

# Farewell Heights Secondary Plan – Public Comments

Comments received from December 3<sup>rd</sup> to December 5th, 2021.

If you require any of this information in an alternate format, please contact the Planning and Development Services Department at [planning@clarington.net](mailto:planning@clarington.net) or 905-623-3379 ext. 2405

## Parish, Sarah

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@trmheatingcables.com>  
**Sent:** December 3, 2021 11:47 AM  
**To:** Parish, Sarah; Salazar, Carlos  
**Subject:** Farewell Heights Secondary Plan - comments

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]@trmheatingcables.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

### EXTERNAL

---

Hello,

We live at the bottom of the court on Timberlane, and have been here for 5 years.

As with our neighbors on the court and surrounding area, we were all likely quite surprised to receive the mailed notice, without any detail, nor proper time to prepare....especially for something extensive like this, that has already made it to a secondary plan, without consultation prior to now.

As today is now December 3rd, the deadline for comments/requests to speak, I now see some documents on the website.

After reading the uploaded documents, there is still little to no information provided that really gives us any idea of what the plans here are to be.

There are no drawings detailing what the plans here are.

From the news now that there is already an organization named FHLG that is spearheading this, it's obvious corporate plans, with municipality awareness, have been in the works without public consultation, for quite some time now, which is unfortunate.

My comments and questions now are:

1. when will we see actual plans and requests for this land use? Unless I'm missing something, the documents thus far are pages and pages of zero actual planning details.
2. who will be involved to ensure all environmental issues are addressed and followed? CLOCA, Ministry of the Environment, etc?
3. in the vary vague mailer provided to us, you show within the zone, some red shaded sections, and some green colored sections - in the intent of the red shaded sections to be new residential homes?...what is the plan with the green shaded sections, to be left as green space?
4. note - we built a pool within our property line in 2019. We were denied access to even build the pool any appreciable actual distance from our home, (but still within our own property line), from Cloca, who were extremely involved in the placement of our pool, the preservation of trees even within our property line, and the distance we were allowed to build the pool from any other EP/Wetland, all within our own property line. I surely hope that CLOCA is heavily involved here, and does not

magically change these types of restrictions or zoning of the lands directly leading up to our property line.

- a. at the same time, CLOCA advised us that there was no chance building could ever take place directly behind our backyard property line, so I hope that this has not changed in such a short period of time.
- b. at the same time, the municipality advised us of the same findings, that there was no possible way building could be done anywhere near our property line at the back.

5.

6. 5. Also at the same time, out of curiosity, I requested ownership information of the lot directly behind our property line, and asked the question, "if we were allowed to purchase part of this lot to extend our property line, to protect some of the EP/Wetland/green space directly behind us?", to which I was told by the planning dept. that this land was privately owned, and that a transfer of ownership was NOT a possibility due to the EP/Wetland nature of the lot, even if we agreed to leave the space as is (which was our idea)...so how can this same lot now be sold, modified for use etc. ??

7. 6. I agree with the comments that you have provided by our neighbors, in the attachments.

- a. a. The wells on Timberlane Court will likely be negatively impacted by any new building.
- b. b. the affect on home values to us will likely be negative.

8. 7. additionally,

9. a. the effect on wildlife in this area, which is quite abundant, will be harmful. There is little space for wildlife left, as it is.

10. b. the traffic at Pebblestone and Trulls is ALREADY terrible, adding any new homes will worsen this. We see vehicle accidents at this corner multiple times per month already.

11. c. Pebblestone is already a racetrack for vehicles, with no concern for safety. Sometimes just turning out of our own street is a problem with vehicles racing along Pebbestone, this will just get worse.

12.

13. 8. I think a fair question to ask is, who (corporation or private individuals) makes up the FHLG Group?

Thank you, I look forward to being given more details.

Sincerely, Jeff and Sue Cade, ■ Timberlane Court

## Parish, Sarah

---

**From:** GARY CLEGHORN <[REDACTED]@rogers.com>  
**Sent:** December 5, 2021 7:52 PM  
**To:** Parish, Sarah  
**Subject:** Re: Farewell Heights Secondary Plan

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@rogers.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

### EXTERNAL

---

One other thing came to mind. I have a large number of mature trees near the property line bordering the proposed development area. If this goes ahead I would hope some kind of buffer area would be established to protect them and reduce any damage if they should be blown over or fall.

On Sunday, December 5, 2021, 06:29:20 p.m. EST, GARY CLEGHORN <[REDACTED]@rogers.com> wrote:

Hello Sarah, I have the following concerns about this secondary plan. I'm also concerned about how rushed this seems to be. The fact preliminary information was only made available late Friday Dec. 3 has made it difficult for me to respond in a timely manner.

Why was this information not provided earlier? The terms of reference seem to have been dictated by the Farewell Heights Landowners Group. Shouldn't the municipality be preparing an independent terms of reference that considers all taxpayers not just those in the Farewell Heights Landowners Group? Maybe I'm being a bit paranoid but my experience with large land owners and those with deep pockets is that they get more favourable treatment compared to the little guy.

- My understanding was that in order to consider any development of this area a watershed study was to be done based on an agreement with the Pebblestone Rate Payers Association many years ago. Many residence in and around the area are on well and septic. I'm concerned about its effect on my well and the large area of forest on my property. Was this study done?
- The area under consideration (red fill) seems to be smaller than the red outlined area on your map. Does this mean that the green areas within the red outline are not to be developed?
- Its already scary to take a walk on Pebblestone Rd. because of the traffic and lack of a large shoulder. This development will no doubt increase traffic on Pebblestone and the danger for pedestrians.
- My property borders on the proposed development area. With the requirement for higher density and affordable housing these days, I am worried about high rises and town houses next door and a subsequent loss of value and enjoyment of my property. This includes more noise and light pollution. Prior minor variances have required a neighbouring business to shield the homes near me from light issues.
- I have no desire to change over to municipal services but if wells are damaged as a result of a development, do the developers have to pay to hook you up to municipal services?
- Is there a possibility that even though everything points to not developing this area, the Farewell Heights Landowners Group is able to get a ministerial order to proceed?

Thanks for your consideration,

Gary Cleghorn

[REDACTED] Timberlane Ct.

Courtice, ON. L1E2H1

905-[REDACTED]

(1 acre estate lot home, resident for over 26 years)