

Other comments:

Coco Group: Comments on Section 7.2.2.1.5 Urban Residential Collector Road
Policies

Michelle Van [REDACTED]: Comments on Belle River Marina

Michael Laliberte [REDACTED] Consents and the Urban Fringe
Designation

Kathy Cottingham – Lighthouse Cove: Duplessis and Quenneville Association

David Black – property owner [REDACTED]

Patrica and Norman Vanier – [REDACTED] re-designation to Residential to
permit lot creation

Michael Parent [REDACTED] – re-designation to Residential (currently
Mixed Use).



Coco Group

November 16, 2020

VIA E-MAIL ONLY

Town of Lakeshore,
Community & Development Services
419 Notre Dame
Belle River, Ontario
N0R 1A0

Attention: Kim Darroch, B.A., M.P.L., MCIP, RRP
Manager of Development Services

Re: Five year Official Plan Review as it pertains to the Emeryville
Secondary Plan

Thank you for your e-mail dated October 26, 2020 with respect to the above noted study. We understand the Town of Lakeshore is making comments based on their 5-year Official Plan review, with a Public Meeting scheduled on November 17, 2020. In particular, you have proposed changes in Section 7.2.2.1.5 Urban Residential Collector Corridor.

As you are aware, we are large landowners in the Emeryville Secondary Plan Area, and the below policy significantly affects our approved development proposals. On behalf of 1156756 Ontario Limited and based on your e-mail dated October 26, 2020, please see our comments below in red with respect to your draft policy issues.

7.2.2.1.5 Urban Residential Collector Road

Urban Residential Collector Roads are designed with the dual function of carrying moderate volumes of local traffic to arterial roads, and distributing arterial traffic to local roads, while providing access to abutting properties. Urban Residential Collector Roads are adjacent to residential/commercial land uses and provide connections to local, collector and arterial roads.

The following will be the policy of the Town:

- a) Urban Residential Collector Roads will generally be two traffic lane roads with a road right-of-way width of 20 to 24 metres and be designed to carry traffic to and from residential neighbourhoods and act as the connector between local and arterial roads.

We have amended Phase 6 to reflect this matter.

- b) On-street parking may be permitted on one side of the road in the Urban Areas, although location and time restrictions may be enforced in specific instances; for example, adjacent to schools or during peak periods of traffic demand.

We have no issues with this policy and remaining will comply with the municipal requirement.

- c) ~~Direct access to collector roads, excluding Oakwood Avenue, will be permitted, subject to geometric design considerations.~~

As stated at a number of Public discussions with staff and correspondence, we maintain that Lakeshore has reversed its position regarding Driveway access onto Oakwood Avenue. River Ridge constructed the extension to Oakwood Avenue, and all the required services pursuant to the Subdivision Agreement dated November 2, 1999, the Agreement to Amend Subdivision Agreement dated March 13, 2006, and the cost sharing Agreement dated March 24, 2003, all ratified by Council.

Staff are aware well aware 1156756 Ontario Limited, has a Draft Plan Registered as of May 27, 1999 for Subdivision of Part Lots 3, 4 & 5 East Puce River Concession, Town of Lakeshore, County of Essex, Ontario. The approvals include, among other things, access for private driveways onto Oakwood Avenue.

We maintain the position that the lots fronting on Oakwood should have access for private driveways as initially presented, will have no negative impact on Oakwood. By prohibiting access, our development will have a significant negative impact on our property values. To simply state, the access to our lots directly from Oakwood was an oversight in the 2010 Official Plan is not accurate.

The proposed Emeryville Secondary Plan must remain intact as it pertains to our Draft Approval.

- d) In the Urban Areas, sidewalks will generally be constructed on one or both sides of Urban Residential Collector Roads.

All current proposals reflect this condition.

- e) Dedicated bikeways, separate cycling facilities or wider curb lanes are encouraged.

We have no additional comments on this condition.

- f) **Passive traffic calming devices are permitted, as required.**

We have no additional comments on this condition.

- g) **Typical traffic volumes on Urban Residential Collector Roads are generally between 1,000 to 20,000 vehicles a day.**

We have no additional comments on this condition.

In conclusion, our group has received all the necessary approvals and executed all municipal requirements over the years to ensure the appropriate development in the Town of Lakeshore. We object to any changes, which adversely affect our development as envisioned within the Emeryville Secondary Plan. Please remove the words "excluding Oakwood Avenue" from condition C, so we may proceed based on the Municipality honouring its previous approvals.

Sincerely,



Jenny Coco, CEO

c.c: Anthony Rossi

Kim Darroch

From:

Sent:

To:

Subject:

[REDACTED]
October 26, 2020 2:58 PM

Kim Darroch

Official plan comments

Hi Kim,

I am writing as unable to attend the meeting. I have reviewed the plan but did not find it detailed enough.

I did not find this specifically but was advised it has been recent news that there was consideration to build a second boat ramp at the Belle River marina. If that is the case, I do not think it is at all necessary and would be very costly... the money could be wisely used elsewhere. If this is because it was busy this year, that is most likely due to covid as boaters came from other areas where there was no ramp available. In normal times, one ramp is more than enough for this area.

Also, I am not sure if it is being considered but hopefully the plan will deal with the beach area under water when levels are high, require continual and regular clean up on the beach and more picnic tables on the grass would be great. There is also an issue with the whole area around the park that was very close to or covered in water i.e. the fishing dock, the bridge and the volleyball area behind the parking lot. They were a mess all summer. As water levels will most likely continue to rise and fall, these community areas must be maintained. We have this beautiful beach, park and marina area and it appears priorities are to create more and not take care of what is already there.

Thank you,

Michelle Van
[REDACTED]

Kim Darroch

From: Michael Laliber [REDACTED]
Sent: November 16, 2020 7:43 AM
To: Kim Darroch
Cc: Brianna Coughlin
Subject: Town of Lakeshore - Official Plan Review - Attendance and Opportunity to Speak

I wish to attend the subject meeting. I am particularly interested in the specific uses enabled by the Designations in the Essex Urban Fringe area and of any development, severance or lot creation plans for properties shown on Map 30. I may want to pose a question on issues related to the zoning of properties in this area and would appreciate your accommodation of that. Please also send anything relevant to consent requests and the adoption of the Official Plan to me at the address provided below. Thank you.

Michael Laliberte
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

Kim Darroch

From: Kathy Cottingham [REDACTED]
Sent: November 16, 2020 2:29 AM
To: Brianna Coughlin; Kim Darroch
Cc: KATHERINE COTTINGHAM
Subject: Fwd: Katherine Cottingham shared "Duplessis and Quenneville Presentation to Council Nov. 17 2020 1" with you.

Dear Kim and Brianna

Please find attached my presentation and honour my request to make a presentation on behalf of myself and the Duplessis/Quenneville Association. At the virtual council meeting for the Lakeshore 5-year plan on Nov. 17th. I also am requesting to make a presentation at the Lighthouse Cove Secondary Plan virtual Council meeting that I believe is intended to be held Dec. 15th or possibly the 17th. Please advise.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and all you do in these difficult times.

Yours sincerely,

Kathy Cottingham
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Katherine Cottingham [REDACTED]
Date: November 16, 2020 at 1:59:54 AM EST
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Katherine Cottingham shared "Duplessis and Quenneville Presentation to Council Nov. 17 2020 1" with you.



Katherine Cottingham shared a file with you

Attached please find the comments I wish to submit to the Lakeshore Council on behalf of the Duplessis/ Quenneville Association and myself. I also request time to present at the virtual council meeting.



Duplessis and Quenneville Presentation to Council Nov. 17 2020 1.docx

Open

 Microsoft

[Privacy Statement](#)

2020 11 15

24 Lawson Street, P.O. Box 370
Tilbury, ON. N0P 2L0

Mayor Bain and Lakeshore Council Members:

My name is Katherine Cottingham. I am one of the property owners on the Duplessis/Quenneville Roads of the Development Plan 1620 at Lighthouse Cove. I hope to appeal to council on my own and their behalf for its aid in resolving an issue that has gone on for over 50 years -despite efforts by property owners to resolve the situation and allow our property owners to build on their property.

With all due respect, many factors have played into the scenario that has seen these areas on designated public highways lie vacant as the only streets in the plan not developed:

- the normal passage of time as they awaited their turn for the developer to get to our streets.
- the fact that the developer went bankrupt unbeknownst to property owners.
- the lapse of time that resulted as property owners, who did their due diligence, and purchased with the confirmation by Lakeshore that theirs would be the next development to be completed and within 7 years of purchase are still waiting for that to happen.
- the harassment that these property owners faced when trying to enjoy gentle use of their property as they waited for it to be approved for development. -being told they could not enjoy gentle enjoyment of their lot, (even have a lawnchair on it)
- the harassment they faced regarding removing the approved sheds on their property (Sheds that were approved by Tilbury North and that would allow them to care for their property as outlined in the Lakeshore bylaws).
- the threat received that they had to remove docks which were approved by Oceans and Fisheries and complied with their regulations and restrictions.
- the frustration with the inability to contact all of the property owners to help resolve the situation due foreign ownership, death of the property owners and inaccuracies and lack of updates in the addresses on the role.
- the attempt to allow other developments to proceed but to prohibit development on our roads from being developed until sanitary sewers are approved for the area. (funding for sanitary sewers have been applied for and rejected multiple times -twelve times I've been told). Luckily County Council approved us keeping our properties right to build on sanitary sewers.
- the passage of time-since council's directive for staff to meet with us to help resolve the issues which was to take place once the five-year plan was done and before the Lighthouse Cove Secondary Plan was passed. A plan that is scheduled to be voted on in Dec. of this year.

All of this occurred as these property owners watched developments in other areas of Lighthouse Cove get approved and realized. We were given various reasons that our development could not move forward such as: one egress only, flooding concerns, even

priority given to surveying needs regarding the supposedly threatened fox snakes. All this as both infill and new development were occurring in other areas of Lighthouse Cove.

I am certain you will agree that these property owners have shown extraordinary patience in enduring these delays. Now they feel it is time to resolve this problem and are looking for your assistance in resolving it in a manner that is positive for both the property owners and the residence of Lakeshore in general.

The majority of those property owners that we were able to reach want to either build their dream homes on their lots or enjoy them now and have the area improved to the point that they are buildable lots. They hope they can recoup some of the expenses and taxes they have paid for negligible services over as much as 50 years.

There is considerable interest in developing the area as proven by three of our lots recently selling in two days. Realtors holding these sales were inundated with calls and inquiries. (I refused offers to sell my lots within the last month as well)

Given the incredibly unique situation in this area of the Plan 1620 development, we are hoping council will assist this group in resolving the issue of these abandoned lots and designated public highways. We would like to work with you in a positive manner to resolve this ongoing situation once and for all.

With respect to that we would like to see the following happen.

1. Assistance to the group regarding the actual location of these public highways and the requirements in putting in a temporary road. A reasonable request given that many roads in the Lighthouse Cove area do not appear to meet the necessary standards and need improvement. This would prevent us having to redo any improvements we make.
2. The ideal alternative would be to have Lakeshore assume the roads and bring them to the level that they will provide for the rest of the area. These expenses could be charged on our taxes.
3. Assistance in prohibiting encroachment on the road access to our properties.
4. Bylaw changes to allow sheds to be put on our properties before homes are built to allow us to care for our lots according to the mandates in the present bylaws.
5. Bylaw changes to allow temporary seasonable usage of RVs or trailers on our properties until such a time as development can take place or lots sold as buildable lots.
6. Public washrooms to be included in the Lighthouse Cove area due to the loss of restaurant businesses in the area which previously allowed use for tourists. This would accommodate and encourage tourism in the area.
7. Consideration to allowing some services to go in along our roads, such as electricity, in the interim.
8. We would like to see street signs go up on our roads.
9. We would like Lakeshore to consider acquiring some areas for public usage: ie beach.
10. Finally, we urgently request that the municipality advocate on our behalf to allow the development of this long-neglected area, not just infill.

We realize some of these will be addressed by the Lakeshore 5-year Plan and others by the Lighthouse Secondary Plan but feel the municipality needs to hear our commitment to the area and its development and make the necessary changes to Lakeshore by-laws and policies.

I respectfully submit this requested in-put to both the Lakeshore 5-year Plan and the Lighthouse Cove Supplementary Plan and request that I be allowed to present to council on both virtual council meeting dates.

Katherine (Kathy) Cottingham

Duplessis/Quenneville Association

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Kim Darroch

From: Brianna Coughlin
Sent: November 13, 2020 3:45 PM
To: Kim Darroch
Subject: FW: Comment regarding the Public Plan Review Tuesday November 17, 2020
Attachments: Lakeshore Council Comments REV - David Black.docx

Hi Kim,

Please see the email below, we've added him to the list of speakers.

Brianna Coughlin
Manager of Legislative Services

Town of Lakeshore

bcoughlin@lakeshore.ca



Remember to Like, Follow, and Share us on  and .

NOTICE: Due to COVID-19, Our Town hall is open to the public with limited services. In-person payments for municipal bills including tax, water, permits and applications will now be permitted with a limit of 1 person at the counter at a time. The Building, By-law and Engineering departments continue to operate at another location and are not available for counter inquiries. For further information about the pandemic, its impact on Town services and to receive emails on updates, [subscribe](#) to our webpage or check out our [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#) accounts for up to date

From: dbblack [redacted] [mailto:dbblack [redacted]]
Sent: November 13, 2020 3:36 PM
To: clerk <clerk@lakeshore.ca>
Cc: Kathy Cottingham [redacted]
Subject: Comment regarding the Public Plan Review Tuesday November 17, 2020

Please find attached comments for use in the meeting regarding the 5 year plan review.

These comments are specific to Lighthouse Cove, Schedule C9.

I am a second generation owner of property on Quenneville Drive.

I will attend the Zoom meeting. Please send me meeting access codes.

Regards,

David Black
Property owner – Quenneville Drive

Lakeshore Council

Planning Department

Public Input to Current 5 year plan – part of Schedule C9

I am a second generation property owner on Quenneville Drive in Lighthouse Cove. My parents purchased the property in 1969 and have recently transferred it to my ownership. There have been a number of meetings, public forums and presentations to council, but there has been very limited progress on a number of the fundamental challenges to enhancing use and enjoyment of our property.

BARRIERS TO BUILDING / DEVELOPMENT

- 1) Sanitary Sewer Systems.
 - i) At the Phase 2 discussion in Stoney Point acknowledgement of municipal sanitary sewer systems as the long term solution;
 - ii) The lagoons in Stoney Creek are shovel ready ONCE FUNDING IS ESTABLISHED;
 - iii) What additional funding is required to extend the systems to connection ready delivery throughout Lighthouse Cove
 - iv) With the COMBINED requirement, what genuine tangible sources of funds and the availability of the funds are currently accessible.
 - v) It was brought forward at the Phase 2 meeting that the Tilbury sanitation system has the capacity to absorb the load from Lighthouse Cove. Has any further discussion of this been conducted? Would this not be a more cost effective approach?
- 2) Septic Systems.
 - i) What plan is in place to remediate existing septic systems;
 - ii) Can a testing & validation system be established for all existing, and potentially future, septic systems to ensure that they meet current sanitation standards;
 - iii) For new or proposed building, provide a list of brands, models, or system attributes for new systems plus a test program;
 - iv) If septic systems do not meet the municipal test, the owner has a threshold period e.g. 6 months to remediate, after which the residence is posted on not habitable, til remedied.

ROAD INFRASTRUCTURES

- 1) Secondary access over the railway tracks – this has been a community safety issue in the case of emergency where the Tisdelle access is unavailable
 - i) At the Phase 2 discussion in Stoney Point, a second access was identified along Mariner's Drive; this would require access to and over the tracks and the purchase of some farm land on the south side of the tracks to accommodate a road.
 - ii) This is a CURRENT REQUIREMENT that does not depend upon any other activity. HAS ANY PROGRESS BEEN MADE ON ESTABLISHING THIS SEONDRARY EMERGENCY RELIEF ACCESS?
- 2) Existing road foundations
 - i) At the Phase 2 discussion in Stoney Point, there was a comment from a study performed that indicated that the foundation materials of Melody Trail were not suitable for current road construction. Has the balance of the roads been tested to assess the same alignment

- with current standards? Will this be a requirement for municipal sanitary sewer systems and therefore required remediation of all the roads in the development?
- 3) What will be the goal of road redevelopment for flood control and protection?
 - a) Will road construction result in higher road surfaces to provide further protection from road access flooding i.e. road heights raised 8" – 16" for discourage road access from being submerged and isolating residential lots from secondary flood from road access frontages.
 - b) Once Melody Trail is remediated, is the plan to perform the same updates / upgrades to each of the following ; Martin, Reaume, LeFaive, Rivait, Quenneville, Duplessis, Markham, Island?
 - 4) What interim plan can be initiated to provide use of the public highway property that is part of the official lot plans for both Duplessis and Quenneville;
 - a) A previous town planner indicated that part of the park encroaches on the public highway allowance;
 - i) Can both Quenneville and Duplessis have interim gravel roads established to allow access for existing owners to have reasonable access to their property
 - ii) Can a process be put into place to review this, with road and survey specs to assure that is interim road will meet future permanent upgrades
 - b) With the establishment of an interim road solution for Quenneville and Duplessis, what will be the requirement to provide municipal water and electrical service
 - 5) When road enhancements to Melody Trail are planned, can the opportunity be used to include a bike path. This would also be applicable to Tisdelle.

DEVELOPMENT VS INFILL BUILDING

There has been continued new residence building in the Lighthouse Shores area. This is considered infill. However, the Quenneville Drive and Duplessis Drive properties do not currently have tar and chip road surface and, with the exception of the Park Pavillion, have no residence or permanent buildings.

Property owners have an interest to use their properties in one of the following manners:

- 1) Build permanent cottage or four season residences;
- 2) With road access, allow season use of temporary residence such as RV's
- 3) With road access, allow casual use such as camping, cook fires' including overnight activity
- 4) With road access, build docks to secure boats
- 5) With road access provide a variance to allow accessory sheds to store maintenance equipment to make regular upkeep more accessible;
- 6) With access, allow for passive daytime use – swimming, fishing, skating, picnic etc,

Currently these are restricted uses (excluding (6)).

There have been a number of meetings to request updates on how to move forward. To date, there has been little more than public forum discussion.

THERE NEEDS TO BE A REASONABLE INTERIM PLAN TO ALLOW FOR THE QUIET ENJOYMENT OF THESE PROPERTIES. THE REQUIREMENT TO MEET WITH FUTURE ROAD CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS IN THE INTERIM, NECESSITATES THAT THE CITY PROVIDE MORE SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE. A

REASONABLE INTERIM PLAN FOR USES, SHOULD INCLUDE PROPERLY SURVEYED AND INSTALLED GRAVEL ROADS AND ANY REALIGNMENT OF PARK FACILITY ENCROACH ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY AS A GOOD FIRST STEP TO THE ENHANCEMENT OF THE AREA.

AS PART OF THESE DISCUSSIONS, THE CITY NEEDS TO PROVIDE CLEAR GUIDANCE ON HOW IT WILL PARTICIPATE IN ANY COST ACTIVITY ON THE QUENNEVILLE DRIVE PROPERTIES SINCE THE PARK CONTROLS APPROXIMATELY 40% OF THE ROAD FRONTAGE.

OTHER FLOOD MITIGATION STRATEGIES

Flooding challenges created by ice melt in the Spring are a continuing challenge to the area. Are there new or enhanced approaches to dealing with the ice jams and incremental water flow from Spring melt?

Are there any strategies in place to deal with surge to hopefully diminish short term flood damage?

I appreciate your time reviewing and responding to my questions and comments

David Black,

Quenneville Drive

Subject: Town of Lakeshore - Official Plan Review - Statutory Public Meeting (File: OPA-3-2015) - Registration of Delegation and Request to Speak at November 17, 2020 Meeting

Brianna Coughlin
Manager of Legislative Services
(519) 728 2700 ext. 235
bcoughlin@lakeshore.ca

Dear Ms. Coughlin:

As the owners of the property with the street address of [REDACTED] Belle River (identified as [REDACTED] on the Official Plan) who are significantly affected by the boundaries and Designations being proposed for the revised Official Plan, we respectfully request an opportunity to speak at the subject meeting to outline our concerns and request changes to the Plan. Our primary objective is to secure a change to the proposed Plan such that the boundary delineating the areas west of our property which are zoned R1-16 be moved to the east boundary of our property to provide us with the same benefits and opportunities as have been afforded our immediate neighbours. Some principal facts and considerations that we ask Council and its Planning professionals to address in responding to this request include the following:

1. Our property is less than 8 acres in size with approximately 2 of those acres used for the family home and an outbuilding to house machinery and equipment;
2. We purchased this property just under 50 years ago to house and raise our large family and as an investment for the future;
3. For many years, we were able to modestly add to our income and grow some of our food from the approximately 6 acres that we had available to plant and harvest a crop;
4. Our nine children have all grown and have built families of their own (most of them continue to reside in Lakeshore);
5. Our plan always was to raise our family on this property and then to subdivide the property to have willing members of our family reside in their own homes on the property, while raising some additional monies from the sale of the land to help fund our retirement;
6. My husband and I have developed very serious health issues that preclude us from doing any of the difficult work of farming ourselves;
7. In any event, a parcel as small as ours has become increasingly uneconomical to farm with the cost of seed, treatments, equipment, and repairs usually far exceeding any revenue to be earned from selling crop on such a small scale;
8. The Lakeshore Official Plan has provided our immediate neighbours to the West the benefit of a change from an Agricultural to a Residential Designation that has enabled them to build new homes on their properties;
9. Our neighbours on the North, with properties on the lake, also are afforded the benefit of a Residential Designation;
10. We understand that the Town must conduct its activities in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of the Planning Act and in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement, but there is nothing about our request that requires a contravention of these policies and changing the boundaries or Designation as we request is completely within the authority of the Town Council;
11. If you choose not to change the boundaries or Designation as proposed, my husband and I will remain trapped in a situation where we must maintain a property that we cannot manage or afford without any sustainable logic for the different treatment and opportunity being afforded our immediate neighbours.

Again, we respectfully request your attention to our request. If our request cannot be immediately granted, we would appreciate learning how we might overcome the constraints that the proposed Official Plan will continue to impose

upon us ~~and~~ how we might be freed from the very difficult position this Plan puts us in as a family. Please provide us with the registration details for the meeting so that we might effectively address Council on the 17th. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Patricia and Norman Vanler
[REDACTED]

Belle River, Ontario
[REDACTED]

Sent from Mall for Windows 10



Virus-free. www.avast.com

NOV 10/20

TO THE TOWN OF LAKESHORE
From PATRICIA + NORMAN
[REDACTED] VANICE
[REDACTED] Belle River

I REPRESENT BOTH OF US
AS LONGTIME RESIDENTS AND
TAXPAYERS. WE WOULD
ASK THAT THE TOWN WOULD
GRANT US REZONING OF
OUR SMALL HOBBY FARM 8.3
TO RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY.

WE ARE ELDERLY AND CANNOT
PHYSICALLY WORK THE LAND.

I HAVE APPROACHED COUNCIL
PREVIOUSLY OVER THE YEARS
TO REZONE AND HAVE BEEN
DENIED OR IGNORED.

I SEE FARM LAND BEING REZONED
ADJACENT TO US EAST OF
DUCK CREEK FOR EXAMPLE
THE SUBDIVISION (SEASONS)

I HAVE LEGITIMATE QUESTIONS
AND WOULD LIKE ANSWERS.

[Signature]

Kim Darroch

From: Michael Parent [REDACTED]
Sent: October 30, 2020 10:14 AM
To: Kim Darroch
Subject: Official Plan Issue West Pike Cr RD

Good Morning

Received township notice of the 5 year Official Plan review finally moving forward after 10 years plus. As you know I have sent in forms, emails, attended meetings regarding my objections to the mixed use corridor plan for mine and adjacent properties.

No one from the township has ever contacted me on the issue.

From my quick review of maps etc I see absolutely no change to your proposal.

This puzzles me because of the strong arguments against the proposal and the councils historic position on these lands.

Therefore in order to prepare for the council I need the following information from Lakeshore Planning:

1. Who exactly has decided to override councils bylaws and zoning decisions my requests and WHY? Is this our planning dept or a consultant?

2. Has anyone pointed out to the council that the plan ignores their specific zoning decisions on the properties in question?

3. Why do the maps not indicate flood plain areas on some of the lands even though ERCA will not allow any building?

4. What has ERCA communicated on your plan specifically to the zoning proposal on the lands in question?

5. Why were some of the council's zoning decisions folded into the plan and others ignored? Who made these decisions?

6. Please explain exactly the zoning issues with the properties. I am led to believe that lands are still zoned residential and will remain such. However, if the Official plan allows commercial zoning anyone can apply for any one of the properties to be rezoned commercial and the council could not deny that application.

7. I was also told by Huron County that the province requires all County zoning to match official plans and this is not what Lakeshore states. What is the township, Essex county, and Ontario's position of zoning matching Official Plans?

I would appreciate it if you forward me in writing all documentation (emails, letters, conversations, etc) on my issue. If I must make a documentation request to someone else please let me know by email immediately because we have no time to deal with Canada Post.

I will be registering as a delegate for the meeting.

To contact me please call or text [REDACTED]
email [REDACTED]

Thank you

Michael Parent
[REDACTED]

