

Report No. CP 2021-343 - Attachment No. 1

Report No. CP 2021-343 - Attachment No. 2





Report No. CP 2021-343 - Attachment No. 3

Town of Ingersoll

Report No. CP 2021-343 - Attachment No. 4



Schedule "A" To Report No. CP 2021-343

CONDITIONS OF DRAFT APPROVAL – SB 21-01-6 – Erie Thames Powerlines Corporation

- 1. This approval applies to the draft plan of subdivision submitted by Reeves Land Corporation (SB 21-01-6) and prepared by Brooks & Muir Surveying, as shown on Plate 3 of Report No. 2021-343 and comprising Part of Park Lots 6A, 7A and 8A, Block 30, Plan 279, in the Town of Ingersoll, showing 8 lots for single detached dwellings and 5 lots for semi-detached dwellings as well as a reserve block (Block 14), subject to the following modifications:
 - a) That a park block be incorporated into the draft plan of subdivision to replace Lot 8 in a configuration acceptable to the Town and that it be conveyed to the Town of Ingersoll free of all costs and encumbrances.
 - b) That a 5 m (16.4 ft.) x 5 m (16.4 ft.) daylight corner at the intersection of Wonham Street and Holcroft Street shall be conveyed to the Town of Ingersoll free of all costs and encumbrances.
- 2. The Owner shall enter into a subdivision agreement with the Town of Ingersoll and County of Oxford.
- 3. The Owner agrees in writing, to install fencing as may be required by the County of Oxford, to the satisfaction of the County of Oxford Public Works Department. This may include the installation of a chain link fence surrounding the County Water Tower Property, and if required, along the lot line between Block 14 and the railway at no cost to the County.
- 4. The Owner agrees in writing, to satisfy all requirements, financial and otherwise, of the Town regarding construction of roads, installation of services, including water, sewer, electrical distribution systems, sidewalks, street lights, and drainage facilities and other matters pertaining to the development of the subdivision in accordance with the standards of the Town, to the satisfaction of the Town of Ingersoll.
- 5. The Owner agrees in writing, that 0.3 metre (1 foot) reserves abutting local streets shall be conveyed to the Town of Ingersoll as required, free of all costs and encumbrances, to the satisfaction of the Town of Ingersoll.
- 6. The subdivision agreement shall contain provisions indicating that prior to grading and issuance of building permits, stormwater management plan, a grading plan, erosion control plans, servicing plans, hydro and street lighting plan, along with other reports as required, be reviewed and approved by the Town, and further, the subdivision agreement shall include provisions for the owner to carry out or cause to be carried out any necessary works in accordance with the approved plans an reports, to the satisfaction of the Town of Ingersoll.
- 7. That Block 14 be dedicated to County of Oxford, free of all costs and encumbrances, to the satisfaction of the County of Oxford Public Works Department.
- 8. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, all lots/blocks shall conform to the zoning requirements of the Town's Zoning By-law. Certification of lot areas, frontages, and depths shall be provided to the Town by an Ontario Land Surveyor retained by the Owner, to the satisfaction of the Town of Ingersoll.

- 9. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, such easements as may be required for utility and drainage purposes shall be granted to the appropriate authority, to the satisfaction of the Town of Ingersoll and the County of Oxford Public Works Department.
- 10. The Owner agrees in writing, to satisfy all the requirements, financial and otherwise, including payment of applicable development charges, of the County of Oxford regarding the installation of the water distribution system, the installation of the sanitary sewer system, and other matters pertaining to the development of the subdivision, to the satisfaction of the County of Oxford Public Works Department.
- 11. The subdivision agreement shall make provision for the assumption and operation of the water and sewage system within the draft plan of subdivision by the County of Oxford, to the satisfaction of the County of Oxford Public Works Department.
- 12. The Owner agrees in writing, to prepare and submit for approval from County of Oxford Public Works, detailed servicing plans designed in accordance with the County Design Guidelines, to the satisfaction of the County of Oxford Public Works Department.
- 13. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the Owner shall receive confirmation from County of Oxford Public Works that there is sufficient capacity in the Ingersoll water and sanitary sewer systems to service the plan of subdivision, to the satisfaction of the County of Oxford Public Works Department. Confirmation shall be given in accordance with the "Protocol for Allocation of Water and Sewage Capacity for Development".
- 14. The Owner agrees in writing, to the satisfaction of the Town of Ingersoll, through the subdivision agreement, to ensure that all agreements of purchase and sale for lots abutting the Canadian Pacific Railroad of the existence of the Railway's right-of-way, the possibility of alterations as well as the possibility that the Railway may expand its operations, and that such expansion may affect the living environment of the residents notwithstanding the inclusion of noise and attenuating measures in the design of the subdivision and individual units, and that the Railway will not be responsible for complaints or claims arising from the use of its facilities and/or operations.
- 15. The subdivision agreement shall contain provisions requiring that each dwelling unit has been supplied with a central air conditioning system to be installed at the time of construction, to the satisfaction of the Town of Ingersoll.
- 16. The subdivision agreement shall contain a provision directing the owner and all future owners of all lots within the draft plan to a warning clause in all purchase and sale agreements and be registered on title advising owners of the existence of a water tower in the immediate vicinity as well as maintenance and potential upgrades to the tower, to the satisfaction of the County of Oxford Public Works Department.

- 17. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the owner shall complete an archaeological assessment of the subject property and mitigate, through preservation or resources removal and documentation, adverse impacts to any significant archaeological resources found. No demolition, grading or further soil disturbances shall take place on the subject property prior to the entering of the appropriate report on the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports and confirmation of same has been received by the County of Oxford.
- 18. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the Owner shall agree in writing, to satisfy the requirements of Union Gas that the Owner/developer provide Union Gas Limited with the necessary easements and/or agreements required for the provisions of gas services, to the satisfaction of Union Gas Limited.
- 19. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the Owner shall agree in writing, to satisfy the requirements of Bell Canada that the Owner/developer provide Bell Canada with the necessary easements and agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities where a current and valid easement exists within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost, to the satisfaction of Bell Canada.
- 20. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the Owner shall secure clearance from the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA), indicating that a sediment and erosion control report/plans, a stormwater management report that includes a water balance analysis and also that permit(s) have be obtained for the proposed development, to the satisfaction of the UTRCA.
- 21. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the Owner shall agree in writing to satisfy the requirements of Canada Post Corporation, if required, with respect to advising prospective purchasers of the method of mail delivery; the location of temporary Centralized Mail Box locations during construction; and the provision of public information regarding the proposed locations of permanent Centralized Mail Box locations, to the satisfaction of Canada Post.
- 22. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the County of Oxford shall be advised by the <u>Town of Ingersoll</u> that Conditions 1, 2, 4 to 6 (inclusive), 8 to 10 (inclusive), 14 and 15 have been met to the satisfaction of the Town. The clearance letter shall include a brief statement for each condition detailing how each has been satisfied.
- 23. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the Owner shall secure clearance from the <u>County of Oxford Public Works Department</u> that Conditions 2, 3, 7, 9 to 13 (inclusive), and 16, have been met to the satisfaction of County Public Works. The clearance letter shall include a brief statement for each condition detailing how each has been satisfied.
- 24. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the County of Oxford shall be advised by <u>Union Gas</u> that Condition 18 has been met to the satisfaction of Union Gas. The clearance letter shall include a brief statement detailing how this condition has been satisfied.
- 25. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the County of Oxford shall be advised by <u>Bell Canada</u> that Condition 19 has been met to the satisfaction of Canada Post. The

clearance letter shall include a brief statement detailing how this condition has been satisfied

- 26. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the County of Oxford shall be advised by <u>UTRCA</u> that Condition 20 has been met to the satisfaction of UTRCA. The clearance letter shall include a brief statement detailing how this condition has been satisfied.
- 27. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the County of Oxford shall be advised by <u>Canada Post Corporation</u> that Condition 21 has been met to the satisfaction of Canada Post. The clearance letter shall include a brief statement detailing how this condition has been satisfied.
- 28. Prior to the approval of the final plan by the County, the Owner shall provide a list of all conditions of draft approval with a brief statement detailing how each condition has been satisfied, including required supporting documentation from the relevant authority, to the satisfaction of the County of Oxford.
- 29. This plan of subdivision will lapse on December 8, 2024, unless an extension is authorized by the County of Oxford.

From:	
Sent:	
To:	
Subject:	

May 21, 2021 1:13 PM Planning; council Fwd: File No. OP-21-02-6. SB 21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders.

Good afternoon

We have found it rather disturbing and very disappointing that it looks like Lot #1 on the "proposed" zoning change for Wonham Street South has already somehow made it into the hands of a resident. Not really sure how this has come about but now along with a chicken coop (with live chickens), a sea container they also have moved they lawn furniture, trampoline onto the property only wish that the residents of Ingersoll could get proper answers to questions asked and also that deals would not be done without the proper channels being taken

I thought none of these changes to the property would take place at least until there was a public meeting to discuss the matter.

Just to have some answers as to why these things are taking place ahead of any decision would be nice

Thank you

----- Original Message ------

From:

To: planning <planning@oxfordcounty.ca>, council <council@townofingersoll.ca> Date: May 6, 2021 at 11:21 AM Subject: File No. OP-21-02-6. SB 21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01

Mr.. Ron Versteegen, Senior Planner

We are writing this to you with our concerns over the land change in reference to file No. OP-21-02-6. SB 21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01

We are opposed to having this land designation changed for Recreational Zone to Special Residential Type 2 Zone (R2-Special)

This property has been a home to wildlife in this area, there are Canadian geese, foxes, cranes, turtles, ducks and so many different birds.

In the winter this area has seen endless hours of children tobogganing and playing; in the summer they are kite flying, playing catch; just going out to play in a space that is available to them.

We are very much against having this area given up for more houses in Ingersoll. We have so many undeveloped areas for new development in this town – why are these not being finished

before taking away recreational land. Is there such a greed for more tax money that we take away from something that has a need in this town.

We do not feel there is a need for houses to be added in this area, to reduce more recreational land in Ingersoll, as there is a planned development on the golf course property to the south of Holcroft Street over to Clarke Side Road. Our golf course should not be taken away for housing either!

This land change from Recreational to Special Residential Type 2 should not have been considered by the Town of Ingersoll, it should have been stopped by Town council before it got this far in the planning.

One statement in the letter that we would like clarification on is how or when was this land designated as "Low Density Residential"? This property has always been zoned "Recreational" according to all zoning maps offered by Oxford County - this is confusing!

If Erie Thames Power (ERTH) wants to sell this land, why doesn't the Town of Ingersoll purchase this land and turn it over to the Park & Recreational department; very low maintenance, just have to cut the grass.

Questions:

1) Does Reeves Land Corp have a site plan/drawings for the homes/townhouses to be built on these lots?

2) On Lot #1 will the chicken coop and sea container be removed or left on the lot? Chicken's are not permitted in the Town of Ingersoll according to town by-laws. Nor are sea/shipping containers.

3) On the County of Oxford planning information the question regarding previous consent to sever or minor variances (#5) the answer is **YES** - on the Town of Ingersoll planning application the same question is asked and the answer is **NO - PLEASE VERIFY**

4) If site plans for the eight (8) single family homes on Wonham Street South & the 5 semi detached homes on Holcroft Street are changed for any reason does Reeves Corp or the Town of Ingersoll have to notify us and submit a new application for these changes? i.e. Allowing a severance to Lot #1 and having a garage built on it

It was brought to our attention that this first area (Lot #1) has been guaranteed to an employee of ERTH, which seems that this would be a conflict of interest by all parties. We would like a guarantee that the plan provided will be the last & final plan on this property

We are starting to believe that we may not have an option to try and halt this process; we are feeling that there may have been deals already made for this property. I truly trust that we are wrong in the assumption and that we will all be able to voice our opposition to this proposal at a Public Meeting.

A concern we also have is the plan shows eight (8) lots on Wonham Street South - with lot No 1 being up to the property line of an existing home to the north; should we lose our battle to stop this change are we guaranteed that there will be eight (8) lots as shown and not seven (7)?

In summary the elected officials for the Town of Ingersoll should turn this application down. This is not open space it is recreational - keep it that way. Harris Street, Clarke Side Road and Whiting Street subdivisions have many empty lots to be filled in. The plans to re-develop the golf course area as well should be turned down, but with being said this would be another large housing development in the Town of Ingersoll.

David & Gail Fitzmorris

•

Ron Verteegen Planning Committee Px Oxford County Woodstock, Ontario

Re: File # OP21-02-6, SB 21-01-6, ZN6-21-01

This letter is to confirm that WE<u>DO NOT APPROVE</u> of the land across the street from our home becoming a subdivision and zone change being approved.

It very upsetting to think after 36 years of understanding the land across from our home was green space or parks and recreation, someone wants to develop it as something different.

Our comments and concerns about this change:

The application for the zone change refers to the property as non used ground.

We have lived here for 36 years in a very close neighbourhood and this property is in use everyday. We don't see it as non used ground. It is used by either walkers, kids playing ,children taking a short cut walking to Harrisfield school, family entertainment ,wildlife, and photographers are only a few of the activities we see on this land. The season changes lead to many conversations by us, with other neighbours, visitors to our home when we watch the trees turn colour in the fall and buds develop on the trees in the spring. Being seniors this is something we all love and enjoy. These are a few of the reasons we want to see the land stay the way it is.

For us the openness of the property across the road, was part of the reason we purchased this lot. We were told by the real estate agent that it was land that would never be developed or perhaps a park area. For us this green area is the first thing we view in the morning and the last thing we view before going to bed. It is very calming.

<u>Concerns about this zoning being changed and being developed by Reeves Corporation and who ever</u> the builders would be on this property.

Years ago the town let a developer build homes in town and the houses were not well built and property owners had poor workmanship done in their new homes. It hasn't been mentioned who the builder is and we heard a story about a builder who didn't have the credentials but wanted to build in Ingersoll so he joined with another contractor so he could build here. The newest subdivisions in town have all had water run off problems so whats to say this will not happen as well. I understand the town council is well aware of how the homeowners feel about these problems. Ask some of the new homeowners in these subdivisions how they feel about the water in their basements because someone didn't do a proper study before construction.

<u>Concerns if houses are built on east side of Wonham</u>: There is no parking on that side of the road or sidewalks: A problem that has been constant on this street is when you don't have room for all your vehicles (3 or 4 drivers in one home) in your driveway, people are parking in front of the existing homes on the west side of the street. This makes it dangerous for backing out of the driveways as the traffic views are blocked, and the speed that some vehicles come up this road would make accidents more of a possibility. It also doesn't leave space in front of the houses for our own use. If you take a drive into the new subdivisions it looks cramped and closed in to see all the vehicles in driveways and vehicles parked out on the street. Takes away from the look of a residential street especially an already developed one as ours is.

Our mostly brick homes are established homes, we have all put money into upkeep and to now start with new houses with the size of 11M frontages is concerning. It has always been an open street and the proposal for 11m wide lots and 8 homes will not tie into the neighbourhood. On the west side of the street you have 6 homes and on about the same size of land you propose there will be 8 homes. Picture how that will look, it will change the neighbourhood look completely and we don't think in a positive way. Currently new homes have tall wooden fences surrounding their property which closes in the lots and doesn't allow neighbour interaction as much. This is not something we have ever had at this end of Wonham Street. The developer perhaps is not aware of the number of times the train passes by this piece of property and the whisle that blows first at Wonham, then at Holcroft, then on Thames. Needless to say at times is even irritating for us and we are further away than the planned homes.

Affordable housing on Holcroft

In this case does affordable housing mean county run housing or places built without the higher cost materials?

The word affordable housing is something that scares established neighbourhoods immediately. We feel unfairly. For some who can't afford to own or pay high rent, and are conscientious about their home, affordable housing is great and an asset to a neighbourhood. Unfortunately some are not conscientious and this then can run a neighbourhood down. We can see this in certain areas of Ingersoll. One of our neighbours suggested as Aylmer did to have a builder build some homes within a subdivision that are not as costly. The housing proposed therefore leaves us with a concern about the value of our existing home.

Application for a Severance:

It does not say who has applied for this severance or how much property they want severed, and what this land would be used for. Would a building other than a home be built on this property? We would like a little clarification about this and are we going to have to approve of this request at some time?

When I hear the word Erth, I think of green space or recreational space. Why not plant a few trees or plant something like lilac trees, this would beautify the area and help the environment.

Why does the town or oxford county think this property needs to be rezoned for building when there are already subdivisions started that are not all developed and the golf course proposal for a large subdivision that they hope to have development starting the end of 2022? Leave this town some green space.

In closing because we have been given the chance for our input to this request we again want to say we want to ask the County of Oxford and the Council of Ingersoll to reject this application, as tax paying home owners on this street we want the property across the street to stay as it is with no buildings on it.

Bonnie and Bill Knott



From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject:

May 6, 2021 4:30 PM Planning council Re: Wonham St.South, Holcroft St No. op-21-02-6 sb21-01-6& zn 6-21-01

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders.

----- Original Message ------

From: Date: May 6, 2021 at 1:20 PM

Questions regarding proposed low cost and affordable housing development in Ingersoll

How did the PUC of Ingersoll which later became ERTH acquire the above mentioned land from the town?

Was it sold, or just donated to ERTH when it was first started and what year did this happen.

If this land was sold, what price did the Town of Ingersoll get for it, and if just transferred to ERTH, why would the Town not give it to the parks and recreation dept. as it is has been zoned recreational since the water tower was built and has been used as a park by the citizens of town as such for many years.

Is there a Official Land Transfer document at the Oxford County Land Registry Office regarding this land, and if and when did this take place?

Since the Town of Ingersoll is part owner of ERTH, did it vote with the other shareholders to sell this property for the housing development?

Does this mean that the other municipalities that are shareholders of ERTH have a say in what the Town of Ingersoll does with the recreational land?

If the land was just transferred to ERTH at no or a minimal price would you agree that this is a huge windfall for the shareholders of ERTH?

If we have a price of \$60,000.00 per lot at 13 lots, that adds up to \$780,000.00 thousand dollars. Warren Buffet himself could not have made a better investment, if the land was just transferred to ERTH.

How would this large amount of money be used? Would the Town of Ingersoll get all of it, or would it be divided between the shareholders of ERTH?

Is the Town of Ingersoll aware that there is a application to severe a piece of land from the Recreational land by a employee of ERTH Corp.? If this is true, how much frontage is he asking for, at what price, and is he paying his own surveying and land transfer cost? Has the town approved his application?

Since the whole purpose for the sale of this Recreational land is for low cost and affordable homes would it not by highly unethical for the Town to approve the application for severance, when it could be used for a extra house or two? As a voting member of ERTH, would the Town have any say in this matter?

Has the town already seen and approved the style, design, and lot sizes of these low cost, affordable homes?

AS I have stated in my other letters, we believe the land should stay Recreational in its entirety and nothing should be divided off.

We would greatly appreciate it that you and the council of Ingersoll answer each of these questions as soon and as accurately as possible

Fred and Nancy Kaspersma

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Mary Hutt May 6, 2021 10:40 AM Planning Ron Versteegen, Senior Planner

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders.

Applicant: Reeves Land Corporation

File No.: OP 21-02-6, SB 21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01

Mr Versteegen,

We will not repeat but agree with concerns others have contacted you about in regards to the above. Our question is why does this land need to be developed? Financial gains on both sides we presume? This area is surrounded by new house builds and areas for new builds but not started yet so we are definitely not short on residential lands. How much more do we need? It is not mainly a matter of "not in my back/front yard" but a matter of using up whatever green spaces are left in this town to plop down some new houses only for the financial gains of others. Our neighbours and ourselves will fight this to the end. We are life long residents of the town of Ingersoll with my father, Alf Boniface, owning a store on the main street for years. It saddens me to see what the downtown core of Ingersoll has become. If I thought the mayor would listen to my concerns I would get in touch with him. However Mr. Comiskey is not very approachable and prefers to correspond by email and even then does not always get back to you, we have heard this on more than one occasion. If this change goes through we have had many conversations on what we would do. Moving has come up more than once. To another area in Ingersoll? We think not. It would be out of town and that saddens both of us but really who would care if they get what they propose. Are our concerns and those of our neighbours falling on deaf ears?

Thanking you for your time, Michael and Mary (Boniface) Hutt



August 26, 2021

To the town clerk,

Cc: Mayor Ted Comiskey

On behalf of many residents on Wonham Street South we would like to request to defer a discussion regarding the zoning change on the property on the east side of Wonham Street South planning file OP21-02-6SB21-01-6 and ZNC-21-01 until a meeting can be held in person instead of a virtual public meeting via live stream.

Some residents involved do not have computers, or are not equipped with the proper set up for this meeting. Others are uncomfortable to share their opinions this way about an issue that is so important to them.

We would appreciate a response as soon as possible .

Thanking you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Resident of 390 Wonham Street South

Ingersoll Ontario

Bonnie and Bill Knott

From:	Danielle Richard <danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca></danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca>
Sent:	September 2, 2021 10:19 AM
То:	Ron Versteegen
Subject:	Fwd: Re: Water Tower Land Rezoning

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders. Hi Ron,

For inclusion on the report regarding the rezoning application on Wonham.

From: Date: Wed, Sep 1, 2021 at 3:17 PM Subject: Fwd: Re: Water Tower Land Rezoning To: clerks <<u>clerks@ingersoll.ca</u>>

Original Message	
From:	
To:	
Date: September 1, 2021 at 3:04 PM	
Subject: Re: Water Tower Land Rezoning	

File op21-02-6, sb21-01-6 &zn6-21-01

I am writing regarding ERTH,s application to re zone the Recreational Land on Wonham St. South and Holcroft St. to Residential for the purpose of building a infill subdivision across the street from us.

When the Town of Ingersoll decided to form Erie Thames Power with other municipalities which latter became ERTH, the Town in effect gave all our hydro poles, lines, transformers, and all the other electrical equipment to ERTH, including the Recreational land on Wonham and Holcroft St.. We have to keep in mind that ERTH is a private for profit company with the Town of Ingersoll it,s largest share holder.

Ted Comisky the Towns Mayor states that the land around the water tower was under Erie Thames ownership, which latter became ERTH, and that technically the land was never the Towns. I would disagree, as this land was paid for by the citizens of Ingersoll in the past and that any land managed by the PUC, or Parks

From: Sent: To: Subject: Ron Versteegen September 3, 2021 1:17 PM planning@oxfordcounty.ca FW: FILE: OP-21-02-6; SB21-01-6 & ZN6-21-01

From: Danielle Richard [mailto:danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca]
Sent: September 3, 2021 11:33 AM
To: Ron Versteegen <rversteegen@oxfordcounty.ca>
Subject: Fwd: FILE: OP-21-02-6; SB21-01-6 & ZN6-21-01

----- Forwarded message ------

From: Date: Fri, Sep 3, 2021 at 10:50 AM Subject: FILE: OP-21-02-6; SB21-01-6 & ZN6-21-01 To: planning <<u>planning@oxfordcounty.ca</u>>, clerks <<u>clerks@ingersoll.ca</u>>

FILE: OP21-02-6; SB21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01 (Erie Thames Power Corp)

Oxford County & Town of Ingersoll

We do not understand why the Ingersoll Town Council would approve the application to remove/sell "zoned" recreational land and should not be permitted to happen. We have so much residential zoned land right now that has not had the development completed. The property owned by Auburn Development (Ingersoll Golf Course) is still on the planning table and this is only meters away from this recreational land. This is a very large development and will include single family homes, duplexes and a high density building (apartment complex).

Why should the resident of Ingersoll give up more recreational land – it is just not necessary in this area.

The concerns we have SHOULD this town approve the re-zoning are as follows:

Wonham Street South

The lot sizes need to be kept with the existing properties on.

This is an established area in Ingersoll and should be kept the same

It is not necessary to change an existing by-law to reduce lot width – lots can be reduced in number & then by enlarging the width they can conform to existing homes.

Holcroft Street housing -

How will these properties exit on to Holcroft Street? Hills on both east and west of the proposed area; railroad crossing right there. Winter conditions are terrible on those hills.

With a proposed High Density building right at the entrance to the new development taking over the golf course the traffic between these two development planning changes is just not safe for that area

There will be considerably more traffic on Holcroft and Wonham Street South and the existing

infrastructure (roads, sidewalk) cannot work

There are not sidewalks on Holcroft Street from railroad tracks east to Thames Street South

This has always been an issue

Our roads in this area will be a nightmare – has any consideration been given to how our roads will be impacted?

Other questions are how has the town planned for schools in Ingersoll to accommodate all the children that will be in this area? Between the development of the golf course area and now wanting to build on Wonham /Holcroft Streets the numbers are astonishing! Our schools are pretty much at capacity now with all the new and still developing subdivisions.

HOW MUCH RECREATIONAL LAND IS THE TOWN OF INGERSOLL GOING TO GIVE UP AT THE COST OF THE INGERSOLL RESIDENTS????

David & Gail Fitzmorris

--

Danielle Richard Town Clerk Town of Ingersoll (519) 485-0120 ext. 6229 and Recreation ultimately belong to the Town and it,s citizens. Given the Towns position that the land was never technically theirs, I suppose that the Town would not have a problem if the Dept. of Parks and Recreation decided to sell half of Victoria Park for a housing development. The Town owns all the land that the PUC and Parks and Recreation manage, how can it not?

The Town of Ingersoll willingly transferred this Recreational land to Erie Thames, latter to become ERTH, instead of transferring it to the Dept. of Parks and Recreation where it should have gone. The Town had a choice to keep it as Recreational land for the use of it,s citizens but instead gave it to ERTH, a private company run for profit. Most citizens of Town do not realize that this property belongs to ERTH and that they could get charged with trespassing if they go on this property without permission because it is now private property.

Another question I have is, why would ERTH even want this property? It is zoned Recreational so they can,t do anything with it. It has not been used by ERTH except for two small buildings that can easily be taken down to make room for housing. I can,t see why ERTH would want to pay property taxes, and the cost of cutting the grass, and maintaining the land just like the rest of the Towns Parks, unless there is some kind of agreement with the Town that the land would be rezoned to Residential in the future and they would be able to sell it and make a hefty profit for ERTH and the Town.

Well the future is here! With property values at the highest point ever in Canadian history, ERTH has decided that now is a good time to sell this land given to it by the Town, on the pretext that they want to build more affordable homes for the Towns citizens. Why would they not have tried to rezone this land years ago when the price of homes was a lot more reasonable?

So now all ERTH has to do is to get the Town to approve the rezoning at a council meeting. I think that this is likely to go ahead as it, s a win for both ERTH and the Town as it is a major share holder, but it would be at the expence of the Towns citizens who will loose the use of this Recreational land forever.

I think that this is a conflict of interest and that the outcome of this vote was predetermined between the Town and ERTH years ago.

The only solution for this problem that I can think of is for ERTH to cancel it,s request for the rezoning of the land and transfer it back to the Town since they should not have had this land in the first place. The Town could give the land Official Park Status so that we would hopefully not have more problems in the future.

The Town should also pay back ERTH for all costs associated with property taxes , maintenance , and insurance costs over all these years.

Fred and Nancy Kaspersma

_

From: Sent: To: Subject: Ron Versteegen September 3, 2021 1:17 PM planning@oxfordcounty.ca FW: FILE: OP-21-02-6; SB21-01-6 & ZN6-21-01

From: Danielle Richard [mailto:danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca]
Sent: September 3, 2021 11:33 AM
To: Ron Versteegen <rversteegen@oxfordcounty.ca>
Subject: Fwd: FILE: OP-21-02-6; SB21-01-6 & ZN6-21-01

----- Forwarded message ------

From: Date: Fri, Sep 3, 2021 at 10:50 AM Subject: FILE: OP-21-02-6; SB21-01-6 & ZN6-21-01 To: planning <<u>planning@oxfordcounty.ca</u>>, clerks <<u>clerks@ingersoll.ca</u>>

FILE: OP21-02-6; SB21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01 (Erie Thames Power Corp)

Oxford County & Town of Ingersoll

We do not understand why the Ingersoll Town Council would approve the application to remove/sell "zoned" recreational land and should not be permitted to happen. We have so much residential zoned land right now that has not had the development completed. The property owned by Auburn Development (Ingersoll Golf Course) is still on the planning table and this is only meters away from this recreational land. This is a very large development and will include single family homes, duplexes and a high density building (apartment complex).

Why should the resident of Ingersoll give up more recreational land – it is just not necessary in this area.

The concerns we have SHOULD this town approve the re-zoning are as follows:

Wonham Street South

The lot sizes need to be kept with the existing properties on.

This is an established area in Ingersoll and should be kept the same

It is not necessary to change an existing by-law to reduce lot width – lots can be reduced in number & then by enlarging the width they can conform to existing homes.

Holcroft Street housing -

How will these properties exit on to Holcroft Street? Hills on both east and west of the proposed area; railroad crossing right there. Winter conditions are terrible on those hills.

With a proposed High Density building right at the entrance to the new development taking over the golf course the traffic between these two development planning changes is just not safe for that area

There will be considerably more traffic on Holcroft and Wonham Street South and the existing

infrastructure (roads, sidewalk) cannot work

There are not sidewalks on Holcroft Street from railroad tracks east to Thames Street South

This has always been an issue

Our roads in this area will be a nightmare – has any consideration been given to how our roads will be impacted?

Other questions are how has the town planned for schools in Ingersoll to accommodate all the children that will be in this area? Between the development of the golf course area and now wanting to build on Wonham /Holcroft Streets the numbers are astonishing! Our schools are pretty much at capacity now with all the new and still developing subdivisions.

HOW MUCH RECREATIONAL LAND IS THE TOWN OF INGERSOLL GOING TO GIVE UP AT THE COST OF THE INGERSOLL RESIDENTS????

David & Gail Fitzmorris

--

Danielle Richard Town Clerk Town of Ingersoll (519) 485-0120 ext. 6229 September 4, 2021

Attention: Council Members and Ron Versteegen

We understand the File No:OP21-02-6,SB21-01-6 and SN6-21-01 simplified is: <u>Erth</u> (a private corporation) is the owner of the land on east side of Wonham Street and a part of Holcroft Street. Erth has a request from Reeve Land Corporation to purchase this land and rezone it from Recreational to Residential.

We are strongly against the change from recreation to residential

We and many in the community as tax payers want to ask our town council to support us in leaving this beautiful piece of property recreational.

The application says this land is un used and if you lived in this neighbourhood you would know this property is well used by Ingersoll residents and many have expressed they are concerned about changing the zoning.

Concerns:

<u>Changes the look of neighbourhood</u> – lots on west side (our home) 60 feet wide and plan shows proposed lots 36.08 feet. Rezoning would allow the proposed lot sizes on Wonham Street South to be <u>reduced to 11.0m from the</u> <u>towns approved legal minimum limit of 11.5.</u> New houses with established homes change the whole look of neighbourhood. Concerned that property is being rented out by Toronto purchasers and renters won't be putting money into landscaping and upkeep.

Speeding traffic – Traffic is heavy and cars speed up this street, there is a hill in road near Holcroft, no parking on the east side of street means more parked vehicles on our side of road. This blocks the view of traffic when entering the street.

No sidewalks on east side of Wonham – children in new housing have to cross busy road to walk to the bus stop at the corner

Open space will be eliminated- each season changes across the street are beautiful for everyone to enjoy and once homes are built that beauty will be gone.

In the document received it states there has been a severance application and our concern is what type of building can be built on the property.

<u>If this land is changed to residential –</u> we are concerned Reeves Land Corporation will change how he wants to build on this land and we will have no say in the matter

As tax paying residents, we have been given the chance to respond to the request to changing the zoning of the property across the road from us from recreational to residential. We are definitely against this. Our town does not need more subdivisions especially with the proposal for housing on the old golf course property. Check the comments on Ingersoll Voice and talk to the many people who have stopped us on our street and agree this land should stay as it is.

We built our home on Wonham Street South 36 years ago and at that time we (and other home owners on this street) were told by the real estate agent and the town hall office the property belonged to Erie Thames and was zoned recreational. For this reason we purchased land on Wonham Street S. Ingersoll.

I am sure by now you have read the letters sent earlier to Oxford Planning in early spring. Because we have learned more about this proposal some of our comments may have changed.

When I hear the word **Erth I think of green space or calming space**, why not plant a few trees or plant some flowering bushes (lilac), this would beautify the area and help the environment. If Erth is concerned about paying taxes why not make this park land.

Thank you for the opportunity to address our concerns and comment

Bill and Bonnie Knott

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Planning September 7, 2021 6:59 AM Ron Versteegen Ingersoll Clerk FW: File OP21-02-6,SB 21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01

FYI...

Shelley

From: Sent: September 6, 2021 2:50 PM To: Planning <planning@oxfordcounty.ca> Subject: Fwd: File OP21-02-6,SB 21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders.

----- Original Message ------

From: To: planning <<u>planning@oxfordcounty.ca</u>> Date: at Subject: Fwd: File OP21-02-6,SB 21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01

> ----- Original Message -----From: fredkaspersma fredkaspersma To: planning <<u>planning@oxfordcounty.ca</u>> Date: at Subject: File OP21-02-6,SB 21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01

I would like to know when the Town of Ingersoll owned the PUC, who paid the property tax on the Recreational land at Wonham and Holcroft Street ?

When the Town Council gave this Recreational land to ERTH Corp., who paid the property tax on it ?

Why did the Town Council keep this land give away a secret, and why didn,t ERTH post NO TRESPASSING signs on their new free property, because as soon as the Town Council gave the land to ERTH, it became private property and anyone on the land without permission could have been charged with trespassing? Did ERTH Corp. need this Recreational land to run their company? If so, how did they use this land to run their business?

It makes no sense why the Town Council gave this land to ERTH when they did not need it. Now ERTH wants to change the zoning from Recreational to Residential so they can make a profit from land it should have never been given.

The citizens of Ingersoll own this Recreational Land, not the Town Council. They should not have the right to give land to a private corporation without input from the towns citizens.

This was a very big move for the Town Council. The citizens of town should have been notified about the give away, and we should have had a vote on this matter because of the affect it will have on our neighborhood and all the people that use this land.

Once again the Town Council did not represent it,s citizens fairly, as they did it the past when the Town Council tried to build a microwave communications tower in front of our homes, without giving us notification, and we had to force the Town Council and Oxford County to have a public meeting.

The Town Council should be ashamed of what they are doing, and this Recreational Land should be given back to the citizens where it belongs and given park status.

From:	Danielle Richard
To:	Ron Versteegen
Subject:	Fwd: Fw: development water tower land
Date:	October 5, 2021 4:13:22 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders.

------ Forwarded message ------From: **Kristy Van Kooten-Bossence** Date: Mon, Sep 13, 2021 at 7:07 PM Subject: Fw: development water tower land To: Danielle Richard <<u>danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca</u>>

Did you receive the email below?? She said she sent it to the email link on the town website.

Kristy

Kristy Van Kooten-Bossence

NOTE: This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender and delete this email message and any attachments included.

Forwarded Message ----From: Arjan and Catherine Kouwenberg
To: kvankootenbossence
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021, 02:54:25 p.m. EDT
Subject: development water tower land

Hi Kristy,

Here's another go at this email!

I saw the FB discussion on the development of green space around the water tower. While I also hate to see loss of green space, no one can deny we have a housing shortage and affordability issue in the region. So my question is, "Why 13, detached homes? Why not 30, smaller, attached homes with a shared greenspace and walkable/cycle path?"

When I graduated from university in 1999 I could buy a nice townhouse in Guelph for less than 2.5x my starting salary. I think it's fair to say starter homes in 2021 are more like 10x salary. So I'm one of the lucky ones that was born at the right time and, on paper at least, I'm pretty wealthy. The folks complaining on that FB site have probably been homeowners for quite some time and have nice homes with sidewalks, mature trees and probably decent sized backyards. I see the housing issue as a generational fairness issue and municipal councils can play a huge role in increasing the inventory of homes at a price

point that allows people under the age of 30 a chance to get into the market without having to rely on downpayments from parents or grandparents.

There are some very nice houses going up in Ingersoll in the past 2-3 yrs but they are already too big, and therefore too expensive, for starter homes. And they are built for a 2 car, high carbon lifestyle. Long term I would like to see the entire municipal residential planning rules blown up to allow for denser housing on narrower, tree line streets centred around services and conveniences so they are less car dependent and more walkable/cycleable (is cycleable even a word, it should be but spell check doesn't like it).

My 22 yr old nephew and his partner recently had to leave Ingersoll when their rental house sold and they couldn't find another locally. They moved to London and are commuting back to Ingersoll M-F for work. So, not ideal but that is typical of what young people are facing.

So I am pro mixed use development in the core of our towns that focuses on smaller carbon footprint, less square footage and lower price points, even if that means losing some green space. This housing issue is one of my biggest concerns for the younger generation so I hope Ingersoll council will discuss how to tackle it.

Thank you!

Catherine Agar, Salford ON

South-West Oxford

--

Danielle Richard Town Clerk Town of Ingersoll (519) 485-0120 ext. 6229

From:	<u>Planning</u>
To:	Ron Versteegen
Subject:	FW: op21-02-6,sb 21-01-6&zn6-21-01
Date:	September 15, 2021 10:56:10 AM

From: fredkaspersma fredkaspersma Sent: September 15, 2021 10:09 AM To: Planning <planning@oxfordcounty.ca> Subject: op21-02-6,sb 21-01-6&zn6-21-01

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders.

Hi Ron

being that the zoom meeting on Sept 13 did not give all the people a chance to express their views because of technical problems and my lack of knowledge with the computer, i am asking that this letter be submitted to be read by the town council and the county.

my first question is what was the land zoned as in 1985 when we first bought our home on Wonham Street?

Question 2 is, If the land was not zoned recreational in 1985, when was it changed to recreational and why?

Question 3 is, when did Erie Thames Powerlines, or ERTH, become a private company?

Also, in the county of oxford official plan, and the town of Ingersoll land use policies book page 9.2-1, it clearly states that homes be built on Vacant Residentially designated lands, not Recreational Land. I don,t believe the government is forcing the town or county to build homes on Recreational Land in the town.

Another point is that the proposed housing plan is considered as a INFILL SUBDIVISION by your own rules in the planning book. On pages 9.2-14, 9.2-15, and 9.2-16 it clearly states that the proposal is not in line with our neighborhood.

To note, the proposal is not consistent with the street frontage, lot area, setbacks and spacing of existing development within the immediate residential area. Page 9.2-14

And also the proposal is not consistent where it states, that any new residential lots with direct exposure to a established residential street will be consistant with the size of lots within a two block area on the same street and new residential development will maintain setbacks and spacing between dwellings consistent with the established build pattern. Page 9.2-15 in the planning book.

We have a lot of support from the community to keep this land as it is, and our goal is to keep this land as Recreational.

I would appreciate a answer to my questions above, and also to let my letter be submitted to both the county and town council for them to read.

Danielle Richard
Ron Versteegen
Fwd: ZN6-21-01 - further comments
October 5, 2021 4:13:50 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders.

------ Forwarded message ------From: **Danielle Richard** <<u>danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca</u>> Date: Fri, Sep 17, 2021 at 8:27 AM Subject: ZN6-21-01 - further comments To: Ron Versteegen <<u>rversteegen@oxfordcounty.ca</u>>

Hi Ron,

Please see below.

------ Forwarded message ------From: Jack van Egdom Date: Fri, Sep 17, 2021 at 7:16 AM Subject: September 13 meeting To: danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca <danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca> Cc: fielderj31

Good morning Danielle,

After attending the public meeting on September 13, I have some additional concerns regarding the rezoning of the water tower lands, I would like to bring forward that I had forgotten to in the meeting.

These concerns include there being no sidewalk on Holcroft street, As it Is the quickest access to the hospital from our area.

Another concern I have is how these house will affect the water table and flow of ground water in the area. We have neighbours that have issues with water in their basement, and we are worried about disturbing the flow of ground water and having flooding in our basement.

I hope I am not too late to have these concerns heard, but if it is still possible to have these passed forward that would be greatly appreciated.

let me know,

Thanks, Jack van Egdom Mayor and Council Town of Ingersoll 130 Oxford St. (2nd floor) Ingersoll, ON N5C 2V5

Delivered via email: danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca



September 19, 2021

Re: Potential Loss of Water Tower Parkland

Dear Mayor Comiskey and Council,

Transition to Less Waste (TTLW) would like to take this opportunity to thank the Town of Ingersoll for its collaboration with our organization on previous progressive undertakings, such as the zero-waste initiative at the Canterbury Folk Festival. Ingersoll has also shown awareness of how current actions can impact future generations by opposing the importation of waste materials into a quarry area that would risk the safety of our drinking water. We believe that, like our organization, there are those on Ingersoll Council that share TTLW's concerns about the loss of parkland and greenspace around the community in recent years.

Toronto Public Health authored two reports, *Healthy Toronto by Design* and *Improving Health and Health Equality Through the Toronto Parks Plan*. This resulted in a 2015 report from their Medical Officer of Health outlining the many benefits to the public of greenspace retention and growth:

[T]he current evidence indicates an association between experience of, or exposure to, green space and the following positive health outcomes:

- Reduced all-cause mortality
- Reduced obesity
- Reduced cardiovascular disease
- Improved birth outcomes
- Reduced mental illness, including depression and anxiety.

Studies consistently find strong and significant positive associations between increasing green space density (of any measure) and cooling effects.

•••

Even modest increases in nearby green space density have been shown to improve health in vulnerable populations.

•••

Connected green spaces provide the most cooling benefits and green spaces that are close to

residences provide physical and mental health benefits. Well maintained green spaces are important for health.

Transition to Less Waste strongly believes it is in the best interest of public health to deny the applications for zone change and the applied for amendments regarding property frontage, that would see parkland that has been used for generations turned into a housing development.

Ingersoll's own by-law for Recreational Zone (REC) zoning does not support the insertion of a housing development on the water tower parkland, nor does the County Plan's Open Space designation.

The County Plan clearly outlines some of the many benefits of Open Space properties: Permitted uses within Open Space areas in designated settlements shall be limited to active and passive recreation including hiking/cycling pathways, parks, conservation areas, sportsfields, golf courses, swimming areas, arenas and other leisure areas. Additionally, depending upon the context of the OS designation, such lands can provide areas for the enjoyment of the environment in its natural state including the conservation of soils, fisheries and wildlife, the preservation of natural features which are distinctive and/or valued by the community; the enhancement of the urban environment through the introduction of greenspace areas, pathways and corridors into the built environment.

The Provincial Policy Statement also makes a strong case for retaining parklands, stating in section 1.1 that *Healthy, livable and safe communities are sustained by:* [*R*]*ecreation, park and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs;* [*and*] avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns; ...promoting development and land use patterns that conserve biodiversity; ...preparing for the regional and local impacts of a changing climate

1.5 Public Spaces, Recreation, Parks, Trails and Open Space

1.5.1 Healthy, active communities should be promoted by:

- 1. a) planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity;
- b) planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publiclyaccessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces, open space areas, trails and linkages, and, where practical, water-based resources;

We are asking that the Town go to bat for every child who plays on the hill in the winter, every resident who walks their dog on the property, and every senior and disabled person who enjoys use of or proximity to the parkland. We are asking you to consider the current and future residents of Ingersoll and how much they deserve the same access to publicly accessible

TTLW Comment on Parkland Development Proposal

greenspaces and parkland that you and your families, friends, neighbours and fellow Ingersoll citizens have enjoyed. The science is clear that greenspaces are a way to battle climate change and enhance public health. We know they are also a place to picnic, go sledding, spend valuable time with family and friends, and enjoy the many benefits to mental health, happiness and well-being, that those opportunities bring.

For the current and future generations of Ingersoll residents, we are asking that the application be denied. You have shown before that Ingersoll doesn't back down when it comes to the wellbeing of the public and the environment, please take this opportunity to prove that again.

With thanks for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

The Transition to Less Waste team & Michael Farlow, Acting President, TTLW

Mayor Comiskey and Ingersoll Town Council Town of Ingersoll 130 Oxford St. (2nd floor) Ingersoll, ON N5C 2V5



Delivered via email: danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca & mgraves@ingersoll.ca

September 20, 2021

Re: OEAC In Favour of Retaining Publicly Accessible Greenspace

Dear Mayor Comiskey and Ingersoll Town Council,

The Oxford Environmental Action Committee (OEAC) is strongly in favour of retaining all greenspaces within Oxford County. This especially applies to Ingersoll, a town that has rapidly seen the loss of parkland and greenspaces within the past decade. As an organization, we seek out environmental health issues – those in which the positive or negative impacts apply not just to the physical environment, but also to the health of people who live in or near that environment. In this case, the preservation of the Recreational/Open Space land by the water tower as undeveloped greenspace clearly fits the criteria for the betterment of the people of Ingersoll. Along with the improved health aspects of living near or using parkland, the policies of Ingersoll, Oxford County, and the **Provincial Policy Statement 2020**, also support the continuation of the property as greenspace.

During the year, the parkland is used by the public for various purposes, this includes seniors and disabled citizens viewing the property from their windows, people walking, picnicking, playing with their children, exercising their dogs, meeting to chat, coming together from other neighbourhoods, viewing wildlife, sledding, and other healthy and social activities.

> "Nature is beneficial to health but more importantly, it is essential to our existence".

> - Dr. Charles Gardner, Medical Officer of Health, Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit
Toronto Public Health produced an evidence review as part of their **Green City: Why Nature Matters to Health** document, in 2015, that concluded:

- Green space improves physical health, mental health and wellbeing of urban residents.
- Frequent access to nearby green space is important, especially for children.
- Nearby green space may provide added benefit in low-income neighbourhoods.

Since 2000, many studies have looked at the potential impacts of green space on health. Reviews and synthesis of the green space and health studies (Table 1) have been increasing over the last 10 years and the overwhelming evidence shows statistically significant relationships between health outcomes and green space.

These reviews suggest that the presence of green space in an urban environment is important for people's health for a number of different reasons. For instance, access to safe, natural settings has been found to have a positive influence on overall physical health and wellbeing, increasing rates of physical activity, fostering social connections and reducing stress.

Frequent access to nearby green space is important, especially for children. Children who live near parks and playgrounds are more likely to have healthy weights, improved cognitive function, reduced stress and reduced ADD/ADHD symptoms.





Green City: Why Nature Matters to Health, City of Toronto Medical Officer of Health, 2015

Table 8: Density of green space has been found to be significantly associated with several hea outcomes

Health Benefit	Related Study
 lower stress levels and a greater resilience to stressful life events 	Van den Berg, et al., 2010; Nielsen & Hansen, 2007
healthy weights	Lachowycz & Jones, 2011; Norman et al., 2010; West, Shores & Mudd, 2012; Bell et al., 2008
reduced morbidity	Maas et al., 2009a
reduced risk of cardiovascular disea	se Mitchell & Popham, 2008; Maas et al., 2009a
 lower risk of heat-related stress and morbidity 	Harlan, Declet-Barreto, Stefanov & Petitti, 2013
healthy blood pressure	Hartig et al., 2003
 improved cardio-metabolic health (reduced risk of diabetes, heart disease or stroke) 	Paquet et al., 2013
healthy pregnancy and births	Kihal-Talantikite et al., 2013; Donovan et al., 2011; Laurent et al., 2013; Dadvand et al., 2012

Green City: Why Nature Matters to Health, City of Toronto Medical Officer of Health, 2015

EcoHealth Ontario author Karen Morrison, Ph.D., produced Leveraging the Benefits of Green Space for Environmental and Public Health Benefits in 2017. It states:

Found in cities and the countryside, green spaces typically include natural areas, parks, community gardens, playgrounds, street trees, yards, agricultural areas, wetlands, forests and nature reserves. In addition to providing a wide variety of recreational opportunities and biodiversity, green spaces also deliver important ecological functions such as cooling, improving air and water quality, storing water during droughts, recharging groundwater and many more. The Canadian Health Association for Sustainability and Equality, authored **Health Benefits of Greenspace** and noted that:

Studies suggest that easy access to green space is an important neighbourhood feature for many people. However, land use planners have found that it can be difficult to preserve green space in the face of competing priorities and development pressures.

The Town of Ingersoll Bylaw

The subject property is zoned 'Recreational Zone (REC)' in the Town's Zoning By-Law. The REC zone permits a limited range of open space type uses, including (but not limited to) a conservation project, a golf course, a lawn bowling club, and a public park.

The County of Oxford Official Plan

The subject property is located within the 'Open Space' designation according to the Land Use Plan for the Town of Ingersoll, as contained in the Official Plan.

The Open Space designation applies to Regulatory Flood Plain Areas, Floodways where Two Zone Flood Plain policies apply, Conservation Authority lands, and other public lands, Earth Science Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, and parks, pathways, recreation areas and stormwater management facilities.

Permitted uses within Open Space areas in designated settlements shall be limited to active and passive recreation including hiking/cycling pathways, parks, conservation areas, sportsfields, golf courses, swimming areas, arenas and other leisure areas. Additionally, depending upon the context of the OS designation, such lands can provide areas for the enjoyment of the environment in its natural state including the conservation of soils, fisheries and wildlife, the preservation of natural features which are distinctive and/or valued by the community; the enhancement of the urban environment through the introduction of greenspace areas, pathways and corridors into the built environment.

The Provincial Policy Statement 2020, recognizes the need for green spaces:

1.1.1

Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by:

2.b) recreation, park and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs;
 8.h) promoting development and land use patterns that conserve biodiversity;
 9.i) preparing for the regional and local impacts of a changing climate.

1.5 Public Spaces, Recreation, Parks, Trails and Open Space

1.5.1 Healthy, active communities should be promoted by:

- *1. a) planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity;*
- 2. b) planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publiclyaccessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces, open space areas, trails and linkages, and, where practical, water-based resources;
- *3. c) providing opportunities for public access to shorelines; and*
- *4. d) recognizing provincial parks, conservation reserves, and other protected areas, and minimizing negative impacts on these areas.*

Recreation: means leisure time activity undertaken in built or natural settings for purposes of physical activity, health benefits, sport participation and skill development, personal enjoyment, positive social interaction and the achievement of human potential.

Rather than ERTH selling off the property to developers, and the Town of Ingersoll allowing development on publicly accessible greenspace, the OEAC offers the suggestion that the addition of native tree species in the parkland would be beneficial and assist in the promotion of environmental health. Adding native flower species on select areas of the property would also benefit the environment and neighbourhood by serving the role of beautiful pollinator gardens. The relatively inexpensive additions of trees and pollinator gardens to the property would increase benefits to public health while also addressing global heating and providing habitat for native species and shade for park visitors.

The OEAC suggests that it would be more equitable for an in-person public meeting to be held on the topic of the water tower parkland when it is safe to do so. This would allow people without internet access to participate in the process of decision making.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Crellin President, OEAC & the OEAC Board

Dedicated to the Children of Ingersoll

These comments have been prepared in the public interest on the topic of preserving publicly accessible Open Space/Recreational parkland in Ingersoll. We believe the retention and expansion of greenspace and parkland in Ingersoll would benefit the environment and public health, and that these should be top priorities for the Town Council, as we look towards the future of our Town.

Mayor Comiskey and Ingersoll Town Council Town of Ingersoll 130 Oxford St. (2nd floor) Ingersoll, ON N5C 2V5



Delivered via email: danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca & mgraves@ingersoll.ca

September 20, 2021

Re: OEAC In Favour of Retaining Publicly Accessible Greenspace

Dear Mayor Comiskey and Ingersoll Town Council,

The Oxford Environmental Action Committee (OEAC) is strongly in favour of retaining all greenspaces within Oxford County. This especially applies to Ingersoll, a town that has rapidly seen the loss of parkland and greenspaces within the past decade. As an organization, we seek out environmental health issues – those in which the positive or negative impacts apply not just to the physical environment, but also to the health of people who live in or near that environment. In this case, the preservation of the Recreational/Open Space land by the water tower as undeveloped greenspace clearly fits the criteria for the betterment of the people of Ingersoll. Along with the improved health aspects of living near or using parkland, the policies of Ingersoll, Oxford County, and the **Provincial Policy Statement 2020**, also support the continuation of the property as greenspace.

During the year, the parkland is used by the public for various purposes, this includes seniors and disabled citizens viewing the property from their windows, people walking, picnicking, playing with their children, exercising their dogs, meeting to chat, coming together from other neighbourhoods, viewing wildlife, sledding, and other healthy and social activities.

> "Nature is beneficial to health but more importantly, it is essential to our existence".

> - Dr. Charles Gardner, Medical Officer of Health, Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit

Toronto Public Health produced an evidence review as part of their **Green City: Why Nature Matters to Health** document, in 2015, that concluded:

- Green space improves physical health, mental health and wellbeing of urban residents.
- Frequent access to nearby green space is important, especially for children.
- Nearby green space may provide added benefit in low-income neighbourhoods.

Since 2000, many studies have looked at the potential impacts of green space on health. Reviews and synthesis of the green space and health studies (Table 1) have been increasing over the last 10 years and the overwhelming evidence shows statistically significant relationships between health outcomes and green space.

These reviews suggest that the presence of green space in an urban environment is important for people's health for a number of different reasons. For instance, access to safe, natural settings has been found to have a positive influence on overall physical health and wellbeing, increasing rates of physical activity, fostering social connections and reducing stress.

Frequent access to nearby green space is important, especially for children. Children who live near parks and playgrounds are more likely to have healthy weights, improved cognitive function, reduced stress and reduced ADD/ADHD symptoms.





Green City: Why Nature Matters to Health, City of Toronto Medical Officer of Health, 2015

Table 8: Density of green space has been found to be significantly associated with several hea outcomes

Health Benefit	Related Study
 lower stress levels and a greater resilience to stressful life events 	Van den Berg, et al., 2010; Nielsen & Hansen, 2007
healthy weights	Lachowycz & Jones, 2011; Norman et al., 2010; West, Shores & Mudd, 2012; Bell et al., 2008
reduced morbidity	Maas et al., 2009a
reduced risk of cardiovascular disea	se Mitchell & Popham, 2008; Maas et al., 2009a
 lower risk of heat-related stress and morbidity 	Harlan, Declet-Barreto, Stefanov & Petitti, 2013
healthy blood pressure	Hartig et al., 2003
 improved cardio-metabolic health (reduced risk of diabetes, heart disease or stroke) 	Paquet et al., 2013
healthy pregnancy and births	Kihal-Talantikite et al., 2013; Donovan et al., 2011; Laurent et al., 2013; Dadvand et al., 2012

Green City: Why Nature Matters to Health, City of Toronto Medical Officer of Health, 2015

EcoHealth Ontario author Karen Morrison, Ph.D., produced Leveraging the Benefits of Green Space for Environmental and Public Health Benefits in 2017. It states:

Found in cities and the countryside, green spaces typically include natural areas, parks, community gardens, playgrounds, street trees, yards, agricultural areas, wetlands, forests and nature reserves. In addition to providing a wide variety of recreational opportunities and biodiversity, green spaces also deliver important ecological functions such as cooling, improving air and water quality, storing water during droughts, recharging groundwater and many more. The Canadian Health Association for Sustainability and Equality, authored **Health Benefits of Greenspace** and noted that:

Studies suggest that easy access to green space is an important neighbourhood feature for many people. However, land use planners have found that it can be difficult to preserve green space in the face of competing priorities and development pressures.

The Town of Ingersoll Bylaw

The subject property is zoned 'Recreational Zone (REC)' in the Town's Zoning By-Law. The REC zone permits a limited range of open space type uses, including (but not limited to) a conservation project, a golf course, a lawn bowling club, and a public park.

The County of Oxford Official Plan

The subject property is located within the 'Open Space' designation according to the Land Use Plan for the Town of Ingersoll, as contained in the Official Plan.

The Open Space designation applies to Regulatory Flood Plain Areas, Floodways where Two Zone Flood Plain policies apply, Conservation Authority lands, and other public lands, Earth Science Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, and parks, pathways, recreation areas and stormwater management facilities.

Permitted uses within Open Space areas in designated settlements shall be limited to active and passive recreation including hiking/cycling pathways, parks, conservation areas, sportsfields, golf courses, swimming areas, arenas and other leisure areas. Additionally, depending upon the context of the OS designation, such lands can provide areas for the enjoyment of the environment in its natural state including the conservation of soils, fisheries and wildlife, the preservation of natural features which are distinctive and/or valued by the community; the enhancement of the urban environment through the introduction of greenspace areas, pathways and corridors into the built environment.

The Provincial Policy Statement 2020, recognizes the need for green spaces:

1.1.1

Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by:

2.b) recreation, park and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs;
 8.h) promoting development and land use patterns that conserve biodiversity;
 9.i) preparing for the regional and local impacts of a changing climate.

1.5 Public Spaces, Recreation, Parks, Trails and Open Space

1.5.1 Healthy, active communities should be promoted by:

- *1. a) planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity;*
- 2. b) planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publiclyaccessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces, open space areas, trails and linkages, and, where practical, water-based resources;
- *3. c) providing opportunities for public access to shorelines; and*
- *4. d) recognizing provincial parks, conservation reserves, and other protected areas, and minimizing negative impacts on these areas.*

Recreation: means leisure time activity undertaken in built or natural settings for purposes of physical activity, health benefits, sport participation and skill development, personal enjoyment, positive social interaction and the achievement of human potential.

Rather than ERTH selling off the property to developers, and the Town of Ingersoll allowing development on publicly accessible greenspace, the OEAC offers the suggestion that the addition of native tree species in the parkland would be beneficial and assist in the promotion of environmental health. Adding native flower species on select areas of the property would also benefit the environment and neighbourhood by serving the role of beautiful pollinator gardens. The relatively inexpensive additions of trees and pollinator gardens to the property would increase benefits to public health while also addressing global heating and providing habitat for native species and shade for park visitors.

The OEAC suggests that it would be more equitable for an in-person public meeting to be held on the topic of the water tower parkland when it is safe to do so. This would allow people without internet access to participate in the process of decision making.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Crellin President, OEAC & the OEAC Board

Dedicated to the Children of Ingersoll

These comments have been prepared in the public interest on the topic of preserving publicly accessible Open Space/Recreational parkland in Ingersoll. We believe the retention and expansion of greenspace and parkland in Ingersoll would benefit the environment and public health, and that these should be top priorities for the Town Council, as we look towards the future of our Town.

Danielle Richard
Ron Versteegen
Fwd: Water Tower Parkland Proposal
September 25, 2021 7:36:58 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders. Correspondence concerning development of water tower lands.

------ Forwarded message ------From: **Tyler Vincent** Date: Fri, Sep 24, 2021 at 10:41 PM Subject: Water Tower Parkland Proposal To: <<u>danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca</u>>

Dear Ms. Richards,

Please see my comments and the attached letter from my son. I would appreciate them both being included in the next Ingersoll Council Agenda so that they may be included in the Council's consideration regarding the water tower parkland development proposal.

One of the biggest disappointments of my young childhood was moving from Guelph, Ontario to London, Ontario. Being 10 years old at the time the disappointment was for the simple reason that London had barely any parkland, and parks were a big part of our family's recreation. Now that I'm older I understand this was because Guelph had carefully planned and preserved its green spaces as the city grew, while London had only tried to develop green spaces after it was too late.

Hearing of the Water Tower parkland potentially being sold for development feels like the same sort of mistake. In the 10+ years I've lived here I've continuously seen our green spaces shrink and disappear in favour of new developments. I appreciate the need for density in city planning. I also appreciate that housing in Ingersoll is in demand and there is a shortage. However, these are short term problems. Erasing parkland is something that cannot be easily taken back, and without care it's easy to nibble away at these spaces one small development at a time until there is very little left. I would urge the council to reconsider developing this land and preserve it for future generations to enjoy.

Sincerely,

Tyler Vincent Ingersoll, ON

--

Danielle Richard Town Clerk Town of Ingersoll (519) 485-0120 ext. 6229

Dear mayor and Town council. I've had very much fun Sidding and hanging gut at the recreational area by the water tower. I would reall Y got (ikpit if it was turned info d residential area, and other people wouldn't like it cither. For years I've been siedding there with my my family and have had a lot of fun Every winter. Please do not tur thisquesome place to sign into a residential area. Animals use this Park too, prease don't take it guay From them. We need nature, Build houses 50 newhere PISE. Sincerely, AQUINA. 1 1.1.1.2 Hilroy

Attn: Mayor and Council Town of Ingersoll 2nd floor, 130 Oxford St. Ingersoll, Ontario N5C 2V5

Emailed to: danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca

September 26, 2021

Regarding: Rezoning Water Tower from Open Space/Recreational to Residential

Dear Mayor and Council,

Oxford Green Watch (OGW) is a local environmental organization that identifies opportunities for the environment to be preserved for human health and enjoyment. We believe that the economy of the future is one that prevents health issues through a healthy environment, provides health and leisure services and opportunities, and where a wide variety of eco-friendly industries provide employment, such as and eco-tourism.

OXFORD GREEN

WATCH

OGW is writing this letter today to let you know that our organization wholly believes that the preservation of parkland is not only for the benefit of current Ingersoll residents, but is the legacy we leave for the generations to follow. What we choose now as a town and residents will show them what we value. Is it profits for ERTH Corp. which is owned by Ingersoll and our neighbours? Or is it the retention and enhancement of existing parkland that is zoned Recreational and designated as Open Space. This zoning by-law and designation were put in place to reserve parts of Ingersoll's land use for public health and recreation, and to support the natural environment.

The Provincial Policy Statement encourages Ontario's communities to be mindful of the provision and preservation of the type of Recreational and Open Space parkland that is being considered by your council.

Section 1.1 says that Healthy, livable and safe communities are sustained by: [R]ecreation, park and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs; avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns.

And section 1.5, Public Spaces, Recreation, Parks, Trails and Open Space says:

1.5.1 Healthy, active communities should be promoted by:

1. a) planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity;

2. b) planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publiclyaccessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces, open space areas, trails and linkages, and, where practical, water-based resources;

Currently the neighbourhood is threatened with the loss of the treed Open Space golf course area, as well as this water-tower parkland. The loss of these two areas would mean the only parkland in the area would be the Lion's Park, a small playground, that while valuable, lacks the opportunities multi-use parkland like the water-tower property provide.



Photo from Google Earth Maps

Parks and Recreation Ontario provides the following information on recreational/parkland in Ontario, taken from a survey of Ontarians:

Ontario residents put high value on their local recreation and parks services. This message comes through loud and clear in the results reported as Findings are as follows:

- 1) For the first time, leisure trumps work in importance
- 2) Leisure contributes to overall health and happiness
- 3) Most Ontario residents live within walking distance of a park or green space
- 4) Eight in every 10 households use public parks

5) Nearly every Ontario household realizes benefits from local public parks, including those who never use parks.

6) Four in every 10 Ontario residents take advantage of local public recreation services

7) Even those who don't participate in recreation say they benefit

8) Ontario residents depend on public and community agencies for recreation

9) Recreation and parks are not just for children. Parks use is spread almost equally across all ages and involvement in recreation continues strong until late in life.

10) Most Ontario residents would pay more taxes for upgraded public recreation services

11) The vast majority believes recreation and parks are essential services that benefit the entire community

12) Nearly all Ontario residents recognize that losing public parks, recreation programs or facilities would have a significant negative impact.

13) Ontario residents overwhelmingly recognize that recreation and parks boost social cohesion and quality of life.

14) There's strong agreement that recreation contributes to health and well-being

15) Ontario residents are especially adamant about the role of recreation and parks in fostering healthy children.

16) Over three-quarters of Ontario Residents agree that recreation is an antidote to crime.17) The majority of Ontario residents agrees that recreation contributes to environmental stewardship.

SUMMARY

People of means are better able to access recreation and parks services, no matter who the provider. All recreation providers need to ensure that everyone shares in the benefits associated with engaging in parks, recreation and leisure services.

- 1) Recreation is important in the "work-life balance."
- 2) Ontarians seek recreation opportunities in their communities.
- *3) Recreation needs to be accessible to everyone*
- 4) All Ontarians benefit from parks and recreation.
- 5) Most people are willing to pay for public recreation and parks
- 6) Ontarians understand the wider benefits of parks and recreation
- 7) Public space is vital to community health.

8) Participating in recreation is a key determinant of health status and quality of life.

9) Local parks and recreation services have a vital impact on community and social development.

Harper, J., Godbey, Geoffrey, Greenslade, Loreley, et al. (2009). *Recreation and Parks* - *Essential for Quality of Life. Use and Benefits of Local Government Recreation and Parks Services: An Ontario Perspective - Research Summary*

Neighbours of the water-tower parkland have written letters, erected signage, and spoken to council about their use of the parkland and belief that it should be retained for public use. OGW agrees with these residents, and also speaks up for others in the community who use the green

space for recreational uses all year long, and engage socially there with friends and family.

We are asking that the Town of Ingersoll hold a public meeting on the potential rezoning of the land from Recreational/Open Space to Residential, when and where it is physically safe to do so, following COVID safety protocols. Seniors and those with disabilities in the community need to be provided with alternative ways to make their thoughts known to the Town, such as door-to door surveying that uses clear language to explain that ERTH Corp.'s sale of the property to a developer would mean the permanent loss of publicly accessible green space in their community.

In summary, Oxford Green Watch opposes the amendments and re-zoning asked for in the application for ERTH Corp. (partially owned by Ingersoll) to sell the property to a developer for use as a residential area. OGW stands with the community in asking that the property be retained as publicly accessible parkland, a commodity that is becoming increasingly rare in Ingersoll.

With thanks for your consideration of our comments, provided in the interest of the public good.

Sincerely,

Reed Elliott President, Oxford Green Watch September 28, 2021

Re: re-zoning application for water-tower parkland

Dear Mayor Comiskey, Deputy Mayor Freeman and Councilors Bowman, Eus, Van Kooten-Bossence, Lesser, and Petrie,

I spent my childhood growing up in Ingersoll, and my husband and I now raise our son here. In the strange times we are in due to the Covid pandemic, publicly accessible outdoor space has become even more important to our family and others in town. Hearing that Ingersoll may lose another park to development is extremely disappointing. Like many families in Ingersoll, we have used the parkland for generations. Our son and his cousins have many happy memories of sledding on the water-tower hill. When we rented a home in the neighbourhood in the past, we walked down Holcroft St. and into the park every season of the year along with countless others out with their children, walking their dogs, or meeting up with friends.

This land is used every day of the year by many, and is of value to the neighbourhood and our entire community. You have policies at the Municipal, County, and Provincial level that all support this land remaining parkland. You may also have the first-hand knowledge that playing in that park is fun; that it brings joy. You may have taken your own kids there to play and know that running, sledding and walking through that parkland helped them grow up healthy and made for some great recreational time with your friends and family. Today I'm asking you to give Ingersoll's residents, current and future, the same opportunities we had. I'm asking you to turn down the application to allow amendments, and turn down the proposed zone-change that would remove the Recreational zoning and replace it with a residential development.

Report CP 2021-281 lays out the Town Bylaw's Recreational Zone permitted uses, and the allowable uses within the County Plan's Open Space designation. It also provides a point form of some of the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS). The PPS has additional clauses that apply to Recreational and Open Space properties that support keeping Ingersoll's parkland intact.

PPS:

1.1.1

Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by:

2.b) recreation, park and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs;
 8.h) promoting development and land use patterns that conserve biodiversity;
 9.i) preparing for the regional and local impacts of a changing climate.

1.5 Public Spaces, Recreation, Parks, Trails and Open Space

1.5.1 Healthy, active communities should be promoted by:

- 1. a) planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity;
- 2. b) planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publiclyaccessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces, open space areas, trails and linkages, and, where practical, water-based resources;
- 3. c) providing opportunities for public access to shorelines; and
- 4. d) recognizing provincial parks, conservation reserves, and other protected areas, and minimizing negative impacts on these areas.

Recreation: means leisure time activity undertaken in built or natural settings for purposes of physical activity, health benefits, sport participation and skill development, personal enjoyment, positive social interaction and the achievement of human potential.

We have a finite amount of publicly accessible parkland in Ingersoll, and it behooves us to stop allowing developments to take precedence over the mental and physical health of our children and other residents. We require greenspace to increase our overall well-being, this fact is repeated in study after study.

I believe Ingersoll should deny this development proposal. We should then create a Parkland Plan and form a committee with the sole purpose of planning for the retention and expansion of publicly accessible greenspaces in Ingersoll (as other communities have done). Our parkland should be enhanced with native tree species that would work to clean our air, combat climate change, increase biodiversity, and beautify our town. The town I want my son to grow up in cares about his mental and physical health and his access to parks around the town. Access that will increase his well-being; it cares about all of our communities' children, and the opportunities they have to step off of concrete and into greenspace – where they can run and play and experience the same joy we did as kids, playing in these same parks.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Crellin Ingersoll Resident

From:	Danielle Richard
To:	Ron Versteegen
Subject:	Fwd: Park land
Date:	October 4, 2021 8:41:15 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders.

I received a couple of correspondence items regarding the rezoning application on the water tower lands over the weekend, here's the first.

----- Forwarded message ------

From: graeme crellin Date: Sun, Oct 3, 2021 at 5:25 PM Subject: Park land To: danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca <danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca>

Dear Mayor and council, I am an Ingersoll resident who would like to see the water tower parkland stay a publicly accessible recreation area for the people of Ingersoll to continue enjoying.

Sincerely, Margaret Crellin

Dear Ms Richard's I would be grateful if you could include my thoughts in the next council agenda. Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

--

Danielle Richard Town Clerk Town of Ingersoll (519) 485-0120 ext. 6229

From:	Danielle Richard
To:	Ron Versteegen
Subject:	Fwd: Water Tower Parkland
Date:	October 4, 2021 8:41:31 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders.

----- Forwarded message ------From: **Debbie Forget** Date: Sun, Oct 3, 2021 at 7:17 PM Subject: Water Tower Parkland To: <u>danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca</u> <<u>danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca</u>>

Please include in the next agenda Oct. 12. so the Mayor and Council are aware that, I am in favour of the property remaining a Recreational Zone (Ingersoll's zoning) and Open Space (the County Plan's designation). So that it is still publicly accessible parkland for our residents to enjoy.

Debbie Forget

--

Danielle Richard Town Clerk Town of Ingersoll (519) 485-0120 ext. 6229 Ingersoll Council and Oxford County Planning - October 4 2021

OP 21-02-6; SB 21-01-6 & ZN 6-21-01 (Erie Thames Powerlines Corp.)

This is not your average minor variance – it requires changes to the official plan, the zoning bylaws and a dozen or so minor variances. There must have been reasons for the current designations of land the previous councils had to make the choice that they did. And now it falls upon this council to decide the future of this land.

I would further contend that although the minimum amount of notice was given with the minimum methods to do so, official plan changes deserve a broader notice than 20 stamped envelopes, a plastic sign and an official notice on a web page.

This development will have 10 inclined driveways backing on to a hill and crossing over what will become an even more popular sidewalk, especially with the impending development of the golf course property. There a visibility issues even now and depending on how close to the road the semi-detached units are built there will be parking issues (Smaller units rarely use their garages as intended) similar to what we see now on Kendall Lane where cars are spilling out on to McKeand Street.

Dr Reeves does not own the land in question, he only has a conditional offer to purchase and even if Town Council and County Council approve the changes to the OP and the zoning bylaws, there is no guarantee of the presented type of housing being built in the near or long term (decades) or remaining fence free.

The types of housing being presented are not in a major deficit of supply, especially with the housing potential that was promoted by council for the boundary adjustment. This is not a social initiative by ERTH Corp or Reeves Development nor am I suggesting that should be their mandate. There are no provincial mandates requiring council to change the OP or Zoning to allow for housing as this is not transit related. With our newly expanded borders, it would seem that initiatives such as this to sell or develop every scrap piece of land for infilling only delays the opportunities for smart planning and development of the designated lands for housing on the former SWOX lands. (At no cost to Ingersoll rate payers). We need seniors type housing that allows folks to realize the equity in their homes and to find nice accommodations within the community they have spent a longtime in. We need apartment buildings, especially with the potential employment from the DOT distribution centre and the undeveloped potential industrial lands in the former SWOX township. There are 3 apartment building on the books, two of which have been on the books since the late 1980's. If this proposed development had something in it to address those deficits or perhaps was forward thinking with regards to energy use or active transportation it may have fit better with community needs and the PPS.

This proposal addresses nothing other than a deficit of inventory for one developer and a line item on a corporate balance sheet. That is not what vibrant and progressive communities deserve. I implore council to reject this proposal as presented.

"Little boxes on the hillside, Little boxes made of Ticky Tacky,



Little Boxes on the hillside, Little boxes all the same."

Tim Lobzun

From:	Danielle Richard
То:	Ron Versteegen
Subject:	Fwd: Ingersoll Plan
Date:	November 1, 2021 2:18:18 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders. Thought I'd send this along to you :)

------ Forwarded message ------From: **Tiffany Egerter** < Date: Mon, Nov 1, 2021 at 1:05 PM Subject: Ingersoll Plan To: <<u>danielle.richard@ingersoll.ca</u>> Cc: <<u>mgraves@ingersoll.ca</u>>

Hi Danielle,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Ingersoll, Ontario. It is my understanding that a large portion of land near the water tower has been (or is in the process of being) sold by ERTH to Reeves for residential development. It is also my understanding the land is within or close enough to have significant impact, when grade is considered, on our local waterways. I moved to Ingersoll, in search of a community with a small town feel with access to local waterways and natural habitats to raise my son. My partner and I purchased the property at 38 Charles East with the dreams of our 3 young sons enjoying the benefits of local and accessible town amenities with a natural habitat (Halls Creek) running through their very own backyard to play in and savour nature. It is of urgent necessity that I implore you to consider the impact on our local waterways, this new development would bring. You as a town, have gone to great lengths to beautify and protect our creeks and waterways, this development would no doubt cause irreparable damage down stream as the water moves towards the Thames. My home is along this same waterway (Halls Creek goes right through our property) and I am concerned for the safety and integrity of my home property, as much as I am for the shared parkland along the same water system.



"Correction does much, but encouragement does more." - Johann Wolfgang von Goethe.

IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and do not

Re: Application ZN 6-21-6, Resolution to Defer

I am writing a follow up to my letter to Ingersoll Council dated September 13, 2021, to firstly, thank you for reading my letter at the council meeting; and secondly, to reiterate the critical importance of increasing the inventory of new homes in Ingersoll as well as taking into consideration the price point of new housing such that it is affordable for local, first time home buyers.

I would like to draw Council's attention to the recent report by Mike Moffatt of the Smart Prosperity Institute which projects the number of new housing units needed in communities across Ontario.

https://institute.smartprosperity.ca/publications/growing-number-households

"The goal of this report is to provide policymakers with the data they need to make the policy decisions to ensure there is an adequate supply of attainable, family-friendly, climate-friendly housing located near employment opportunities, to allow for relatively short, climate-friendly commutes."

Pages 119 and 120 of the report project the housing needs for Oxford County over the next ten years:

- The Ontario Ministry of Finance projects Oxford's population to grow by 20,294 persons over the next 10 years. It grew by 7,504 from 2006-16. Over the next 10 years, we project an additional 8,715 households, on net, living in Oxford, occupying 670 high rise apartment units and 8,045 low and medium density housing units, on net.
- This household projection is based on population projections from the Ministry of Finance and does not include "*drive until you qualify*" demand from other parts of the province and is thus a highly conservative estimate.
- From 2021 to 2031, 12,524 new young families occupying low and medium density will be formed. This will be offset by 4,479 older families leaving existing low and medium-density housing. If the high projected rates of population growth occur, the formation of new households will substantially outpace generational turnover.
- In absolute terms, the Ontario Ministry of Finance projects growth in Oxford to be, on net, roughly 2,000 persons per year for the foreseeable future. This would suggest that the immigration of young families that Oxford has experienced in recent years is likely to continue.

The projections in this report lend support to the question I posed in my original letter: Why build only 18 homes, 8 of them detached, when we have a housing affordability and inventory crisis? I urge council to not only approve the zone change application, but to consider a plan for 30 smaller, more affordable attached homes in the same space.

Sincerely,

Catherine Agar Salford, ON Report No. CP 2021-343 - Attachment No. 7

AMENDMENT NUMBER 264

TO THE COUNTY OF OXFORD OFFICIAL PLAN

The schedules attached hereto, constitute Amendment Number 264 to the County of Oxford Official Plan.

COUNTY OF OXFORD

BY-LAW NO. 6397-2021

BEING a By-Law to adopt Amendment Number 264 to the County of Oxford Official Plan.

WHEREAS, Amendment Number 264 to the County of Oxford Official Plan has been recommended by resolution of the Council of the Town of Ingersoll and the County of Oxford has held a public hearing and has recommended the Amendment for adoption.

NOW THEREFORE, the County of Oxford, pursuant to the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, as amended, enacts as follows:

- 1. That Amendment Number 264 to the County of Oxford Official Plan, being the attached text and schedules, is hereby adopted.
- 2. This By-Law shall come into force and take effect on the day of the final passing thereof.

READ a first and second time this 8th day of December, 2021.

READ a third time and finally passed this 8th day of December, 2021.

LARRY G. MARTIN,

WARDEN

CHLOÉ J. SENIOR,

CLERK

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENT

The purpose of this amendment is to redesignate the subject lands from 'Open Space' to 'Residential' and 'Low Density Residential' to facilitate the development of a residential draft plan of subdivision, consisting of 7 lots for single detached dwellings, and 5 lots for semi-detached dwellings.

2.0 LOCATION OF LANDS AFFECTED

The subject lands are described as Part of Park Lots 6A to 8A, Block 3, Plan 279 and Parts 2 & 3, Plan 41R-6739 in the Town of Ingersoll. The lands are located on the northeast corner of Wonham Street and Holcroft Street, and are municipally known as 90 Holcroft Street West.

3.0 BASIS FOR THE AMENDMENT

The subject amendment has been initiated to redesignate a portion of the subject lands to 'Low Density Residential' to facilitate the development of a residential draft plan of subdivision, consisting of 7 lots for single detached dwellings and 5 lots for semi-detached dwellings.

It is the opinion of Council that the proposed amendment is consistent with the relevant policies of the Provincial Policy Statement as the proposed draft plan of subdivision is cost-effective, and an efficient land use pattern that minimizes land consumption and servicing costs. The proposed development also contributes to an overall mix of housing types to accommodate current and future residents of the regional market area.

The development is not proposed within a natural hazard area as directed by Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority has indicated that the requirement for an Environmental Impact Study can be waived in this instance, which would enable development on the subject lands to proceed.

Council is of the opinion that the subject lands are suitable for low density residential development as the lands are located on, and will have direct access to, collector roads. The proposed redesignation will provide for an efficient lot fabric, street layout and subdivision design.

The site is located in an area that abuts existing low density development to the north, west and east and an open space use to the south (Ingersoll Golf Club).

Further, it is the opinion of Council that the proposed amendment is appropriate and supportive of the strategic initiatives and objectives of the Official Plan and is consistent with the policies for Low Density Residential areas within the Town. The Low Density Residential designation is intended for areas to be primarily developed or planned for a variety of low rise, low density housing forms including single-detached dwellings, semi-detached, duplex or converted dwellings, quadraplexes, townhouses and low density cluster development.

The subject property is surrounded predominantly by single detached dwellings on various sized lots along Wonham Street and Holcroft Street. The creation of new low density residential lots within the older established areas of the Town is encouraged, provided that the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding residential environment. The proposed subdivision development is considered to be a compatible form of development and can co-exist with the surrounding area without creating adverse impacts.

4.0 DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT

- 4.1 That Schedule "I-1" Town of Ingersoll Land Use Plan, is hereby amended by changing the designation of those lands identified as "ITEM 1" on Schedule "A" attached hereto from "Open Space" to "Residential".
- 4.2 That Schedule "I-2" Town of Ingersoll Residential Density Plan, is hereby amended by changing the designation of those lands identified as "ITEM 1" on Schedule "A" attached hereto from "Open Space" to "Low Density Residential".
- 4.3 That Schedule "I-3" Town of Ingersoll Leisure Resources and School Facilities Plan, is hereby amended by removing those lands identified as "ITEM 1" on Schedule "A" from the "Open Space" designation.

5.0 IMPLEMENTATION

This Official Plan Amendment shall be implemented in accordance with the implementation policies of the Official Plan.

6.0 INTERPRETATION

This Official Plan Amendment shall be interpreted in accordance with the interpretation policies of the Official Plan.

SCHEDULE "A"

AMENDMENT No. 264

TO THE

COUNTY OF OXFORD OFFICIAL PLAN

SCHEDULE "I-1" *TOWN OF INGERSOLL LAND USE PLAN*



Metres





- AREA OF THIS AMENDMENT

ITEM 1 - CHANGE FROM OPEN SPACE TO RESIDENTIAL





LAND USE PLAN LEGEND



SCHEDULE "A"

AMENDMENT No. 264

TO THE

COUNTY OF OXFORD OFFICIAL PLAN

SCHEDULE "I-2" TOWN OF INGERSOLL RESIDENTIAL DENSITY PLAN



Metres





- AREA OF THIS AMENDMENT

ITEM 1 - CHANGE FROM OPEN SPACE TO TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL



RESIDENTIAL DENSITY PLAN LEGEND





SCHEDULE "A"

AMENDMENT No. 264

TO THE

COUNTY OF OXFORD OFFICIAL PLAN

SCHEDULE "I-3"

TOWN OF INGERSOLL LEISURE RESOURCES AND SCHOOL FACILITIES PLAN Metres



ITEM 1 - REMOVE FROM OPEN SPACE



100

0

200

