

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Lindsey Green](#)
Cc: [John Woodbury](#); [Brian Milne](#); [Barbara Dobreen](#); [Michael Sherson](#); [Martin Shipston](#); [Jason Rice](#); [Jim Frew](#); [Dave Milliner](#); [Clinton Stredwick](#); Randy.Scherzer@grey.ca
Subject: April 21st Council Meeting: Re Staff Report PL2021-032
Date: April 19, 2021 4:10:13 PM

Greeting Mayor, council, Ladies & Gentlemen:

Here is our original brief for the council meeting on April 21st to address Staff Report PL2021-032 Wilder Lake Subdivision. Attached is the Southgate website link for supporting documents and comments.

It should be noted we spent the better part of 3 days preparing this brief from documents on the Township website prior to 11:50am today. At that time 3 Burnside documents (dated July 24/20, Nov 11/21 and Feb 24/21) appeared for the first time on the Southgate website for C1-20. This just 2.5 hours after Mr. Caprini submitted an e-mail with his brief to speak at the council meeting. We are incredibly disappointed in the Township's tardiness in posting important documents given the high public profile of this application. This brief is the original and we have changed nothing. However, we will spend more time and forward an updated copy before the meeting.

<https://www.southgate.ca/en/municipal-services/planning-applications-public-notice.aspx#C1-20-H-Bye-Construction-Wilder-Lake-Subdivision>

Burnside Engineering Peer Review: Staff report mentions Burnside only in background information. Southgate link provides only the preliminary review. The preliminary review provides a number of issues that need to be addressed. Some include stormwater management, hydrology report, traffic study and street lighting. An in-depth final peer review document is not part of the public record. This is critical in the approval process and needs public scrutiny.

Ministry of Natural Resources & Forestry (MNRF) & SVCA Comments

Correspondence with Parry Malloy (Office of the Surveyor General MNRF) in March 2020 confirmed MNRF should be commenting on the Application since the lake bed is deemed vested in the Crown. To date no comments are part of the public record. Were they part of the original circulation for comment? If not have they been since?

SVCA: Staff report indicates the "SVCA initial comments have been resolved and are satisfied with the proposal" There is nothing in the public record to indicate this.

Camp Creek: The staff report mentions ground and surface flows to the west and north. "As a result, septic tank runoff would flow away from the lake and would not have an impact on the quality of the lake water". The staff reports ignore a significant water course that will be impacted by the development. Instead this would seep into the nearly 700m of Camp Creek that flows through Homestead. How can this potential septic runoff, fertilizer, road salt and such flowing into a significant cold water trout stream and eventually into the main Saugeen be considered acceptable? What about potential well contamination and liability? Comments in the staff report about existing septic systems around the lake indicates a need for a self-contained water treatment and sewage system for the development.

Golden-Brown Algae, Blue-Green Algae and Phosphorus: The issue of Golden-Brown Algae was summed up in 3 basic words in the Staff Report - check existing septic systems. These other 2 issues were absent from the report. Throughout Ontario these environmental issues are the plague of many inland lakes. The report inadequately addresses these issues.

Township Infrastructure Responsibilities. It has been proposed the Township take ownership of the 3 SWM blocks. As part of infrastructure this is a municipal responsible to own and maintain them. The Staff report the Township would prefer not to own or maintain these – WHY? Easement to the dock should not be part of Block 30, and it should be retained by Homestead and remain a separate entity or it becomes a source for potential Township liability. Such an agreement would allow Homestead to monitor all activities on the easement.

Density of Development: By definition a Lake Carrying Capacity study is critical and required by Grey County Official Plan. It has been proposed to be waived. There is also an OMB (now LPAT) ruling. **LAKE CARRYING CAPACITY STUDY** refers to a study comprised of various components which would predict the effects of lakeshore development on the water quality, fisheries and wildlife for a particular lake. The purpose of any study would be to determine the current state of the lake and to establish an upset limit for future development to ensure that the integrity of the lake environment is maintained.

Ontario Municipal Board Case PL151021 Feb 17, 2017 Using a specific formula Wilder Lake can sustain only 17.5 dwellings, there are currently 15. The OMB applauded this formula as ‘good planning’.

Subdivision Agreement: This was mentioned a number of times in the staff report. A draft of Subdivision Agreement should be in place now as to identify which issues such as short-term rentals, lot vegetation cutting and planting, dark sky compliant lighting to name a few, indicating how will they be addressed. **Zoning by Law:** Staff report mentions the removal of all cottages and the lodge? Does this include those the developer wanted to retain? Staff report mentions the need to grant frontage exceptions of the 3 lots. As stated before, it is an issue. What is the need to grant these exceptions when there are 26 other lots?

In conclusion, the Staff Report is incomplete and we propose the deferral of any further approvals until a The Burnside Peer review is made public, the MNRF and SVCA make their final statements and a peer reviewed Lake Capacity Study is carried out by a 3rd party and is paid by the developer. The other issues we have mentioned are also critical and need to be addressed.

Regards, Heather & Tom Arnott