



6 Royal Cres
PO Box 188
Pain Court, Ontario N0P 1Z0
(519) 809-4539
oakviewlup@outlook.com

Date: March 30, 2023

To: Town of Kingsville, Planning Services
Attn: George Robinson, MCIP, RPP

RE: Summary of Feedback from March 28 PIC
RE: Seacliff Drive, Pt. of Lot 4, Concession 1 ED
Roll # 3711 310 000 24800

Author: Robert Brown, H. Ba, MCIP, RPP

Purpose

To provide an overview of the comments, questions and concerns raised by abutting landowners.

Background

The subject property is an 8.608 ha (21.27 ac.) vacant parcel located on the south side of Seacliff Drive, just east of Wagle Grove Drive. The property extends from Seacliff Drive to the bluff along the Lake Erie shoreline. The property was acquired by the applicant in May of 2021 with the intention of developing a residential subdivision consisting of 75 lots, 43 for single detached dwellings and 16 blocks to accommodate 32 semi-detached dwelling units on individual lots.

As part of the application process the Town requires applicants to hold a Public Information Centre (PIC) to provide abutting land owners the opportunity to provide feedback on significant development such as a plan of subdivision. A PIC was held on March 28th from 6pm to 8 pm at the Kingsville Arena. There were approximately 35 people in attendance including the developers, planning consultant and Town representative.

Feedback with Comment

Will Wigle Grove Rd be connected to the subdivision?

Comment: The plan as presented is to connect WGR to the new subdivision. The development itself will have its own access directly to Seacliff.

Why does it have to be connected?

Comment: Connection provides both WGR and the new subdivision with a secondary access point consistent with the Town's development standards.

Could the connection be limited to emergency access only similar to the connection between Timbercreek Estates and Lakeview?

Comment: This could be a consideration if the municipality is in agreement with this. That connection was made to resolve an existing lack of secondary access to Lakeview. Best practice though tends to be connection of subdivision unless there is some physical limitation to doing so.

WGR has been a road for quite sometime. Is this something that could be classified as a heritage road?

Comment: At the time of the meeting no information was provided on this however follow-up review notes that the Ontario Heritage Act does not contain any provisions for the designation of a road.

Traffic concerns along Seacliff

Comment: This is a concern with all development regardless of location. With more development comes more traffic. A TIS was completed and reviewed and noted that road improvements on Seacliff (a left turn lane) would be required. The study did consider current traffic volumes and future changes into 2032 but concluded that each of the reviewed intersection would continue to function at good levels.

In addition it was noted that there are a number of projects that have been completed or are in the works to improve traffic along Main Street including the realignment of Jasperson, improvement of Road 2 E and the planned West Side collector. All of these improvements are driven by ongoing development pressure and funded in part by that development.

Traffic impact on Wigle Grove Rd directly if connected to new development

Comment: The new development has its own direct connection to Seacliff Drive. Connection to WGR is done for two main reasons, to provide secondary access for the

new development and provide secondary access for WGR which like many other developments along Seacliff does not comply with the development standards secondary access policy. With its own main connection to Seacliff there is limited rationale to support any dramatic increase in traffic on WGR. For the new development to use WGR there has to be some advantage over simply accessing Seacliff via Street A. There is also assumption that all traffic from the new development will use WGR. There is no supporting rationale for this conclusion. Even if you considered this a possibility then you also have to consider that WGR residents are equally likely to take Street A to County 20 as it is a new road and full urban cross section with better site lines at County Road 20.

Status of East/West portion of WGR

Comment: Based on comment at the PIC the status of the road in this location needs to be confirmed, public or private. If private then who owns it?

Will WGR residents be required to connect to sewer?

Comment: No, no infrastructure is being extended along the north south portion of the road. Only a force main will be in the east/west portion and will not permit individual domestic connections.

Development should consider larger lots and fewer lots.

Comment: This was noted however it is important to keep in mind that provincial goals on all development is to take full advantage of existing designated lands to maximize their use. Continuing current development patterns that don't support or encourage greater density and housing variety is not sustainable.

Will WGR be upgraded?

Comment: It was noted that all roads and streets in the municipality are assessed and have a timeframe for when they will require repair or replacement. We are not aware of any planned improvements in the immediate future.

Environmental Impacts

Comment: Development of the property has required a number of background studies including an EIA and Species at Risk review. Recommendations from these reports will be incorporated into the development agreement if needed. All works complete to date have been undertaken consistent with the recommendations in those reports including any tree removal or bank stabilization. Additional restoration work will be undertaken on the shoreline to re-naturalize the area impacted by the shoreline works.

Existing laneways and tree rows.

Comment: Any existing laneways abutting the development will remain as is. Any trees that are located on adjacent lands can't be removed. Any trees on the development side will remain if they are not impacting on servicing works. Rear yard drains will need to factor in setbacks to avoid existing trees and root balls.

Impact of force main installation on ERCA lands

Comment: Construction of the force main will require permission from ERCA and can be undertaken in such a way to minimize impact to the ravine.

Impact on existing septic systems

Comment: Construction activities in the new development will not have any impact on existing septic systems.

Stormwater outlet

Comment: The stormwater outlet for the development is the lake. An outlet will need to be engineered and installed.

Erosion issues with stormwater run-off and ERCA ravine

Comment: Currently there is natural run-off that would impact on bank erosion however there has been recent work completed along the bank and a new stormwater outlet will collect, direct and control the flow of water through an engineered outlet. Any erosion issues in the ravine area will be up to the owner to maintain and address. This doesn't change as a result of the property development.

Future Erosion repair

Comment: The bank along the new development has been engineered to prevent long-term erosion. It should however be noted that ongoing maintenance of this will eventually be on the individual property owners who purchase the lot.

Who will be responsible for the force main once installed?

Comment: Infrastructure associated with most residential subdivision development is assumed and maintained by the Town. This includes water, sewer, storm and roads.

Can lands along the rear of the WGR lots be conveyed to owners that have maintained the lands for many years.

Comment: No

Will there be sidewalks?

Comment: Development standards require sidewalks on both sides of the new streets.

Will there be traffic lights at the new intersection?

Comment: No the TIS did not indicate a need for traffic lights, only a left turn lane

Was sanitary sewer connection considered to County Rd 20?

Comment: There is no connected infrastructure along County 20 to direct flows into the existing system. Sanitary servicing for this area in generally was always intended to run along the southerly end and not back toward County Rd 20 in part due to the natural fall from County Rd 20 toward the lake.

Has the sanitary system been designed to consider lands to the east?

Comment: At the time of the PIC this was not clear. Follow-up with Town staff confirmed that the sanitary main along the south end of the development will be oversized to service lands to the east. The pump station in the new development is also being oversized to accommodate future development to the east.

Price point of homes

Comment: Lots are around \$400,000. Sizing, style and type of homes will be up to the owners but constructed in conformity with the zoning regulations.

The subject lands were only recently designated and zoned for residential.

Comment: Based on a review of the former Gosfield South OP and Zoning these lands have been both designated and zoned for residential development even prior to amalgamation. They have been used for agricultural purposes but eventual development was the long-term plan.

What changes or improvements will be done to WGR?

Comment: Other than the sewer works and physical connection of WGR with the new development there is no planned upgrades to changes to WGR.

Timing of development

Comment: Construction is due to start as soon as approvals are in place. Developer indicated that road, water, storm and sanitary installation would take 84 working days to complete.

What are the next steps?

Comment: The general process and steps were outlined. The Plan of Subdivision and Zoning will both require Council approval. This will occur at a public meeting where residents will have the opportunity to comment.

What review has taken place with regard to former gas or oil wells?

Comment: The County of Essex planner requires that the developer provide documentation that this has been reviewed and the location of any wells (if applicable) is noted

Will there be a park or open space in the development.

Comment: Lands are being conveyed (Block 64) to the Town as natural area however there is currently no park planned for the development.

Will there be a sign for the subdivision (gateway feature)

Comment: There is not one planned however the subdivision agreement does require a temporary sign outlining the subdivision layout and details during development.

Affordable Housing

Comment: There is no provisions for this in the subdivision

How long will development take to complete?

Comment: This is market driven. Similar subdivisions in the area have taken 5 years or so to build out the majority of the homes. Complete build out could be longer.

Where will construction access be?

Comment: Access to the subdivision will be required off Seacliff and onto Street A.

Conclusions

The proposed development is a logical infilling of the area and has been planned as future residential development for many years. With much of the larger scale development having taken place to west it is good to see lands on the east side of the community start to grow. All developments, regardless of size, raise issues of concern and are not always well received. The subject proposal is on lots that are consistent with other development in the area, will be on full services and will help to introduce an additional form of housing (semi-detached). When connecting new development to existing development, particularly if the existing development has been in place for many years there is often concern with the impact of that connection. Overall the development represents good land use planning.

Prepared by:

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

Robert Brown, H, Ba, MCIP, RPP
Principal Planner
Oakview Land Use Planning