species, alterations to any existing ‘natural’ surface drainage, potential erosion, potential sedimentation and existing wildlife. All very environmentally concerning. | <p>permitted. As noted on revised plan, these lands are outside of subdivision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the subject lands have been identified and designated for residential purposes since at least 1991 in the Township & Regional OPs • Revised proposal includes 63 homes with a mix of singles, semis and townhouses. This development provides a mix of units that conforms with the policies in the Township’s OP. • The Planning Justification Report outlines other subdivisions in Beaverton that contain a range of lot sizes & dwelling types (157 Main St, Nine Mile Rd, Mara Rd). The revised plan provides a typical frontage of 12.2m for singles, 8.1m for semis and 6-8m for townhouses. The proposed singles and semis along MBR provide an appropriate transition to the townhouse units on east side. • Certain land uses prohibited within IPZ, but not homes. Homeowners can contact LSRCA for advice on how to manage winter salt use. • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region’s peer review consultant. The assessed impacts can be avoided or mitigated through effective stormwater |

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>D. Belanger cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rowhouse height is a huge issue - 9.5m maximum, not 12.5m as proposed • Ensure mandatory 1ft reserve around/along existing MBR to prevent units from accessing their backyards from MBR, which is a major concern • Does 19 street visitor parking allotment allow for fire hydrants on new road? • A street with 50ft lots and bungalows or bungaloffs would be more than enough housing (28 lots) or even a seniors' development similar to Edengrove as there's a very high senior population. • This high-density housing proposal will negatively impact rural community and disrupt residents and natural beauty of wildlife and landscape. • Moved here to get away from city living. • Secondary units encouraged as outlined in section 5.2.3.15 of the OP – with the possibility of multi-generation home ownership, this will create more vehicles than allowed parking could handle. A home with 2 working parents, 2 adult children and grandparents could have as many as 4-6 vehicles | <p>and environmental management measures as outlined in the EIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-storey townhouses are proposed with a max. height of 10.5m. Balconies are proposed as a projection that can exceed the 10.5 metres, but no habitable space is permitted above. • A draft plan condition requires a 0.3m reserve along the rear of the lots backing onto MBR to restrict access. • Fire hydrants will be required in accordance the ON Building Code. On-street visitor parking may be permitted outside of the required setbacks to the hydrants. • The revised 63-unit proposal includes a mix of lot sizes and building types. This development provides a mix of units, which conforms with the policies in the Township's OP. • Secondary units permitted if can meet criteria in the Zoning by-law, including the need for an additional parking space. If an additional parking space cannot be provided, a secondary unit would not be permitted. • The proposed single and semi-detached lots include a minimum of 3 parking spaces per lot with at least 2 in the driveway. The design of the neighbourhood and sidewalk location have been taken into consideration to |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>D. Belanger cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will this development be an eyesore like the ongoing mess at the construction site at Thorah Conc Rd 5 and Reg Rd 23? • Is there an allowance on the proposed new road for sidewalks? • For the proposed private driveway access for the 3 homes, who will be responsible for road maintenance & snow removal? • MBR is the southernmost point of intown services (i.e. gas/water/sewers, etc.) - will the current infrastructure be negatively impacted by this high density proposal? • Section 3.2 of the Planning Justification Report – this proposal doesn't fit with the existing surrounding low density single detached homes and greenbelt lands. • Rowhouses and semis are not in keeping with the existing community of bungalow style, single detached dwellings. • Concern for the basements/foundations/shorelines of existing MBR homes, many of which already have sump pumps that could potentially be negatively impacted | <p>facilitate at least 2 cars in the townhouse driveways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft plan conditions require a construction management plan to be completed & approved by Township to help manage construction & mitigate the impacts on existing residents. • A sidewalk is proposed on one side of the new roadway. A trail connection is also proposed along Thorah Conc Rd 5 • The revised plan has removed the private roadway/driveway access for the 3 lots at the south end. • The proposed plan and background studies have been circulated to and reviewed by infrastructure and utility providers. From a water/sewer perspective, extending the infrastructure along the new road from MBR to Thorah Conc Rd 5 will improve the current dead-end situation that requires regular flushing. • Revised proposal includes 63 homes resulting in a density of 18.6 units/ha. Township's OP requires a min. density of 15 units/ha. This development provides a mix of units that conforms with the policies in the Township's OP. • Drainage reviewed as part of the Functional Servicing Plan. The revised drainage plan includes a swale and municipal services in accordance with |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>D. Belanger cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed development would greatly increase traffic on Thorah Con Rd 5 and the need for railway arms would need to be installed at the railway tracks. • Concern about low priced housing attracting investors resulting in rental properties • No beach/water access for new residents could create privacy/ trespassing concerns for existing MBR properties • Section 5.10.2.4 of OP regarding natural runoff and the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan - reports are not completed • Traffic Impact Study is incomprehensible. How can 86 homes be evaluated as having less than 1 vehicular traffic when there is no public transportation anywhere remotely close by? • Realistically, there is potential for 175-200+ vehicles coming and going. • Substantial increase in traffic will pose danger to pedestrians of all ages, joggers, bicycle riders, children playing. • Great concerns with the revised plan also • 63 units would guarantee a minimum of 126 people if only 2 residents each. Homes will target families and the | <p>LSRCA requirements, the Region and Township standards. Anticipate runoff conditions will be improved for existing MBR homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal has been circulated to CN Rail for review and comment. Railway arms would be under CN Rail's jurisdiction. • Ownership and rental have a role in creating affordable housing options. • Green space is provided for residents through park block and a trail. New residents would be able to use any publicly owned accesses to the lake. • An Environmental Impact Study was completed which includes a natural heritage evaluation under the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. • LSRCA has reviewed the application & provided conditions for detailed design • The Traffic Impact Study was reviewed by the Township's engineering consultant. The study was done in accordance with industry standards and meets the Township's standards. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • Trip Generation estimates were obtained from ITE Trip Generation Manual 11th Ed - an industry standard |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|--|---|
| D. Belanger cont. | <p>average family has 4 people which will double the number to 252 residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be a major factor with more vehicle traffic than the traffic study states and vehicle parking at the 63 homes. This would most definitely have a significant impact on MBR and Cedar Beach Rd which are narrow country roads | <p>to calculate vehicle trips based on land use type and intensity. Is based on real-world observations and provides trip volume estimates for the highest 60 minutes of activity on adjacent road (i.e. "the peak hour").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While many households have more than 1 car, not everyone travels every day or during the peak hour. Actual observations on an average day - which ITE is based on - would be lower than the equivalent of 2 vehicles per dwelling or a similar assumption. |
| <p>J. Swann May 1 2022 May 31 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not give permission to have underground drainage pipe through my property and against a stormwater easement being imposed on my property. Ask Township to turn down proposal as would decrease property value and construction of any new structures would be problematic due to 3m easement from the pipe. Will seek advice from a lawyer. If the construction of such a pipe were to happen, who would monitor the filtration of water flowing through it? Concern for drainage issues not only for my own property but for everyone else. The two natural watercourses should not be built upon, rather a retention pond within the confines of the proposed development would be better. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A revised stormwater plan has been provided. Existing drainage from the agricultural lot will continue to drain through the swale and across both 44 and 48 MBR as it currently does (as required per LSRCA policies). Drainage from the new subdivision will be directed to a stormwater pipe on Thorah Conc Rd 5. 44 and 48 MBR should see a reduction in peak flows and volume of stormwater because drainage from the new subdivision will flow to a storm sewer on Thorah Conc. Rd 5. No easements or pipes are proposed on 44 or 48 MBR. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|---|--|
| <p>R. and G. Nanduri</p> <p>April 19 2022 April 20 2022 April 29 2022 June 4 2022 Mar 12 2024 Mar 13 2024</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBR Residents are gravely concerned about the proposed development. • The size & density of development seem completely out of proportion and character compared to MBR & Cedar Beach Rd. • Residents will be severely impacted. • It will destroy our neighbourhood. • Want development that is in line with the existing character of MBR & existing residents able to retain property value. • Goal is that residents continue to enjoy existing privileges and benefits such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ living in a safe & quiet neighbourhood with open & green surroundings ○ able to walk or bike with family and children on safe streets ○ enjoy frequent glimpses of wildlife ○ free from the worry of environmental degradation to property due to run off water caused by development • Understand the need for new housing • 86 residential units in a small area seems over the top as there is nothing like it in Beaverton, let alone in the neighborhood. • Has a study been done to assess the impact of the development on residents and the neighborhood? Was there an impact assessment with respect to protection of environment, wildlife and Lake Simcoe, and degradation of existing infrastructure including roads and sewers. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • Revised proposal includes 63 homes resulting in a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township's OP requires a minimum density of 15 units/ha. This development provides a mix of units that conforms with the policies in the Township's OP. • The revised plan provides a mix of housing types and a park block within the urban area and is considered compatible with the existing neighbourhood. • The revised plan provides a park block, naturalized swale block and a trail along Thorah Conc Rd 5. • Revised plan includes 63 units and a park block. • An Environmental Impact Study and Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report have been completed and reviewed by the Township, Region and LSRCA, as well as other required agencies. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>R. and G. Nanduri cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development crammed against west side along MBR with no greenery, leaving major portion of the lot vacant. Is there a future phase 2 with more houses? If vacant lot is for greenbelt, why not have a greenbelt along the west side as well? • Should maintain the open space feel of MBR and this community. Should only be 2 storey houses spread over a larger area • Proposed 3 storey rowhouses along MBR would look like an ungainly 3 storey wall that separates subdivision from MBR. • The only green buffer between MBR and the development is narrow strip belonging to the city which includes the drain ditch on east side of MBR and not much room for trees. Some trees and bushes only on the north and south end of MBR. • Should set aside a 15ft wide buffer area/ greenbelt separation along MBR planted with willows, evergreens and maple trees to maintain privacy and visual relief between MBR homes & the subdivision. Existing trees would help in the absorption of excess overflow of water. • 2 storey detached houses with greenbelt of shrubs and trees on the west side of MBR ensures a subdivision that naturally blends with the existing community. • How can township ensure Greenbelt area remains unchanged? More houses will worsen excess stormwater issues. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenbelt refers to land in the Greenbelt Plan, not a naturalized area. • Only a portion of the subject property is within the urban boundary and designated for residential purposes while majority of the lot is within the Greenbelt where development is not permitted. Currently only 1 single detached dwelling is permitted in the remaining lot in the Greenbelt. • Residential development is only permitted within the portion of the property within the urban boundary. • The revised plan includes single and semi-detached dwellings along the west side of the proposed subdivision transitioning to townhouses along the east side. The proposed lots backing onto existing MBR are deeper, with the homes fronting onto the new subdivision road. • Development would only be permitted on the remaining lands should these lands be brought into the urban boundary. Any proposal for expansion must be considered as part of a comprehensive OP review and must address requirements of the Greenbelt Plan & other provincial policies. • There are no plans for an urban expansion at this point in time. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>R. and G. Nanduri cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional drain should be built along MBR for excess runoff water. This would help contain excess runoff water from flowing into & damaging properties on MBR. • How will drainage be directed to stormwater pipe on Thorah Conc Rd 5? Who is responsible for ensuring water is directed as intended on ongoing basis? • The subdivision plan shows fencing on all sides with post and wire fence which would be totally out of character with the MBR & Cedar Beach Rd area. The subdivision should have aesthetic enclosures more in line in with the look and feel of residences along the lake front road. We pay high property taxes and have a right to expect that property values be maintained and not degraded by a development that is substandard in design and aesthetics. • Why is the entrance to the new subdivision not on Moorlands Dr? This would allow MBR to remain a dead-end street with same traffic pattern. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A revised stormwater plan has been provided, where all stormwater from the new subdivision will drain to a storm sewer on Thorah Conc Rd 5. An open swale will maintain the existing drainage from land in the Greenbelt. • Number of measures to direct stormwater, including grading, catchbasins, infiltration trenches and a storm sewer network. Developer will construct subdivision in accordance with approved plans and Township would maintain stormwater infrastructure upon assumption. • The post and wire fence identified on the plan denotes the existing fence around the agricultural lot. Any fences proposed will be required to meet the Township's standards as outlined in the Fence By-law and will be identified as part of the detailed design process. • The builder will be required to submit detailed drawings and elevations at the building permit stage. • An entrance connecting to Moorlands Dr is not feasible as it would require crossing the remaining rural lot, which would fragment the remaining agricultural land and create an additional roadway that would need to be maintained by the Township. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| R. and G. Nanduri cont. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBR and Cedar Beach Rd are narrow roads with no sidewalks or potential for sidewalk. Road safety will deteriorate. • Not having a sidewalk on a road with increased traffic is a potential safety issue. Residents will lose the privilege of walking or biking on MBR & Cedar Beach Rd with increased traffic & no sidewalks. • Does the Brock Sidewalk Master Plan include a sidewalk on MBR? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed road should be at a greater distance away from MBR to the east to minimize excessive traffic noise on MBR and subdivision roads. • Are there plans to have stop signs at the intersection where MBR, Cedar Beach Road and the proposed subdivision Road meet Concession 5? This intersection could pose some traffic issues caused by increase in traffic due to proposed development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed road connection to MBR helps to improve interconnectivity between neighbourhoods from an auto and pedestrian perspective. • The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. • Road connections are better with respect to municipal operations, waste pick-up, snow removal and emergency services access. • Sidewalk Master Plan doesn't currently include a sidewalk on MBR. Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • The proposed development includes a sidewalk on the new road and a trail connection along Thorah Conc Rd 5. • The revised plan includes a reduced offset for the proposed intersection of the new road and Thorah Conc Rd 5 and an all way stop control at this intersection. The revised plan and traffic study were reviewed by the Township's engineering consultant. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>R. and G. Nanduri cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What parameters were used to conduct traffic study to determine the impact of increased traffic on local roads and Reg Rd 23/Thorah Conc Rd 5 intersection? • There will be a traffic jam at Thorah Conc Rd 5 & Reg Rd 23. Turning into Thorah Conc Rd 5 will be difficult and dangerous. • Expect the intersection will have multiple accidents on a regular basis. • Would it be a regional responsibility to address traffic issues at this intersection? If so, has the Region been part of the traffic study conducted? • Traffic analysis and projected number of cars per unit are based on assumptions which were not made clear. Projected number of cars per unit and number of vehicle trips on MBR and Cedar Beach Rd seem to be understated. • The demography of future owners hasn't been specified but is a key assumption. Presume future owners of multi-storey units will not be retired nor fit the typical demography of MBR and Cedar Beach. They will be younger homeowners. • There is no public transit so to assume each unit has 2 cars is not unrealistic. Unless the provincial guidelines account for demography of future owners and no public transit, the guidelines would be misleading and projected number of cars per unit would be very low. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Traffic Study was done in accordance with industry standards & reviewed by Region, Township and Township's engineering consultant. • The intersection at Reg Rd 23 & Thorah Conc Rd 5 is under the Region's jurisdiction. The Region has no plans for improvements and will continue to monitor the function and operation of the intersection. • The scenarios in the Traffic Study are modelled using industry standard tools & an agreed-upon methodology. • Trip Generation estimates were obtained from ITE Trip Generation Manual 11th Ed - an industry standard to calculate vehicle trips based on land use type and intensity. The manual is based on real-world observations and provides trip volume estimates for the highest 60 minutes of activity on the adjacent road (i.e. "the peak hour"). While many households have more than 1 car, not everyone travels every day or travels during the peak hour. Actual observations on an average day - which ITE is based on - would be lower than the equivalent of 2 vehicles per dwelling or a similar assumption. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>R. and G. Nanduri cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demography of unit owners is a key factor in determining the number of vehicle trips made by each household. With 86 young homeowners, can assume there will be significantly high number of vehicle trips on MBR & Cedar Beach Rd than what is projected. • Lack of parking within the development and the inevitable spillover to MBR will make it unsafe for current residents. • The majority of single car garages will be used for storage. There may be boats as well on the driveways so barely enough room in driveways to accommodate parking of owners' cars. Visitors and the owners' other cars will park on MBR. • For seniors and many other residents, with the traffic and parked cars on MBR just getting in and out of own driveway would be stressful and hazardous. • What if visitor cars are parked all night on MBR? Residents would not feel safe. • What about crime & vandalism in the area due to sudden increase in population? Is it reasonable to expect that our quiet area may not be as safe as it is now? Concerned with threat to personal safety or vandalism on property. • There are over 10 trees that are dead or nearly dead on the east side of MBR. Hope new tree planting will include replacing these trees and adding more | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applications propose a mix of housing types that could be marketed towards a range of people in different stages of life. • The proposed single and semi-detached lots include 3 parking spaces per lot with at least 2 in the driveway. The design of the neighbourhood and sidewalk location have been taken into consideration to facilitate at least 2 cars in the townhouse driveways. • Overnight on-street parking is not permitted on any roads within the Township. On-street parking is only permitted for 3 hours at a time. • The proposed development is not anticipated to create any safety issues. The neighbourhood will be protected with the same services as provided throughout the Township. • Approx. 50 trees proposed to be removed (25 are in poor condition or ash trees). The landscape plan includes the preservation of existing trees wherever possible, including trees along MBR. Over 100 new trees proposed to be planted. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>R. and G. Nanduri cont.</p> | <p>trees and shrubs to help ease the soil erosion damage from excess storm water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will this subdivision be developed to ensure it remains a place with well kept homes like the existing neighbourhood & a desirable place to live for many years? • Risk of the proposed 3-storey rowhouses crammed into small lots turning into a rundown subdivision over the years. • It's unlikely Brock or the developer will compensate residents for lost value of property or reduce property taxes. • The proposed high-density development for young homeowners is unwarranted in a quiet area with no public transit nor access to children's park and shops. • In favour of housing that blends with this beautiful community and has the potential to be well kept with uncluttered yards. • Solution would be to include some of the greenbelt on east side, build reasonable number of single & semi-detached 2-storey homes on slightly larger lots, with a green buffer of trees between MBR and the development & provide visitor parking. • Hope final plan will strike a balance between more housing, developer's profit margin & residents' needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This subdivision will be subject to the Township's Property Standards By-law that is applied across the Township. • Property value impacts are not taken into consideration with respect to land use planning matters (based on past OLT decisions). • The revised plan is in keeping with the policies for Residential Areas as outlined in the OP and conforms to the planning policy documents. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|---|---|
| <p>D. Moll and J. Nixon</p> <p>April 20 2022 April 20 2022 May 9 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal. • Not opposed to development of the subject lands; opposed to the imposition of a development which is not in keeping with the character of our neighbourhood. • The proposal is primarily for row housing and semi-detached houses, many 3 storeys in height, and lots with frontages as small as 20 ft. None of these factors exist in our neighborhood. All of them are an egregious imposition on community. • The proposal should be approached from the neighbourhood in question, which we believe is defined by hard edges - the railroad tracks to the east, Lake Simcoe to the west, in the south two dead-end roads, Moorlands and MBR and in the north the Fairgrounds/Beaver River. • Within our 'neighbourhood there are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No row houses on public thoroughfares. Edengrove has row housing, but on private roadways and has its own self-contained amenities. ○ There are no semi-detached houses. All housing is detached. ○ There are few houses that are 2.5 storeys in height, but no 3 storey houses, besides Lakeview Manor which is an institutional use. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • The revised plan proposes 63 units in total, consisting of 21 single detached, 6 semi-detached and 36 townhouses. • The average lot frontage for the singles that back onto the existing homes are 12.2m (40 ft). • The revised plan includes 18 singles and 6 semi-detached units backing onto the existing MBR. The OP requires new development to be compatible with existing neighbourhoods, which does not necessarily mean the exact same lot size. There is currently a range of lot sizes in the existing surrounding neighbourhoods and the proposed lots would be considered compatible with the existing lots in this area. • The revised plan includes single and semi-detached dwellings along the west side of the proposed subdivision transitioning to townhouses along the east side. The proposed lots backing onto existing MBR are deeper, with the homes fronting onto the new subdivision road. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| D. Moll and J. Nixon cont. | <p>covenant running with the land for a period of 99 years, for the benefit of property owners fronting on MBR and Moorlands Dr.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The givens: there will be development & MBR will loop around to Conc Rd 5. • We should call them rowhouses, not townhouses as townhouses are in urban areas like Toronto. Rowhouses give the correct connotation of what they are. • Think the money question needs to be broached. Polemics alone are not going to alter the plan; expert planning evidence is required and we'd be foolish to rely on the Brock Twp. Planning to protect our property rights. A significant sum of money is required to fight this. | <p>detached dwelling in accordance with the RB zone requirements. Development is not permitted within the Greenbelt Protected Countryside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Township's Zoning By-law refers to them as row townhouses. The two terms are often interchanged. • Planning staff at the Township and Regional level reviewed these applications and the Township also retained an external planning consultant. |
| K. Peticca May 11 2022 | <p>The areas of most concern: Pre Construction/Post Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline of construction and duration? • Full impact to MBR residents and surrounding area • Impact to the environment and Lake Simcoe during construction • Will MBR be used for heavy truck traffic and/or parking/storing large machinery? • Potential water run off? • What will the construction process consist of? Blasting? • Removal/disposal of construction waste? • Street cleaning? • Impact to existing residents on MBR | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction timelines are unknown. Draft plan conditions require a construction management plan in an effort to mitigate any impacts on existing residents and will address dust & noise, road cleaning, waste management, fill management, staging of construction, etc. • Erosion and sediment control fencing & measures are standard requirements on any construction site to prohibit the release of sediments & other potential contaminants during construction. • Construction access will be off Thorah Conc Rd 5. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>K. Peticca cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looping of the subdivision road with MBR will create a significant increase in 2-way traffic on a very quiet dead end cul de sac street unnecessarily. There is no need to loop this street into the subdivision. • Current MBR road is not designed or built to accommodate heavy 2-way traffic of such a dense subdivision. • Nothing on the plan indicates adequate buffering of the high density subdivision to the view of MBR residents, only mentions a naturalized boulevard with no plans of planting additional trees or shrubbery • Proposed 3-story semi-detached/ townhouses will create a brick wall view for MBR residents who currently enjoy a more natural rural surrounding. • 86 residential units proposed on a very small parcel of land does not blend in with the current single detached units along MBR and Cedar Beach Rd. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial and local planning policies speak to integrating new developments with existing ones. • The proposed road connection to MBR helps to improve interconnectivity between neighbourhoods from an auto and pedestrian perspective. • The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. • Road connections are better with respect to municipal operations, waste pick-up and emergency services access. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • The revised plan proposes singles and semis along MBR that provide an appropriate transition to the townhouse units along east side of development. Some of the proposed lots backing onto existing MBR are also deeper lots with the homes fronting onto the new subdivision road. • Many trees/shrubs are proposed to be preserved along MBR with new plantings along the swale & road. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>K. Peticca cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed density is unsuitable and will negatively impact the charming character of lakefront homes, year-round enjoyment of our properties, the natural/rural setting of our neighborhood and safe use of our quiet streets for walking and biking. <p>Environmental Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seasonal runoff from rain and snow that naturally flow from this area into Lake Simcoe will be negatively impacted. • Increase of pollutants from a high density development so close to the Lake could lead to contamination of drinking water as MBR is located in Intake Protection Zone (IPZ). What are the plans to address this? • The surrounding area is home to many wildlife species that will be greatly impacted by this development & could damage the Lake Simcoe ecosystem. • Shad flies are native to Lake Simcoe & will be greatly impacted, as will birds & other creatures that feed on shad flies. • Disturbing the natural flow of runoff from this low area could cause flooding for MBR residents - also not addressed in the proposed plan • Major concerns regarding the proposal to construct and bury a pipeline to address water flow that is currently naturally flowing between 2 properties on MBR. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised plan proposes 63 units in total, with an increase in single detached units. • Revised proposal includes 63 homes resulting in a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township's OP permits a minimum density of 15 units/ha with an average density of 20-25 units (OP 5.2.3.4). • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and Stormwater Management Report were completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and peer review consultants. The assessed impacts can be avoided or mitigated through effective stormwater and environmental management measures as outlined in the EIS. • Certain land uses are prohibited within the IPZ, but not residential homes. Homeowners can contact LSRCA for advice on how best to manage their winter salt use. • A revised stormwater plan has been provided, where all stormwater from the new subdivision will drain to a storm sewer on Thorah Conc Rd 5. An open swale will maintain the existing drainage from land in the Greenbelt. • 44 and 48 MBR should see a reduction in peak flows and volume of stormwater because flows from the |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| K. Peticca cont. | <p>Community/Traffic Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No plans to improve or construct turning lanes on Thorah Conc Rd 5 into the proposed subdivision. Very concerning given the increased daily traffic this development will generate (assuming 2 cars per home). Thorah Conc Rd 5 barely has a shoulder to veer for oncoming traffic or pass a stopped car. • Current roads cannot handle the volume of traffic. Is there a plan? • Cedar Beach Rd is barely a 2-lane road even though it is a main traffic route into downtown Beaverton and the marina. It was not built to be a major commuter road for an additional 170+ cars daily • Dangerous traffic conditions for the increased number of school buses needed to service this subdivision. • Close proximity to the train tracks - numerous trains daily creating a long back up of cars both ways potentially stretching up to Reg Rd 23. • No alternate transportation is readily available other than owning a vehicle. • A high density subdivision should be planned closer to town where amenities are more easily accessible and blends in with the surrounding area. | <p>new subdivision will flow to a storm sewer on Thorah Conc Rd 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. • Using industry standard guidelines, the proposed development is expected to generate 55 2-way trips during the morning peak hour and 64 2-way trips during the afternoon peak hour. • The proposed development includes a sidewalk on the new road and a trail connection along Thorah Conc Rd 5. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • The proposal has been circulated to CN Rail for review and comment. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| K. Peticca cont. | <p>Social Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current infrastructure will need to be upgraded to accommodate this proposal. • Soft services such as police, schools, daycare, health care, recreational facilities, local grocery stores, etc are currently in high demand and cannot service existing communities fully. What is the plan for increased social services? • Beaverton lacks basic amenities for local residents. This high density neighborhood will overwhelm the systems. • There is currently 1 grocery store off Hwy 12 servicing all of Beaverton that is not within walking distance. <p>Proposed Subdivision Inadequacies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient parking proposed for residents and visitors • 3 story dwellings - 45 ft way too high for surrounding neighborhood. • Proposed subdivision does not adhere to the Master Plan for Brock which stresses a requirement for single detached homes • 86 units is aggressive and extreme for small parcel of land and does not fit into this lakeside community with majority being seniors/retired/seasonal residents on larger properties. • Townhomes and semis are jammed together like sardines | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applications have been circulated to agencies that help to provide services (including the School Boards, the Region, Durham Region Transit, etc.). All service providers take proposed developments into account as part of their planning processes. Shopping and commercial uses typically follow residential development as the market expands. • The proposed single and semi-detached lots include 3 parking spaces per lot with at least 2 in the driveway. The design of the neighbourhood and sidewalk location have been taken into consideration to facilitate at least 2 cars in the townhouse driveways. • Singles and semis are proposed along MBR, transitioning to 3-storey townhouses on the east side. • The revised plan provides a mix of residential units that conform to the OP • The revised plan proposes 63 units in total, with an increase in single detached units. • The proposed singles and semis along MBR provide an appropriate transition to the townhouse units along the east |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|--|--|
| K. Peticca cont. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little if any buffering for residents of MBR. Landscaping of this so-called natural boulevard does not exist. • This Proposal is unattractive for families. Townhouses and semis typically attract first time homebuyers and young families. However, this proposal lacks simple amenities such as sidewalks on both sides of the street for safety; sufficient green space to enjoy, playgrounds or parkettes for kids to play. | <p>side of the development. Some of the lots backing onto MBR are deeper lots depending on the curve of MBR, will provide a buffer and privacy. This is supplemented with preserving trees/shrubs and providing new plantings as shown on the Landscape Plan. The revised plan includes a park.</p> |
| K. Scuton May 11 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does Beaverton have sufficient infrastructure to support this subdivision? • How can the public school accommodate the potential increase in student population from this subdivision? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water and sewer infrastructure is a Regional responsibility and they are involved in the project approval process. • Durham District School Board is a commenting agency on all Planning applications. The method by which they plan for students is their own and Township staff can't comment on their plans to accommodate growth. |
| J. Hope May 23 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many concerns with area being developed. • Environment - This area is home to a green space and many flora and fauna. It gives people a quiet space to enjoy, especially when walking. Noise and air pollution that will come with development will ruin the wildlife habitat. This seems to be contrary to green space that Brock and Durham are promoting for a walkable lifestyle. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Lands designated for residential uses. Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region's peer review consultant. The assessed impacts can be avoided or mitigated through effective stormwater and environmental management measures as outlined in the EIS. |

| | Comments | Township Response |
|----------------------|---|---|
| J. Hope cont. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lake Simcoe - This gem will be affected no matter how much developers say that they can mitigate the impact. Do not hear there will be no change, just less. This is not acceptable for the town, people and the environment. It will become more polluted. • Traffic - Speed is a great concern for people walking and children playing. It is unsafe. There is more noise from traffic. • More people moving into the area means more traffic. Usually, each household has 2 vehicles. The exit and entrance will be very busy and potentially cause accidents. • Infrastructure - The amount of water required to support this and all the developments will lower the servicing for everyone. The sewers are also impacted. This will affect Lake Simcoe again and lower its ability to support the recreation. • If built, how will infrastructure be maintained? • We have health care, roads, manpower and many other factors to consider. Will everyone's taxes go up because of this? • Township and region have let down the people of Brock by bringing in more people. How will this help Beaverton to be a better place to live? How do the businesses benefit? • Against more development until there is a clearly stated plan for every resident to view and make comments. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The study concludes the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby roads. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • Servicing for growth has been considered and planned for by the Region, as water and sanitary sewers are under the Region's jurisdiction. • A condition of draft plan approval requires the Township and Region to be satisfied there is adequate water and sewage capacity available and allocated to this development prior to final approval and registration. • Long term maintenance will be up to the Township and Region as infrastructure would be added to their respective assets. • Tax assessment from new growth will assist the Township and Region in the provision of services and asset management. An increased market will assist businesses in the area. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|--|--|
| <p>K. Mewett</p> <p>May 24 2022</p> <p>May 30 2022</p> <p>June 1 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When did the subject site, previously listed as Greenbelt in its entirety, go through the process to designate the area of Developable Lands within this property? • What year does the Township have record to say this area is now able to be developed and at what capacity? • What are the Township's requirements for calculating density in Beaverton's Urban Area and does this development fit within the density allowance for this location? • What are the Township's limits on density and traffic levels in this type of urban area? • How will Township mitigate the hazards for pedestrians on Cedar Beach Rd as traffic levels will significantly increase here if this level of development is permitted? • How will traffic and parking be dealt with on MBR if this many homes are permitted, and what will the Township do to mitigate the pedestrian and cyclist hazards? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With no designated community lake access for new residents, how will Township deal with the risk of trespassers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the subject lands have been identified and designated for residential purposes since at least 1991 in the Township and Regional Official Plans (OP). The majority of the property continues to be part of the Greenbelt Protected Countryside. • Revised proposal includes 63 homes resulting in a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township's OP permits a minimum density of 15 units/ha with an average density of 20-25 units (OP 5.2.3.4). • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. • The plan includes a sidewalk along the new road, a park, and a multi-use trail along Thorah Conc Road 5. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • The proposed development is not anticipated to create any safety issues. The neighbourhood will be protected |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>K. Mewett cont.</p> | <p>looking to gain access to the lake, especially at times when some lakefront properties are seasonally unoccupied?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will snow removal and winter hazards be addressed? Where will snow routes be designated and what is the Township’s plan for dealing with the current design & its ability to maintain safe road passage? • The fields currently provide significant absorption and flood control in their current state. The plan identifies only 1 way to manage the drainage. What other options can be implemented to maintain more of the natural drainage that these lands currently provide to the Lake Simcoe Watershed? • The existing drainage feature that is identified as “intermittent” has not been investigated fully. The Township should consider having a broader hydrogeological and surface water movement study to assess what and where water moves in the areas adjacent to the subject lands. The adjacent properties are all influenced and connected as the elevations lead surface and ground water to the lake. What additional studies have been completed to assess what influences adjacent properties have or will have on the subject lands if this natural drainage feature is disturbed/manipulated? | <p>with the same services as provided throughout the Township.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New residents would be able to use any publicly owned lake accesses. • The proposed road connection to MBR and Thorah Conc Rd 5 will allow for snow maintenance by the Township. • The Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report has been reviewed by the Township, Region and LSRCA and provides an overview of the existing and proposed drainage for this area. Existing drainage concerns have been considered as part of this proposal. The drainage pattern and characteristics were confirmed in collaboration with LSRCA, which determined the drainage to be an ephemeral feature, not intermittent. This means no ground water feeds into it, rather it occasionally occurs during heavy rain fall. • Existing drainage from the agricultural lot will continue to drain through the swale and across 44 and 48 MBR as it currently does, but drainage from the new subdivision will be directed to a stormwater pipe on Thorah Conc Rd 5 that will be designed for the 100-year storm event. • No easements or pipes are proposed on 44 or 48 MBR, which should see a |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>K. Mewett cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What measures do the Township have to protect the subject lands and the Lake Simcoe Watershed if a catastrophic water event occurred in this area, specifically the sewage lagoons that are positioned upstream from the subject lands. Where would the water go if 1 or more cells in the lagoon breached or blew out? • If existing landowners of 44/48 MBR don't agree to an easement and supposed improvement to the existing overland flow, what is the developer's alternative plan to manage the drainage? • There is significant groundwater in this area and most MBR residents have sump pumps to deal with water that is slowly making its way to the lake. The Hydrological Evaluation states that cash in lieu compensation is an option to deal with long-term potential impacts to the groundwater. How can a price tag be placed on dealing with the effects this proposed development may have on the groundwater patterns currently experienced. If the groundwater situation becomes less manageable because of development, this would become a future issue for the Township and not the developer over time which the Township may not be willing to risk dealing with. • Concerned about the effects on drainage and groundwater as there have already | <p>reduction in peak flows and volume of stormwater because flows from the new subdivision will flow to a storm sewer on Thorah Conc Rd 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Hydrogeological Investigation and Environmental Impact Study have been submitted and reviewed. • Mitigation measures are required to ensure post-development infiltration levels match pre-development levels. Only after all reasonable efforts have been made to meet the infiltration deficit then cash compensation may be considered in accordance with LSRCA's policies. The funds would be used by LSRCA towards projects. • LSRCA policies recognize that not every site that is planned for development will meet the target absorption rates because of different constraints. The cash-in-lieu option is available for instances such as this proposal, where there is a high water table and the lands are identified for residential uses. The policy is not intended to stop growth, rather provide an alternative option where the target |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>K. Mewett cont.</p> | <p>been some significant issues regarding the new development underway on Thorah Conc Rd 5, east of the subject site. The blasting and dewatering has caused irregular flows of surface and subsurface water to be released and flow west towards the lake. The sewage treatment facility is in this path as is the subject lands named in this proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Photo 5 in the Planning Justification Report (PJR) shows bungalow-style single-detached homes on Cedar Beach Rd. Would the Township not see continuation of this type of development as logical extension of existing neighbourhood and responding to the existing character? How are townhouses/semis considered to be consistent with this existing area? • Where else in Beaverton has this much density been allowed for development in such close proximity to the lake, its watershed and adjacent to Greenbelt? • The existing natural drainage swales on the east side of MBR are currently providing nesting opportunities for many bird/waterfowl species. What studies have been completed to monitor and identify | <p>cannot be met. It should be noted that there is a drainage plan that will improve drainage on the site, that has been reviewed by the LSRCA, Region, and Township.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Residential Area designation permits a range of housing types. The OP requires new development to be compatible with existing areas, which does not necessarily mean the exact same lot size of housing types. There is currently a range of lot sizes in the existing surrounding neighbourhoods and the proposed lots would be considered compatible with this area. • There are other approved developments in Beaverton with similar or higher densities. As the PJR notes, the built form in Beaverton is evolving in response to Provincial and local planning policy documents with more compact developments that have a mix of housing types and smaller frontages. • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region's peer review consultant. The assessed impacts can be avoided or mitigated through effective stormwater |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>K. Mewett cont.</p> | <p>what species will be affected and how will they be accommodated?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastern meadowlark and bobolinks have been nesting in these fields historically. What protection will be considered to maintain this critical habitat that has been present for decades prior to this development consideration? • There is currently very little streetlighting along Torah Conc Rd 5/MBR. Any future lighting will significantly affect both human activity and wildlife. What is the lighting strategy for MBR and what's the plan for the proposed development? With a significant increase in density, comes more unnatural light in an area that has little. • The proposed plan incorporates some new methods of dealing with seasonal drainage and stormwater management, specifically the use of stormwater filters (jellyfish strainers). If these filters are used in | <p>and environmental management measures as outlined in the EIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For example, any tree removal will be required to be removed outside of nesting seasons or surveyed prior to removal in accordance with municipal, Regional and provincial policies. • A habitat management plan is required to be created for MECP's review and approval, to create or enhance and manage meadowlark and bobolink habitat. Management and monitoring to the new or enhanced habitat must be completed for 5 years. • The landscape plan seeks to preserve as much habitat as possible for bird species and introduces similar plantings in areas of disturbance. • The new road will be built to the Township's standards which will include streetlights that are dark-sky compliant. • Long term maintenance will be up to the Township as such facilities would be added to the Township's assets (similar to infrastructure, pipes & stormwater management ponds). An operation and maintenance manual is |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>K. Mewett cont.</p> | <p>conjunction with new drainage paths, what is the Township’s capacity to monitor and maintain these new systems, specifically the filters? What will happen if these filters aren’t maintained?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the impacts or allowances the new through road will have on the quiet and unrestricted MBR. If a through road is permitted, how will the Township mitigate parking & road hazards on MBR? • Are they intending to change zoning of the remaining undeveloped 13.74ha from Greenbelt to developable land or will this remaining parcel be indefinitely protected and only permit for 1 home? • If rezoning application were to be made to change greenbelt area to developable area, could an equal portion of the current planned areas for development not be traded and rezoned to greenbelt? If possible, the natural drainage areas might be allowed to remain or enhanced and a few smaller areas of development in | <p>required to be submitted as part of the detailed design stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed single and semi-detached lots include 3 parking spaces per lot with 2 parking spaces in the driveway. The design of the neighbourhood and sidewalk location have been taken into consideration to facilitate at least 2 car parking in the townhouse driveways. • The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • Only a portion of the subject property is within the urban boundary and designated for residential purposes while the majority of the lot is within the Greenbelt where development is not permitted. Currently only 1 single detached dwelling is permitted in the remaining lot in the Greenbelt. • Development would only be permitted on the remaining lands should these lands be brought into the urban boundary. Any proposal for expansion must be considered as part of a comprehensive OP review and must |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|---|---|
| K. Mewett cont. | <p>varying locations adjacent to the drainage paths would see less disturbance and development adjacent to MBR. Understand this type of trade occurs at other levels of planning when environmental features must be maintained. It would be an excellent option to consider should the proposed plan continue to be recognized as incompatible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the driveway accessing the 3 single dwelling units - it is not likely that the Township would want to see this private driveway scenario and what about snow removal/garbage collection. This area does not seem appropriate for this type of development and should be given more review to see what could be done to design a more suitable layout for emergency and service access. | <p>address requirements of the Greenbelt Plan & other provincial policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no plans for an urban expansion at this point in time. • As noted, these lands have been designated for residential purposes since at least 1991 and this area provides for sequential development that is adjacent to and can be integrated with the existing area. • The private shared driveway has been removed from the revised plan. |
| <p>C. Marlet</p> <p>May 25 2022</p> <p>Mar 18 2024</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding current proposal. • Proposal goes beyond what is allowed in terms of height and parking. • While development of the property is permitted, the proposal is counter to what this quiet cottage-like neighbourhood should withstand. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. A revised plan has been submitted. • The single and semi-detached lots meet the parking requirements, and the sidewalk location has been taken into consideration to facilitate at least 2 cars in the townhouse driveways. • Singles and semis are proposed along MBR to provide an appropriate transition to the townhouse units along the east side of the development. |

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|---|---|
| <p>E. Johnston</p> <p>May 18 2022 May 25 2022 May 30 2022 June 1 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chose property in Beaverton because of Lake Simcoe, the rural atmosphere of the surrounding fields, wildlife, open spaces, and the cottage road where we could take walks and teach children to ride bikes. • Object the proposed development • Beaverton is a bedroom community with very little employment, no social services, no doctor, no hospital, no public transportation. Police services are remote and take 20 minutes to respond, if ever. A car is needed to run an errand, grocery shop, bank etc. Recreation is very limited. The walkability score is zero. • The demographic buyer for Beaverton, according to local realtors, is young families looking for larger lots and space for children or retired persons who prefer single level, detached bungalows with large lots, 40 to 50-ft frontages. • Space is the big draw to Beaverton and the reason people are willing to commute. • This development is not tailored to the demographics of the Beaverton buyer. • Many discrepancies in the Planning Justification Report (PJR) that do not consider the appropriate expansion of the community nor Beaverton demographics. • There are many aspects that do not conform to the Official Plan (OP). • New development should seamlessly blend with the existing housing stock. The | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • In supporting a walkable community, the proposal includes a sidewalk on the new road, a park block and a trail along Thorah Conc Rd 5. • The revised plan proposes 63 units in total, consisting of 21 single detached, 6 semi-detached and 36 townhouses. • The average lot frontage for the singles that back onto the existing homes are 12.2m (40 ft). • The applications propose a mix of housing types that could be marketed towards a range of people in different stages of life. • The revised plan and associated plans and background studies have been reviewed by Regional and Township planning staff and the Township's planning consultant. • The OP requires new development to be compatible with existing neighbourhoods, which does not |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>E. Johnston cont.</p> | <p>proposal ignores existing properties in both density and housing types. Existing structures are detached and for the most part single storey with a height of 12-16ft vs proposed height of 35-43 ft</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Totally incompatible with existing houses on MBR and Cedar Beach. Existing frontages range from 40-300 ft vs the development frontages of 19-24 ft • The OP calls for healthy communities – see OP policies 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.2.1. • There are articles that explain the direct correlation between crowding, high density and physical and mental well-being. People who choose to live in Beaverton value large lots and space. The people living on MBR value the rural and bucolic environment, that is why they are willing to pay exorbitant taxes for very few services. • This proposal with its density and house form does not conform to the OP. • To Plan is to design the future. Communities must be planned to enhance the wellbeing of future populations. • OP policy 4.4.7 recognizes that single detached dwellings will remain the predominant form of housing. • The surrounding area is zoned R1 - low density and large lots • The new development is not compatible or suitable for our community. The approved | <p>necessarily mean the exact same lot size or housing type. There is currently a range of lot sizes in the existing surrounding neighbourhoods and the proposed lots would be considered compatible with this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised plan provides a typical frontage of 12.2m for singles, 8.1m for semis and 6-8m for townhouses. The proposed singles and semis along MBR provide an appropriate transition to the townhouse units along the east side of the site. • Revised proposal includes 63 homes resulting in a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township's OP permits a minimum density of 15 units/ha with an average density of 20-25 units (OP 5.2.3.4). • When interpreting policies, it is important to read the entire section. For example: Policy 4.4.7 recognizes that single detached will remain the predominant form, then goes on to say "Council shall encourage development of higher density residential forms in appropriate locations in order to reduce the share of single detached dwellings relative to the total number of dwellings within the municipality." This does not mean that all future development applications will be single detached, rather recognizing that a substantial |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>E. Johnston cont.</p> | <p>zoning designation should be no higher than R1, with similar frontages as MBR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most new developments are approved as R1 - single detached. The examples provided in the PJR have frontages of 35-53ft. The example of the townhouse has not been approved. There are no other similar densities in Beaverton. • Proposal is in opposition to OP policy 4.9.4 which speaks to development that enhances natural features and functions • Concern for wildlife habitat - trust LSRCA will scrutinize the effect on Lake Simcoe and surrounding intake protection. • OP policy 5.2.3.5(d) requires the proposed use be complementary with the physical and built form of the surrounding areas; • OP policy 5.2.3.5(e) notes that the impact of traffic generated cannot have an undue impact on existing roads & surrounding uses | <p>amount of the existing housing stock is and will continue to be single detached.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OP policy 4.4.2 - Township will encourage a range of housing types. • The revised plan has adjusted the unit mix with more single detached units and fewer townhouse units than initially proposed. • Townhouses have been approved within the Township and there are other approved developments in Beaverton with similar or higher densities. As the PJR notes, the built form in Beaverton is evolving in response to Provincial and local planning policy documents with more compact developments that have a mix of housing types and smaller frontages. Most new subdivisions have R1 exceptions to address smaller lot sizes. • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region's peer review consultant. • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>E. Johnston cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBR & Cedar Beach Rd are country roads - narrow with no sidewalks or shoulders. The road does not allow for parking and two-way traffic. When there is a parked car, passing cars must take turns going around the parked car, and pedestrians and bikers must step off the road to allow traffic to pass. The noise from the traffic alone will have undue impact on people living along these roads. • The Osborne St and Thorah Conc Rd 5 intersection is already overburdened with existing traffic and is the site of many accidents. An additional 160 cars that the proposed development will necessitate because every dwelling will need at least 2 cars, will create chaos at this intersection. • Cul de sacs are a tool for planners to reduce crime in neighbourhoods. People unfamiliar with the area hesitate to go down a road with no exit. This has been of great comfort to the residents of MBR due to the lack of police protection available, and to reduce unwanted traffic. Losing the cul-de-sac is a major concern to the residents of MBR. | <p>does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Traffic Study addressed the intersection at Osborne St/Reg Rd 23 & Thorah Conc Rd 5, which is under the Region's jurisdiction. The Region has no plans for improvements and will continue to monitor the function and operation of the intersection. • Provincial and local planning policies direct communities to be connected by integrating new developments with existing neighbourhoods. • The proposed road connection to MBR helps to improve interconnectivity between neighbourhoods from an auto and pedestrian perspective. • The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. • Road connections are better with respect to municipal operations, waste |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>E. Johnston cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate off-street parking shall be provided. There has been no mention of the required fire hydrants along the street which will reduce the number of parking spaces. Also, there is no allowance for weekend visitors' parking. • OP policy 5.2.3.8 is to ensure harmonious integration with existing developments. • Every resident is concerned with the environmental impact of the development. • It appears that at least 70% of the property will be hard surfaced, either by a building, driveway or road, which is of concern. • Currently the field absorbs much of the rain and that which it cannot runs off through a natural waterway. The hard surfaces will not only prohibit this, but will also introduce pollutants into the runoff, from cars, from yards, from roofs. This has not been appropriately addressed and is of the utmost concern as we all value our | <p>pick-up and emergency services access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • The proposed single and semi-detached lots include 3 parking spaces per lot with at least 2 in the driveway. The design of the neighbourhood and sidewalk location have been taken into consideration to facilitate at least 2 cars in the townhouse driveways. • Fire hydrants will be required in accordance the ON Building Code. On-street visitor parking may be permitted outside of the required setbacks to the hydrants. • The Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report has been reviewed by the Township, Region and LSRCA and provides an overview of the existing and proposed drainage for this area. Existing drainage concerns have been considered as part of this proposal. The drainage pattern and characteristics were confirmed in collaboration with LSRCA • Existing drainage from the agricultural lot will continue to drain through the swale and across 44 and 48 MBR as it currently does, but drainage from the |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|---|---|
| <p>J. and L. Hew</p> <p>April 27 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the following concerns as it relates to the proposed development • If approved, ensure there would not be any structural or land erosion/disturbances on our lakefront property along MBR. • Do not object to the development of homes in the area but concerned about the number of homes (80 plus) proposed which would impact the community and put stress on public infrastructure servicing the community including water, sewage, drainage, safety and security, quiet enjoyment that residents have enjoyed and why we purchased in this neighborhood. • Originally informed it would not be more than 15 homes, which was reasonable. • What additional infrastructure has been put in place to accommodate an ever-growing community in Beaverton. What long term solutions have been considered for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Municipal services ○ Emergency response, police, fire and rescue, medical, mental health ○ Schools, safety zones ○ Traffic and road maintenance ○ Snow removal ○ Sanitation/sewage treatment facilities ○ Garbage & recycling/waste collection ○ Water and drainage supply ○ Electricity ○ Public transportation, traffic congestion ○ Parking in downtown Beaverton | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • The revised plan proposes 63 units in total, consisting of 21 single detached, 6 semi-detached and 36 townhouses. • As part of the application review process, background studies and reports have been submitted, reviewed and updated as needed to respond to comments. • No previous applications were made for this site. • The applications and background studies have been circulated to a number of agencies that help to provide various services (including the School Boards, the Region, utility providers, Durham Region Transit, etc.). All service providers take proposed developments into account as part of their planning processes. Township has taken all proposed and approved developments into account as part of the Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan process. • As part of the application review process, agencies review the proposed development to ensure it |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>J. and L. Hew cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Green space made available ○ Noise and light pollution ○ Long term vibrant, quality employment opportunities within the community ○ Cultural, health & community facilities ● Development taking place but no increase in community supports and services, including sporting arenas, places where families can gather for events, meetings and local programming, libraries. ● With the proposed increase in new residents to Beaverton with all the approved developments, who will be paying for the additional supports that will be required within the community? What long term planning has taken place to accommodate future growth? ● Right now, the adage “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure” applies. There should be provisions made where funds are put aside to address the issues that arise due to the development or developers should construct the infrastructure required to accommodate the additional residents before any residential homes are built. ● Environmental sensitivities with respect to Lake Simcoe – Is this development ecologically planned and sound? Does this development protect the ecological health of Lake Simcoe? | <p>meets the required design criteria with respect to water/sanitary/stormwater infrastructure, waste management, snow removal, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The developer will be required to construct all the infrastructure needed within the subdivision (i.e. water and sewer pipes, roads, sidewalks, etc.). They will also be required to pay development charges at the building permit stage, which are intended to cover other growth-related costs. Development charges help provide funding for library services, parks and recreation, fire services, etc. and a portion is paid to the School Boards. Parkland is also being conveyed as part of this subdivision. ● An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region’s peer review consultant. The assessed impacts can be avoided or mitigated through effective stormwater and environmental management measures as outlined in the EIS. ● The proposal and background studies have addressed the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. |

| | Comments | Township Response |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| J. and L. Hew cont. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With development, there is a loss of natural green space which has the potential to impact the quality of water in Lake Simcoe. Does this development comply with the Lake Simcoe Act with regards to runoff? • Wildlife concerns – the natural habitat for wildlife in the area will be disturbed and destroyed. What long term plans have been thought about or developed to accommodate the loss of natural habitat? • Have the long term consequences of development that impact the quality of water in Lake Simcoe been considered? • Some further impacts to be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduced water quality of the lake, increase growth in algae resulting in increased odours ○ Reducing the health of the ecosystem ○ Reducing the health of aquatic life in Lake Simcoe • Where is excess water (surface & ground) being drained to? Are new houses elevated with water draining/sloped towards our property? Will developers pay for the cost of land erosion of our property due to construction and drainage issues on MBR which may not appear right away. • Who will be held responsible for the long-term environmental issues, erosion issues and the negative impacts this development may have on Lake Simcoe? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A habitat management plan is required to be created for MECP’s review and approval, to create or enhance and manage meadowlark and bobolink habitat. Management and monitoring to the new or enhanced habitat must be completed for 5 years. • The landscape plan seeks to preserve as much habitat as possible for bird species and introduces similar plantings in areas of disturbance. • The Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report has been reviewed by the Township, Region and LSRCA and provides an overview of the existing and proposed drainage for this area. The report addresses water quality and quantity and was reviewed by LSRCA staff. • The revised proposal includes an open naturalized swale with landscaping. • Existing drainage from the agricultural lot will continue to drain through the swale and across 44 and 48 MBR as it currently does, which is required per LSRCA policies, whereas drainage from the new subdivision will go to a stormwater pipe on Thorah Conc Rd 5 • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township’s engineering consultant. The traffic |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>J. and L. Hew cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road is narrow and only one way in and out allowing for MBR residents to walk freely in a relatively safe environment. With the number of homes being considered and the flow of traffic and the opening of the dead-end street being considered, it will mean substantial traffic on the street resulting in safety concerns for residents and families as there is no sidewalk that separates vehicle and pedestrian traffic. The narrow street does not have the proper infrastructure to support the increase in volume. The opening of the street would not be considered environmentally friendly. There is no need to connect MBR to the new subdivision road as this will increase the volume of traffic on MBR unnecessarily • Concerned about potential impacts to MBR properties from construction and vibration, including land erosion, drainage issues that impact homes and retaining wall. • Will the developer reimburse residents to engage an independent construction noise and vibration specialist to ensure that no damage is done to our home and retaining wall as a result of development? A | <p>study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial and local planning policies direct communities to be connected by integrating new developments with existing neighbourhoods. • The proposed road connection to MBR helps to improve interconnectivity between neighbourhoods from an auto and pedestrian perspective. • The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. • Road connections are better with respect to municipal operations, waste pick-up, snow removal and emergency services access. • Depending on the nature of the construction & possibility of vibration, the developer may be required to offer a pre-construction survey of buildings near the proposed construction area to verify existing conditions. • The survey will be completed by an independent third party consultant that is retained by the developer. They are bound by professional designations to |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>J. and L. Hew cont.</p> | <p>monitoring company would monitor and detect any changes to land and homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-story homes would reduce the privacy and security of existing homes along MBR. Will no longer have quiet enjoyment of my home due to noise, traffic and pollution this development will create. Will invade my privacy as it will be overlooking my yard and into my home. Will there be trees planted behind the lots to allow for privacy/visual barrier? It's unclear what the distance of the backyards will be to MBR and where and if trees are being planted. Who will be responsible for ensuring the trees remain a sufficient height and density to maintain my privacy? • This development takes away from the aesthetics of the MBR area which is reflected in our property taxes. Will there be an adjustment to property taxes to reflect loss of enjoyment and the devaluation of homes because it's no longer a quiet street? | <p>be unbiased and report on the facts. It is standard practice for the developer's consultant to arrange the survey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed singles and semis along MBR provide an appropriate transition to the townhouse units along the east side of the development. The lots backing onto MBR are deeper depending on the curve of MBR, which will provide a buffer and privacy. This is supplemented with preserving trees/shrubs and new plantings as shown on the Landscape Plan. • Taxes are based on MPAC's assessment. Property value impacts are not taken into consideration with respect to land use planning matters (based on past OLT decisions). |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|---|---|
| <p>L. & D. Longo</p> <p>April 19 2022</p> <p>May 3 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong opposition to this proposal. • MBR residents and the surrounding community of Cedar Beach Rd, Parklawn Blvd, Thorah Conc 5 and Moorlands Rd will be negatively impacted by this project. • MBR is a lakefront community with Cedar Beach neighbourhood being a lovely rural area of country and cottage style homes with narrow roads and no sidewalks with the ability to walk, children riding bikes and enjoy the natural nature setting free from the worry of traffic. <p>Some concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The elimination of MBR being a dead-end road. MBR should remain a cul-del-sac which will restrict the overflow and traffic from the new subdivision. We need to maintain a safe environment. • This development has no consideration for the absolute chaos of traffic pouring out of one road. This plan should provide its own looped road within the property and not spill out onto MBR, Cedar Beach and Thorah Conc Rd 5. Why not enter and exit off Moorlands Rd? Consider the amount of traffic, construction vehicles, cars, trucks, delivery vehicles and school busses. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. • An entrance connecting to Moorlands Dr is not feasible as it would require crossing the remaining rural lot, which would fragment the remaining agricultural land and create an additional roadway that would need to be maintained by the Township. • Provincial and local planning policies direct communities to be connected by integrating new developments with existing neighbourhoods. • The proposed road connection to MBR helps to improve interconnectivity between neighbourhoods from an auto and pedestrian perspective. • The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. • Road connections are better with respect to municipal operations, snow |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>L. & D. Longo cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This development has no consideration or plans for green spaces or parks that residents can enjoy with their children. • Minimal parking spaces for the amount of vehicles this subdivision will create. • This development will destroy local wildlife habitat. • The environmental damage to Lake Simcoe with drainage pollution flowing directly into the lake from this property is already excessive and a huge factor. LSRCA needs to have input and be an important factor in the approval of this project. Most importantly please consider the protection of Lake Simcoe. • Property values in the area are likely to plummet with multi-family high density. • This development is inconsistent with the neighbourhood of MBR & Cedar Beach. • Should provide a pleasant division between the rear yards of the subdivision homes and MBR with substantial minimum of 35 to 40 ft space and with attractive | <p>removal, waste pick-up and emergency services access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • The plan includes a sidewalk on the new road, a park & trail along Conc 5 • The proposed single and semi-detached lots include 3 parking spaces per lot with at least 2 in the driveway. The design of the neighbourhood and sidewalk location have been taken into consideration to facilitate at least 2 cars in the townhouse driveways. • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region's peer review consultant. The assessed impacts can be avoided or mitigated through effective stormwater and environmental management measures as outlined in the EIS. • Property value impacts are not taken into consideration with respect to land use planning matters (based on past OLT decisions). • The proposed singles and semis along MBR provide an appropriate transition to the townhouse units along the east side of the development. The lots |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|--|---|
| L. & D. Longo cont. | <p>wood fencing – not wire fencing as indicated in plans. Also, the planting of new maple and equivalent trees and bushes to buffer noise and unsightly overcrowded subdivision backyards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not support the amount of high populated dwellings, cars, parking overflow, pollution to Lake Simcoe and traffic it will create. • This project is well suited for a city. • Urge developer to scrap the rowhouses and semis and reconsider building attractive single homes that already exist and blend nicely in the neighbourhood | <p>backing onto MBR are deeper depending on the curve of MBR, which will provide a buffer and privacy. This is supplemented with preserving trees/shrubs and new plantings as shown on the Landscape Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The post and wire fence identified on the plan denotes the existing fence around the agricultural lot. Any fences proposed will be required to meet the Township's standards as outlined in the Fence By-law and will be identified as part of the detailed design process. |
| J. and D. Cooper May 20 2022 Mar 11 2024 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose this amendment and suggest keeping the original housing plan. • Feel this high density housing plan will be very stressful to this community. There are already plans for 2 other developments up to the fairgrounds & the environmental impact to the area will be greatly affected. • Cedar Beach Rd is a community of seniors and younger children who walk and play on the roads all times of the day and evening. With no sidewalks on these roads there is a greater safety risk involved. The road cannot handle traffic as it will become a "thruway" for all the housing projects that connect Cedar Beach Rd to these 3 new developments. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. No previous applications were made for this site. • The revised plan proposes 63 units in total with an increase in single detached dwellings. • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. • The plan includes a sidewalk along the new road, a park, and a multi-use trail along Thorah Conc Road 5. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|---|---|
| J. and D. Cooper cont. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In response to the revised plan - This subdivision is still way too big for this end of town. All the original concerns still stand. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. |
| B. & C. Reynolds May 13 2022 Mar 18 2024 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have serious concerns about the proposed development. Concerns are threefold - increased traffic volume on MBR, drainage issues & possible environmental damage <p>Traffic increase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MBR is hardly a main thoroughfare, more of a country lane. It serves mainly as an access road for 14 houses. It is narrow with a drainage ditch on the east side and partially on the west side. There is no sidewalk or streetlights. The other major use of MBR is recreational. Many residents use it for dog walking, jogging, cycling and as play space for children. Increased traffic will ruin the use of the road, affect quality of life & property value. Concerned construction vehicles will use MBR if road connected. <p>Drainage issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As one of a handful of homes on MBR that have basements, have had to deal with drainage issues that threaten basement flooding. In the spring, 2 sump pumps run almost continuously. If there are to be | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted The revised plan proposes 63 units in total with an increase in single detached dwellings. A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. Construction access will be off Thorah Conc Rd 5. Basements are not contemplated as a result of the groundwater table. The Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report has been reviewed by the Region, LSRCA, Township & Township's engineering |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| B. & C. Reynolds cont. | <p>basements in the new housing, many will require sump pumps. Where will this water be drained?</p> <p>Environmental concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the developer wants to fill in the low lying drainage area at the south end of the property, which will likely cause further drainage problems and affect animal habitat. We are losing many wildlife species due to habitat destruction. • There is an area of milkweed plants on the property which provide a food source and place to lay their eggs for monarch butterflies, which are endangered. • Your challenge as Council is to write rules that protect residents and encourage investment and growth, a fine line. Sometimes NIMBISM from residents who do not want change and developers who want to maximize profits. In this instance the owner will walk off with his bag of gold and not care what he leaves behind. Unfortunately for Brock Council and residents, we will live with the legacy. • Judge this proposal with a jaundiced eye questioning parking adequacy, green space, water runoff and all other issues that the owner doesn't care about. | <p>consultant. It provides an overview of existing & proposed drainage for this area and the drainage pattern and characteristics were confirmed in collaboration with LSRCA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised proposal includes an open naturalized swale with landscaping. • Existing drainage from the agricultural lot will continue to drain through the swale and across 44 and 48 MBR as it currently does, which is required per LSRCA policies, whereas drainage from the new subdivision will go to a stormwater pipe on Thorah Conc Rd 5 • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region's peer review consultant. The assessed impacts can be avoided or mitigated through effective stormwater and environmental management measures as outlined in the EIS. |

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|--|---|
| <p>A. Beaudoin</p> <p>May 24 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I've always wanted growth in Beaverton, personally & as past local business owner. • Understood originally 14 homes were to be built on MBR. This was understandable. It's a beautiful location and fit with the existing homes in the area. • Concerned with proposal for 86 residences in such a small area. • Concerns with traffic increases with roads that have no sidewalks, density, parking issues, etc. • Does Brock Township have a "big picture plan" for Beaverton? What type of community are we striving to be? Are we focussing on seniors, young families, commuters, etc.? What do we want to be and be known for? Are we looking at the end and working backwards or are we selling off valuable land to developers and letting them decide? • If public disagrees, what type of action do we need to take? • Can the Township stop the developer from building 14 homes and allow 86? Who is making that decision? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No previous applications were made for this site. • The revised plan proposes 63 units with an increase in single detached. • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. It concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby roads. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • The Official Plan sets out the long term plan for the Township and identifies areas for residential development. • One objective of OP is to develop communities where people of all ages, backgrounds and capabilities can meet throughout the various stages in lives. • OP encourages compact development to use land in settlement areas more efficiently & preserve agricultural land. • Proposed development must conform with provincial, regional and local policies. Estate residential development (i.e. 14 units) would not conform with planning policies. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|--|--|
| <p>C. Hilder</p> <p>May 24 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have several concerns regarding the proposed development. • Traffic will be a danger to the many people that enjoy cycling, jogging, or walking in the area. It will present a danger to the children playing in our area. The traffic already increases in the summer, but this amount of added traffic would be terrible. • Concerned about wildlife in the area including bears, beavers, deer, coyotes, possums and snapping turtles. Animals rely on this habitat to survive and if take it away, increase their chances of being hit by a vehicle, which is a shame. The construction noise would be damaging to them. • Have seen turtles, including snapping turtles, crossing Thorah Conc Rd 5. With their numbers declining, it is important that traffic in this area is not increased. • There are a lot of birds in the area, including osprey, loons, swans, geese and ducks. Disturbing/destroying their habitat, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • The revised plan proposes 63 units in total with an increase in single detached dwellings. • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township’s engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region’s peer review consultant. The assessed impacts can be avoided or mitigated through effective stormwater and environmental management measures as outlined in the EIS. • For example, any tree removal will be required to be removed outside of nesting seasons or surveyed prior to removal in accordance with municipal, Regional and provincial policies. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|---|---|
| C. Hilder cont. | <p>is a great concern. Have seen bobolinks in the fields off Thorah Conc Rd 5. Bobolinks are of special concern because of their dwindling numbers. They need these fields to nest quietly. What will happen to them if the fields are taken away?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not only would the new development and its construction be a great nuisance, but it would also be a great danger to many. • Please don't allow our beautiful area, that so many depend on, to be ruined. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A habitat management plan is required to be created for MECP's review and approval, to create or enhance and manage meadowlark and bobolink habitat. Management and monitoring to the new or enhanced habitat must be completed for 5 years. • The landscape plan seeks to preserve as much habitat as possible for bird species and introduces similar plantings in areas of disturbance. |
| D. Martin rep. for Pegrose Holdings Inc May 20 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very concerned by the magnitude of density of the proposal involving 49 townhouses, 34 semis & 3 detached units. • Proposal is completely out of character with existing properties in the area including the single-family homes on Moorlands Dr and Cedar Beach Rd. • Concerned with the impact on Lake Simcoe arising from further demands on the water supply, the impact on sewage treatment facilities and other environmental impacts that are sure to arise but are unknown at this point. • The proposal would make MBR a point of access into the development. Given the massive density increase, this will result in a huge increase in the vehicle traffic using MBR to access the new dwellings. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • The revised plan proposes 63 units in total, consisting of 21 single detached, 6 semi-detached and 36 townhouses. • The revised plan has a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township's OP permits a minimum density of 15 units/ha with an average density of 20-25 units (OP 5.2.3.4). • An Environmental Impact Study and Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report have been completed and reviewed by the Township, Region and LSRCA, as well as other required agencies. • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff & the Township's engineering consultant. The study concludes the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|--|--|
| D. Martin cont. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any access to or egress from the development should be from Thorah Conc Rd 5 and there should be no involvement of MBR as a point of access. | <p>street system and traffic generated by the development doesn't add adverse impacts on the nearby road network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provincial and local planning policies direct communities to be connected by integrating new developments with existing neighbourhoods. The proposed road connection to MBR helps to improve interconnectivity between neighbourhoods from an auto and pedestrian perspective. Road connections are better with respect to municipal operations, waste pick-up and emergency services access. The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. |
| K. & S. Gilson May 23 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shocked to see proposal and extremely concerned of the negative impact on family and community that would be irreversible. The development is extremely dense focused on townhouses & semi-detached. This would have several negative impacts including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in traffic on neighbouring roads given high density of 86 units | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The revised plan proposes 63 units in total, consisting of 21 single detached, 6 semi-detached and 36 townhouses. Revised proposal has a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township's OP permits a minimum density of 15 units/ha with an average density of 20-25 units (OP 5.2.3.4). |

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|---|---|
| <p>K. & S. Gilson cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Negative impact to the health of the lake and those who use it due to pollution and runoff to the lake ○ Negative impact on the environment and biodiversity as it distributes the ecosystem of the area ○ Doesn't fit the community as there are no other townhouses or semi-detached units in the area ○ Health and well being of the current residents from increased noise, pollution and traffic, ● Ask Township to respectfully turn down this application. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff & the Township's engineering consultant. It concludes the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by the development doesn't add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. ● Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. ● An Environmental Impact Study and Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report have been completed and reviewed by the Township, Region and LSRCA. ● The revised plan includes 18 singles and 6 semi-detached units backing onto existing MBR. The OP requires new development to be compatible with existing neighbourhoods, which does not necessarily mean the exact same lot size. There is a range of lot sizes in the existing neighbourhoods and the proposed lots would be considered compatible with existing lots in area. ● A portion of the subject lands have been identified and designated for residential purposes since at least 1991 in the Township & Regional OP |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|---|---|
| <p>L. Reichert</p> <p>May 23 2022 May 30 2022 May 31 2022 June 1 2022</p> | <p>• 2 major concerns: Stormwater Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stormwater management plan is not viable. • Have no interest in plan to use my property for drainage from this subdivision. Very surprised to see it as the proposal. • In past 50 years, there have been several natural events that have caused some difficulties. Cannot imagine the terrible destruction that would ensue if my property was used as part of the proposed drainage for this subdivision. • Believe proposal must have a viable stormwater/watershed plan. • Against a stormwater easement being imposed on my property. <p>Community and Neighborhood Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical means in accordance with • Gentle means not harsh or severe • The Planning Justification Report say: “The proposed development represents a logical extension of the existing neighborhood along MBR and Cedar Beach Rd....” (p. 2) & “.. is consistent with | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report has been reviewed by the Region, LSRCA, Township & Township’s engineering consultant. It provides an overview of existing & proposed drainage for area. • The drainage pattern and characteristics were confirmed in collaboration with LSRCA. • The revised proposal includes an open naturalized swale with landscaping. • Existing drainage from the agricultural lot will continue to drain through the swale and across 44 and 48 MBR as it currently does, which is required per LSRCA policies, whereas drainage from the new subdivision will go to a stormwater pipe on Thorah Conc Rd 5 • 44 and 48 MBR should see a reduction in peak flows and stormwater volume because drainage from the new subdivision will flow to a storm sewer / piped outlet on Thorah Conc. Rd 5. • No easements or pipes are proposed on 44 or 48 MBR. • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township’s engineering consultant. It concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| L. Reichert cont. | <p>a policy framework that seeks to support gentle forms of intensification..” (p.41)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal to connect to MBR in any other configuration than for emergency vehicle access only indicates a glaring lack of comprehension of the neighborhood. • The proposal to turn MBR into an Indy 500 race track is a complete reversal of the logical extension declaration. • Any household in the southern 1/3 to 1/2 of the development is highly likely to take MBR as their common route of choice. • This adds a potential 30-44 households to a current traffic pool of 17 properties. • MBR & Cedar Beach Rd are destinations. Traffic is from local and area residents (both permanent and seasonal) or those sightseeing/exploring in nature. • There is considerable pedestrian traffic (of all ages) who use roads for walking in a cottage countryside, enjoying nature. • These roads are more heavily trafficked in cottage season (May to October). • The Traffic Impact Survey was carried out in the offseason in November 2021. • The Traffic Study has nothing really to do with neighbourhood. Its purpose appears to be solely concerned with whether or not a resulting usage increase is able to be accommodated by the type/capacity/ & intersection management of the roads. | <p>proposed development does not add adverse impacts on nearby roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study was done in accordance with industry standards and meets the Township’s standards. • The purpose of a traffic study is to model existing conditions, a future with the development, and a future without the development to determine the impact of development. • The study addressed seasonal variations in traffic volumes. • Provincial and local planning policies direct communities to be connected by integrating new developments with existing neighbourhoods. • The proposed road connection to MBR helps to improve interconnectivity between neighbourhoods from an auto and pedestrian perspective. • The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. • Road connections are better with respect to municipal operations, snow removal, waste pick-up and emergency services access. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|--|--|
| <p>A. Noordeh</p> <p>May 24 2022 Mar 17 2024</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposed development in quiet neighborhood. • This community was established over 75 years ago and some residents have lived here for over 70 years • MBR residents have enjoyed quiet, friendly, peaceful and safe neighborhood, while respecting the community at large, the environment, preserving nature and Lake Simcoe which we are protective of • We pay high taxes. We have the right to keep community safe, friendly & beautiful. • The proposal has no compatibility with the existing homes in the area. No study being done by credible urban designer to confirm compatibility with our community. • Need an accurate and in-depth study for the environment, traffic, parking, safety, noise, drainage, ecological, wildlife, effect on Lake Simcoe, as well as emotional effect on neighborhood and children, whose serene lifestyle would be changed forever. All these studies must be done by very credible unbiased firms and verified by the planning department, and planners and lawyers engaged by MBR residents. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • The Official Plan (OP) provides a long term plan for the community and identifies areas for development. • A portion of the subject lands have been identified and designated for residential purposes since at least 1991 in the Township & Regional OP. • The revised plan proposes a reduction in units from 86 to 63 and conforms with the policies in the OP. • Background studies and reports have been submitted and updated as needed to respond to comments. Township staff and external agencies, including the Region and LSRCA, have reviewed the studies and reports as part of the application process. The Township and Region also retained consultants to review certain studies. • The Builder will be required to provide detailed architectural drawings of all residential units to the Township for approval prior to any building permits being issued. Residential design will be subject to review by a control architect at the owner's expense to ensure development satisfies Township's design criteria, and compatible with surrounding residential area in terms of architecture and materials. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>A. Noordeh cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development should not use MBR as a loop to save some of its land. It should have a cul-de-sac with a lockable gate for emergency access only. • It should not have access to & from MBR. • The developer may lose a couple of lots, but the Township should look out for the good of residents, not developers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any housing with backyards facing west should have a solid fence and minimum 30ft green buffer that the developer must plant with trees and shrubs • Existing trees and bushes along MBR should be preserved regardless of the size. • The other issue is planting trees along the MBR – new trees should be a minimum of 10cm in diameter and the type of tree should cover from the ground up. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial and local planning policies direct communities to be connected by integrating new developments with existing neighbourhoods. • The proposed road connection to MBR helps to improve interconnectivity between neighbourhoods from an auto and pedestrian perspective. • The road design and subdivision layout does not facilitate or encourage drivers to use MBR. MBR would be a less direct route for the new residents. • Road connections are better with respect to municipal operations, waste pick-up and emergency services access. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • Some of the lots backing onto MBR are deeper lots depending on the curve of MBR, will provide a buffer and privacy. This is supplemented with preserving trees/shrubs and providing new plantings as shown on the Landscape Plan. • Species and size of street trees are provided in accordance with the Township's engineering design criteria. 10cm trees included in draft plan conditions for along MBR. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>A. Noordeh cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cross section of Reg Rd 23 and Thorah Conc Rd 5 is another critical point, especially the way that Conc 5 is angled and slopes down. It is hard to get in and out now, especially in the winter. Imagine another 150-200 cars using it everyday. • Intersection is dangerous, very serious, and life-threatening. It is irresponsible for Township to wash its hands and pass the buck to the Region. The Township and Region should work together for the good of residents and taxpayers. • Believe landowner wants to rezone land and flip it for maximum profit. No sympathy or care for MBR, CBR and Beaverton. • Shouldn't there be a background check on the developer? As well as the proper assessment of its actual community building, shouldn't these factors be taken | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. • The intersection at Reg Rd 23 & Thorah Conc Rd 5 is under the Region's jurisdiction. The Region has no plans for improvements and will continue to monitor the function and operation of the intersection. • Township and Region work together and Township can make requests to Region for improvements, but ultimate decision on the intersection is up to the Region. • Recommendations for this project are based on land use planning principles and the planning context as outlined in provincial, regional and local planning policy documents. • Technical reports & studies have been carried out by qualified professionals bound to a professional code of conduct. All reports have been reviewed by Region, Township, LSRCA and peer review consultants. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>A. Noordeh cont.</p> | <p>into consideration before they are allowed to move forward with any development?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solution - if developer permitted to develop 12-14 estate lots with low-level single-family homes, then: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Integrity and compatibility with the area will be saved and would keep Beaverton a quiet, beautiful Lake Simcoe community ○ Believe MBR and Cedar Beach Rd residents would be in favour ○ Land gets developed faster ○ MBR & Cedar Beach Rd residences would not appeal for tax reduction due to devaluation of property ○ Township can still collect high tax from MBR, Cedar Beach Rd and new development ○ Developer can still make a good return on his investment ○ Township would leave a lasting considerate legacy for generations • Disappointed that hardly any concerns were addressed after the public meeting. It sounds like a public hearing was held just for formality and not to listen to residents and taxpayers. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Official Plan sets out the long term plan for the Township and identifies areas for residential development. • Proposed development must conform with provincial, regional and local policies. Estate residential development (i.e. 14 units) would not conform with planning policies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many revisions were made to the plan in response to public and agency comments. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|---|--|
| <p>M. Keast</p> <p>May 25 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly oppose development on MBR • Proposal would increase density of residential dwellings in the neighbourhood. Current neighbourhood contains single dwelling homes on larger lots and any rezoning should be consistent with this zoning, not be for townhouses and semi-detached dwellings on much smaller lots. • The proposed 86 (and revised 63) units will put undue stress on traffic congestion in the area. Proposal will change cottage like area on Cedar Beach Rd to busy road, putting public safety at risk and affecting quiet nature of area. • The planned subdivision will cause unsafe traffic congestion at the corner of Thorah Conc Rd 5 and Reg Rd 23. This will be exacerbated by other developments on Thorah Conc Rd 5, Main St and Nine Mile Rd. Traffic on Cedar Beach Rd will also be negatively affect with this new development. A plan with single dwelling units similar in property size to existing zoning in the area would be compatible with local area roads and traffic patterns. • Existing residents pay taxes for quiet waterfront neighbourhood. Development should result in reassessment of taxes to lower amount. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised proposal includes 63 homes, with an increase in single detached units resulting in a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township's OP permits a minimum density of 15 units/ha with an avg density of 20-25 units (OP 5.2.3.4). • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. • The intersection at Reg Rd 23 & Thorah Conc Rd 5 is under the Region's jurisdiction. The Region has no plans for improvements and will continue to monitor the function and operation of the intersection. • The study includes the impact of other area developments, plus an additional compounded growth rate to account for increase in through traffic volume from unspecified origins. • Taxes are based on MPAC's assessment. Property value impacts are not taken into consideration with respect to land use planning matters (based on past OLT decisions). |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|---|--|
| M. Keast cont. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing infrastructure and community services in Beaverton cannot support the significant population growth in 3–5 years. What new infrastructure has been planned to accommodate this growth (e.g. water, roads, sewers, parks, recreation facilities) What is the projected growth over the next 10 years and how will this growth be responsibly managed? What new social services have been planned to service the new residents? E.g. police services, ambulance, schools, social services and health care | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brock Township is forecasted to have a population of 15,180 people by 2031 or population growth of approximately 2,140 people. The developer will be required to construct all the infrastructure needed within the subdivision (i.e. water and sewer pipes, roads, sidewalks, etc.). They will also be required to pay development charges at the building permit stage, which are intended to cover other growth-related costs. Development charges help provide funding for library services, parks and recreation, fire services, etc. and a portion is paid to the School Boards. Parkland is also being conveyed as part of this subdivision. Applications have been circulated to a number of agencies that help to provide services (including the School Boards, the Region, Durham Region Transit, etc.). All service providers take proposed developments into account as part of their planning processes. |
| P. Lombardi on behalf of MBR Ratepayers group May 30 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Client opposes the proposed development on the following basis: It is not supported by the necessary studies and because of this the application is premature and not complete; It does not represent good planning and is not in the public interest; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background studies and reports are submitted and updated as needed to respond to comments. External agencies and Township staff have been circulated as part of the application review process for review and comment. |

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>P. Lombardi cont.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not consistent with the character of the surrounding area; • It is an overdevelopment of the land and the density not appropriate for the area; • It is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020; • It is not an appropriate extension of the Beaverton urban area; • It does not provide appropriate access / egress to the subject land; • It does not conform with the Region OP and Growth Plan policy provisions; • It should not be treated or reviewed as an infill project on the basis that Beaverton is not a typical urban area; • It does not explain how density calculated; • It fails to complete a final EIS study that considers substantive impacts of the proposed development, if any, and neglects to recommend any mitigation / remedial measures, if required; • It does not take environmentally sensitive character of land into consideration; • It fails to consider any impacts of the proposed development on species at risk and their habitat; • It neglects to provide for the appropriate drainage and grading of the subject land. • It lacks an appropriate review of the applicable zoning by-law provisions and any required amendments thereto to facilitate the proposed development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A revised plan has been submitted, which proposes 63 units in total, consisting of 21 single detached, 6 semi-detached and 36 townhouses. • Proposed singles and semis along MBR provide an appropriate transition to the townhouse units along the east side of the development. • The revised plan results in a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township's OP permits a minimum density of 15 units/ha with an average density of 20-25 units (OP 5.2.3.4). • Township planning staff and the Township's planning consultant are of the opinion that this proposal represents good planning, is consistent with the PPS, and conforms with provincial, regional and local policies. • EIS updated and addresses species at risk. This study was peer reviewed by a consultant and reviewed by LSRCA. • The Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report has been reviewed by Township, Region and LSRCA and provides an overview of the existing and proposed drainage for this area. • A draft zoning by-law amendment has been prepared and reviewed to address the zoning by-law provisions. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|---|--|
| <p>M. Sullivan (LandPro) Planning Consultant on behalf of MBR Ratepayer Group</p> <p>May 29 & 30 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application is not in keeping with character of the surrounding area because it's mostly townhouses and semi-detached units in area of single detached dwellings • Application does not represent good planning and is not in the public interest • Not consistent with PPS and not in conformity with Region or Township OPs • Planning Report is inadequate • Subdivision design not adequately justified • Zoning changes not discussed • No analytical summary highlighting how application conforms with policies. • Application must address all appropriate OP policies, not just select policies. • Application didn't demonstrate why this location is appropriate for high density • Report missed OP policy 5.2.3.4 regarding density targets. • Application fails to meet OP policy 5.2.3.5 regarding residential development criteria. • Township OP lacking detail for residential density targets and relies on ROP. • Technical reports are over-simplified which may leave to confusion (i.e. EIS and FSR). • Lack of public engagement. • Application is premature and should be withdrawn or redesigned • Reduce the number of townhouses and increase the singles and semis • Remove the 3 singles on shared driveway | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A revised plan has been submitted, which proposes 63 units in total, consisting of 21 single detached, 6 semi-detached and 36 townhouses. • Proposed singles and semis along MBR provide an appropriate transition to the townhouse units along the east side of the development. • The revised plan results in a density of 18.6 units/ha. The Township's OP permits a minimum density of 15 units/ha with an average density of 20-25 units (OP 5.2.3.4). • All appropriate external agencies and internal Township departments are circulated as part of the application review process for review and comment. Background studies and reports are updated as needed in order to respond to agency comments. • Township planning staff & Township's planning consultant are of the opinion that this proposal represents good planning, is consistent with the PPS, and conforms with provincial, regional and local policies. • A statutory public meeting was held in accordance with the Planning Act. • The revised plan has more singles. • The shared driveway has been removed from the plan. |

*MBR = McLennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|--|---|
| H. Coghill May 3 2022 May 30 2022 June 1 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose proposed zoning • Live in area and walk on roads in this area • Over past few years, it is increasingly dangerous to walk on the side of the roads • Proposed development would increase traffic volume and risk to pedestrians. • Only 2 roads to permit access, which have their own safety issues. • Would like to submit a simple and basic calculation for you to consider. • MBR is 0.3 km in length. Cedar Beach Rd. from Thorah Conc Rd 5 to the first curve is 0.9 km & has 68 single detached homes. • Using a 3 to 1 ratio (length of road) there should be 22 to 24 single dwelling units on the land of the proposed development. • This formula would maintain the integrity of the existing housing density. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. • Traffic calming measures are an ongoing consideration of the Township for roads throughout the Township and can be considered at detailed design. • The revised plan proposes a reduction in units from 86 to 63. • The OP requires new development to be compatible with existing neighbourhoods, which does not necessarily mean the exact same lot size. There is currently a range of lot sizes in the existing surrounding neighbourhoods and the proposed lots would be considered compatible with the existing lots in this area. |
| L. Stevens May 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to houses here • Moved here from Toronto to get away from noise and traffic. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • A portion of the subject lands have been identified and designated for residential purposes since at least 1991 in the Township & Regional OP. |

*MBR = Mclennans Beach Rd

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|--|---|
| <p>S. Cross</p> <p>May 17 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with proposed development • Will cause more traffic on Cedar Beach Rd and Thorah Conc Rd 5. • If approved, a traffic signal would be required at Osborne St and Thorah Conc Rd 5. • No sidewalks in area and lack of public transit or taxi service. • Policing is another issue. Speed zones not currently patrolled and fast cars tear around every weekend. • Concerned infrastructure not in place for all development in the area, particularly water and sewers. • What about schools? • Only 1 grocery store that requires a car to get to. • There is a healthcare crisis in Beaverton. There is no doctor and wait list for nurse practitioners. Nearest hospital is 40 minutes away. • Is the developer providing park land or recreational facilities? • There is wildlife in the area, such as foxes, owls, coyotes, rabbits, raccoons, etc. • Town should not lose small-town flavour. • Growth is fact of life but should be studied beforehand. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township & Regional staff and the Township's engineering consultant. The traffic study concludes that a traffic signal is not required at the intersection of Osborne St and Thorah Conc Rd 5. • The intersection at Reg Rd 23 & Thorah Conc Rd 5 is under the Region's jurisdiction. The Region has no plans for improvements and will continue to monitor the function and operation of the intersection. • The applications have been circulated to a number of agencies that help to provide services (including the School Boards, the Region, Durham Region Transit, etc.). All service providers take proposed developments into account as part of their planning processes. • The revised plan includes a park block. • External agencies and Township staff have been circulated as part of the application review process for review and comment. Background studies and reports have been submitted and updated as needed to respond to comments. |

| | Comments | Township Response |
|---|---|---|
| D. Hanson May 30 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with increase in development noting deer sightings have declined • Concern for safety of children playing with increase in traffic accessing town • High density development is inappropriate in the south end of Beaverton. • Request redesign of the plan. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region's peer review consultant. • The revised plan proposes a reduction in units from 86 to 63 and conforms with the policies in the OP. |
| J. Longo May 28 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with large scale of growth and lack of essential life needs, such as doctors, health care, mental care, transportation, etc. • How is it a good idea to add more houses on top of what town has already? • Concerned with pollution to the lake, amount of cars and traffic on streets. • Cedar Beach Rd is already a busy street and not safe for children to play. • Do not think this is a fair place to build and hope we can put a stop to it. • Do not have a large amount of community support. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OP provides a long term plan for the community and identifies areas where development is permitted. • A portion of the subject lands have been identified and designated for residential purposes since at least 1991 in the Township & Regional OP. • The applications have been circulated to a number of agencies that help to provide services (including the School Boards, the Region, Durham Region Transit, etc.). All service providers take proposed developments into account as part of their planning processes. • The revised plan proposes a reduction in units from 86 to 63 and conforms with the policies in the OP. |
| M. Robertson May 30 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose proposal as presented. • Request independent peer review of environmental studies. Milkweed plants necessary for butterflies' survival has been removed. • Requested archaeological study. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed and reviewed by the Township, Region, LSRCA and the Region's peer review consultant. • Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment was completed. No archaeological resources were encountered. |

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|--|--|
| B. Bloxam May 30 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic study performed during peak weekday hours and doesn't reflect weekend traffic. Concern with anticipated increase in traffic. Request peer review of traffic study. • Concern with proposed stormwater swale model. Consideration given to 25-year plan in light of more severe weather events occurring? Proposed swale might not accommodate volume of water in future and would impact nearby properties. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by Township and Regional staff and an engineering consultant retained by the Township. The traffic study concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the abutting street system and traffic generated by proposed development will not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network. • Existing drainage from the agricultural lot will continue to drain through the swale as it currently does, but drainage from the new subdivision will be directed to a stormwater pipe on Thorah Conc Rd 5 that will be designed for the 100-year storm event. |
| G. Day May 30 2022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the enormity of the project, the change of character to the community, and the costs of building the infrastructure. • Where will there be stores to service these homes? Need stores to service the area • Brock should take the plunge and set the rules for the people of Beaverton. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised plan proposes 63 units in total, consisting of 21 single detached, 6 semi-detached and 36 townhouses. • The developer will be required to construct all the infrastructure needed within the subdivision (i.e. water and sewer pipes, roads, sidewalks, etc.). They will also be required to pay development charges at the building permit stage, which are intended to cover other growth-related costs. • Commercial uses typically follow residential development as the market expands. |

| | Comments | Township Response |
|--|---|---|
| <p>H. and J.P. Beaudoin</p> <p>May 30 2022</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth in Beaverton should be slow-paced and requires adequate services to be in place. • No more than the original plan for this area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Township and Region have to process applications in accordance with the Planning Act. • The applications have been circulated to a number of agencies that help to provide services (including the School Boards, the Region, etc.). All service providers take proposed developments into account as part of their planning processes. • No previous applications were made for this site. |