

October 15, 2020

Re: Lots 247,248,249,256 on Plan 57.Subject to R283173 Blake St on Plan 100 closed by R274935 between Rock St and Hill St part of Hill St Plan 100 closed by R274935 designated as part 7 on Plan 57R6341

Dear Council members,

I wish to express my opposition on the principal of sale of the vacant land described above which is adjacent to Juniper St.

### **WHY**

We must protect our green spaces as once lost, they cannot be regained.

Development in a natural area, it is your duty as custodian of the land to minimize the impact on the natural environment through mitigation planning.

It is irresponsible for the City to engage in any conversation of purchase in regards to housing targets without conducting a transparent and engaging process with minimal impact to taxpayer dollars.

Hearing/Reading that FCHI already has **plans** in place and funding in place, ready to put the shovel in the ground in Spring 2021 implies conversations and possible agreements are in place even though the formal process is still to be conducted. This leads to objections, confusion, uncertainty for those who live in the surrounding area.

**A properly planned exercise is less costly than a rushed affair** such as legal cost, prevention of haphazard development and minimize unnecessary impact to the environment.

I understand the need for housing development but I believe it is vital to ensure that new development should include responsible development. It should have inclusion of the Fenelon falls residents and businesses. It is in tune with the surrounding area and does not put undue strain on local services and infrastructure.

### **Environmental Impact:**

This open green space land has a creek that runs in the middle of the property. The size expands and the land becomes waterlogged for long periods. The surface water flows “drains” directly into the existing watercourse network of **Fenelon River (Trent Severn Waterway)**.

Currently the land is important for wildlife such as Turtles. Turtles have been seen crossing our road. There is no report with reference to an ecology report on the effect of wildlife habitat.

Although the combination of the lots may seem large, the on-site green space shown is deficient in quality as it forms an odd shape triangle following site constraints, such as boundary buffers and the overhead power line easement throughout the property, creek running in the middle of the property and questionable road access.

Green spaces offer ecosystem services such as air filtration and noise attenuation, infiltrations of stormwater and replenishment of groundwater stores. Collectively these features can provide resilience to climate change-related stresses such as extreme weather events example: the effects of flood or drought.

**Potential Adverse Impact:**

Any development on this land could have an impact on the ground water levels which in turn could greatly affect the current residents of Juniper St. We the owners of Juniper St do not have the privilege as other residents to have access to the city water and sewers even though our property taxes contribute towards it. Therefore, many of us have incurred significant expenses to have wells and septic systems. This is not by choice but rather necessity. Although the city is aware of this, they have not provided us with the infrastructure provided to other residents due to budget constraints. Therefore, these wells are our primary source of drinkable water (access to water from the lake when untreated is unacceptable especially when the unexpected can happen such as the spillage of raw sewage). Well waters levels are supplied through the Aquifers in the ground. According to the Conservation Authority there is a waterway that runs through this vacant property. As part of the surplus review there should have been an environmental assessment to determine if any type of development is even possible.

If the City is pursuant in considering direct sale of the property;

I am requesting an environmental assessment be conducted. There could be 3 situations:

Development is not feasible: Property should be rescinded from the surplus land category.

Development is possible but the water wells adjacent to the property **may** be at risk for contamination, reduction in water level access: Property should be rescinded from the surplus land category.

Development is possible: As part of the contingency of sale of the proposed land should be that owner of the said property will be held liable for any development

that directly impacts the WATER WELLS AND SEPTIC SYSTEMS ON JUNIPER ST.

**FUTURE CONSIDERATION:**

The impact of any development on Juniper St needs to take into consideration access on Juniper St. it is not realistic for any moderate-large scale development. It is a small country road which is not likely to handle predicated traffic coming from the road. The safety of pedestrians (walking, driving, riding, motorized scooters/wheelchairs) on the road is of great concern given the lack of footpaths and road markings on the only pedestrian route into the village which is "inadequate to its size". This small road serves as the only vehicular access point for the current houses on Juniper St which is 19 Homes. If publications news is true (development of 90 units), it would increase from 19 homes to 180-270+ individuals accessing road which is too small for bi directional traffic ???????.

I am requesting a motion of reconsideration on the principal of direct sale of the property we are discussing today.

Thank you,

Sharon Larman