

Farewell Heights Secondary Plan – Public Comments

Comments received from December 6th to December 13th, 2021.

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

Parish, Sarah

From: Nicole <[REDACTED]@hotmail.com>
Sent: December 6, 2021 8:46 PM
To: Farewell Heights Secondary Plan
Subject: Proposed development

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

EXTERNAL

Good evening,

My husband and I attended the council meeting tonight due to our interest in the proposed development 'Farewell Heights'. Our family lives at [REDACTED] Trulls Rd.

I would like to start by saying I was disappointed in the lack of dialogue from council in response to the questions and concerns being raised by the area residents. Not once did a council member respond to the questions or comments being raised. The purpose of this meeting was for interested parties to air their concerns and have them 'heard' by the people supposedly representing them at council. I doubt that anyone who took the time to submit a question or concern felt represented in the slightest as their comments were barely acknowledged. This may have been exacerbated by the fact that the Chair was barely audible.

Our main concern with the proposed development is the change in our quality of life. We live here because of the natural environment surrounding our property, the wildlife that lives here, and the natural well water our family drinks.

The addition of a development in the proposed areas will drastically change the amount of traffic on our road. This has already been increased due to the 407 expansion but will surely get worse. Street lights would inevitably be installed changing the country road feel of our street.

The observed wildlife in our immediate vicinity is abundant. We witness a yearly cycle of rare birds such as the Wilson's snipe, barred and great horned owls, red tailed and cooper's hawks, killdeer, indigo bunting, among many other backyard bird species. Each March we listen to the spring peepers and wood frogs emerge from the snow. We see deer and coyote tracks in our yard among the many rabbit and other rodent tracks. Our kids are lucky to experience this wildlife and the thought of it being wiped away for a few homes is extremely upsetting to say the least. Our planet is in grievous danger. Clearing sensitive watershed land is inconceivable.

We have witnessed the drastic effects that road work has on our drinking water this summer. The expansion of Trulls Rd, North of Pebblestone Rd, this summer caused our water to develop a negative odour and taste. The proposed development would undoubtedly negatively affect our well water if we were even able to remain on well water at its onset.

I urge you to require extensive environmental studies and surveys before any secondary planning is put in motion.

Should you have any questions, I can be reached at this email address or by phone at 905-[REDACTED]. My husband, Mike Delvecchio, can be reached at [REDACTED]@gmail.com

Sincerely,
Nicole Mackenzie

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Parish, Sarah

From: John McCabe <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: December 6, 2021 7:16 PM
To: Farewell Heights Secondary Plan
Subject: Farewell heights

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <http://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>.]

EXTERNAL

Sarah, Carlos;

my name is John mccabe I live on vivian drive. I was listening in on the meeting dec 6th, and due to technical difficulties I was unable to speak. I would like to put the comment that the really isn't a plan on how to deal with the issues listed in the presentation such as infrastructure (road ways) as well as style of houses (apartments, estates homes, affordable housing) schools in there area and a provincially significant wetlands. Even the idea of set backs etc and protecting the forested areas. I was disappointed with lack of clarity and it's seems like once again courtice is trying to pull a fast one (like Mallory heights clear cutting) I would like to remain inside the loop

Thanks
John mccabe

Sent from my iPhone

Parish, Sarah

From: Audrey Andrews [REDACTED]@hotmail.com>
Sent: December 7, 2021 9:12 AM
To: Parish, Sarah
Subject: Farewell Heights Secondary Plan

EXTERNAL

Good morning Sarah,

I viewed the meeting last night. I would like to confirm I am on the project mailing list. While I understand that the people who are paying for the Plan likely intended the two spots for land owners on the Steering Committee to be for them, consideration for single/individual land owner representation might be a consideration.

Thanks

Audrey Andrews

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Parish, Sarah

From: [REDACTED]@trmheatingcables.com>
Sent: December 7, 2021 8:35 AM
To: Parish, Sarah; Salazar, Carlos
Subject: Re: Farewell Heights Secondary Plan - comments

EXTERNAL

Hi Sarah and Carlos, thanks for the info, I did watch the livestream of the meeting last evening.

The graphic in the mailer.....

Can you advise please - within the outer red line (the complete zone in this case), there is part that is shaded red/pink, what does this represent? 'something' to be developed here?

And do the portions that are left/shaded green represent land that will NOT be developed within this plan?

(I know the specifics of the plan are in the future pending all of the things you discussed last night, but the graphic sent out must mean something)...I'm just looking for a quick clarification on what the intention of showing part shaded red is, versus left green is.

thanks again, Jeff Cade
[REDACTED] Timberlane Court

From: Parish, Sarah <SParish@clarington.net>
Sent: Friday, December 3, 2021 1:13 PM
To: [REDACTED]@trmheatingcables.com>; Salazar, Carlos <csalazar@clarington.net>
Subject: RE: Farewell Heights Secondary Plan - comments

Hi Jeff,
Thank you for providing your contact information – I've added you to our interested parties list so you will receive all future project updates and public engagement opportunities.

Your comments and concerns will be considered as we begin this Secondary Plan process.

Thank you,
Sarah Parish, MCIP, RPP
Planner II, Community Planning
Planning and Development Services
Municipality of Clarington
40 Temperance Street, Bowmanville ON L1C 3A6
905-623-3379 ext. 2432 | 1-800-563-1195
www.clarington.net

Parish, Sarah

From: Libby Racansky <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: December 7, 2021 9:39 AM
To: Parish, Sarah
Cc: Salazar, Carlos; ClerksExternalEmail; Langmaid, Faye; Richardson, Karen; Windle, Ryan
Subject: Re: Farewell Heights Secondary Plan - December 6th Meeting!

EXTERNAL

Good morning,

I am still in shock after my experience from last night. I will send you documents that the Farewell Heights group are not submitting or at least not giving you the whole story.

I could not get into the meeting. I heard all kinds of noises, there was a warning message all over the screen to me from all developers from GTA. I had to leave the meeting several times because of messages. I just heard very clearly Fay and she heard me as well. As soon as the Council returned from the break, it started again.

Similar thing was going on with our group dealing with developers from Farewell Heights. Finally, I went to Region and Katherine Mac Gregor, Regional Lawyer helped us out by preparing a Settlement that was signed by the Region, municipality, developers and us. After that at the OMB hearing where all Provincial ministries were behind our argument that the OP will be modified and that the Living will change in Special Study.

Our Municipality never was for the idea to expand the urban boundary northward because of difficulties with servicing and lack of amenities. I will quote the Planner at that time : " The area is hard to service because it is **sticking out**... There are other areas located within the existing urban boundary that need to be serviced first."

Also, William Manson developer of Courtice Heights was in charge not only of Farewell Heights, but for the lands further south all the way to Nash Road (including Hancock Neighborhood). One night all these lands were bulldozed prior to the OPA.- all wetlands, woodlots were gone. .

It was a big embarrassment for developers because it was posted in TORONTO STAR With me standing on one of the big pile of mature trees.

Mayor Hamre, at that time, was also furious.

Manson also claimed that Provincial OHAP makes Municipality to be obligated to allow certain lands **to be developed**. **Unfortunately, this Ontario Housing Agreement was reached for the adjacent City of Oshawa that during 80' almost part of the City, but it was not (along Townline). I have requested the Ministry of Municipal Affairs to search for the documents. They did not apply for Clarington. All numbers of subdivisions didn't match subdivisions in Courtice. I have the letter from the Ministry, during Jim Flaherty being the Minister.**

In spite of that, Manson managed years before to get some huge fund for development. It ended up badly for the 130 existing residents by losing their well water or contamination, Developers were reimbursed for their expenditure for servicing these residents. It took a very long time and the poor residents at the end had to pay for being serviced. Everything is in writing. Manso gave incorrect info about this to our Clerks as well. Even today like for example Trolleybus is claiming the same thing about this funding and development need.

I have all signed Agreements Settlements I was going to display on screen (without private parts - signatures) for security.

Hope I make any sense...,
Libby

Parish, Sarah

From: Libby Racansky [REDACTED]@gmail.com >
Sent: December 8, 2021 6:36 AM
To: Parish, Sarah
Cc: Salazar, Carlos; ClerksExternalEmail; Richardson, Karen
Subject: Re: Farewell Heights Secondary Plan - December 6th Meeting!

EXTERNAL

Hi,

Few questions:

TOR with its priorities will not go to Council this coming Monday, will it?

The Second question is more for Karen's expertise: to which SWM is

a) the developed area below Farewell Height (former Tonno) **west of Trulls** draining into - is it Kassinger;s dry pond? And

b) ... the developed lands located **east of Trulls** (former Kassinger) draining into - is it Horban pond?

Thank you,

Libby

Parish, Sarah

From: LIBUSE RACANSKY [REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: December 9, 2021 11:03 AM
To: Parish, Sarah; Salazar, Carlos; Richardson, Karen; Windle, Ryan
Subject: TOR and our comments and two added priorities by us
Attachments: Agreement on watershed planning.GIF; aquifer in courtice -clay gray.GIF; aquifer in Coutice, Darlington.GIF; c mscgregor.GIF; coldstream farewell and fish.GIF; developer' signatures for watershed.GIF; Farewell heights fkioding.jpg; Farewell Heights.GIF; hubicki and SWM.GIF; LIS in greenbelt.GIF; LIS protected.GIF; LIS uplift continues.GIF; Map A2 2014 land use.GIF; modificastion.GIF; natural heritage map urban boundary.GIF; omb 2.GIF; omb and ss 1.GIF; Storm water ponds in Courtice.GIF; tonno kingsburry 1Capture.GIF; vulnerable aquifer map.GIF

EXTERNAL

TOR and Five Priorities: (We are adding two Priorities – 1 & 2; Priority 5 may be deleted, if the owners do not have intention to build houses for less fortunate)

- 1. Conduct watershed planning for the cleared area**
 - 2. Restoration of natural features and setbacks**
 - 3. Climate change, sustainability**
 - 4. Excellence in urban design**
 - 5. Affordable housing (Ontario PPS and Federal help to less fortunate)**
 - 6. Community engagement**
 - 7. Coordination of initiatives**
- 1. In the absence of watershed planning for the area in question there is no possibility of sustainable Plan design for subdivision. Therefore, there is a need for adding as point 1 to conduct watershed planning. All the landowners that wished to built on their land signed the Agreement stating that they will pay for the watershed planning. Lands located east of Trulls need **planning for Black Creek watershed and the lands west of Trulls planning for Farewell Creek.** The independent company should be chosen (or CLOCA could perform this study), not the Delta Urban Inc. CLOCA then will decide sufficiency of this study. From Delta Urban Inc. website it is clear that they never worked with sensitive area like this one.
Attachments: Agreement D6 Tonno and Kingberry, signatures.**
 - 2. Because the land was cleared prior to the OPA, there is a need for **restoration, establishing setbacks from these features.** Only the**

preliminary EIS was conducted by Ecoplans in 1993 on cleared land (evidence point 2.0 of their study). This study was done just for the now called Farewell Heights, located west of the Trulls Road (former Tonno). No study was done for the eastern half of this subject lands. Restoration Plan was suggested by North-South Environmental Inc. in 2007. Not only that restoration wasn't done, but more sensitive lands were cleared. You can see Sensitivity of this land in the **Attachments: Farewell Heights, Proposed restoration, Regional map of natural heritage,**

This area is located on common unconfined aquifer for Courtice north – from the Townline to Green Road and from Hwy 2 to almost to Taunton Toad. With so much of development of the area now, the groundwater level decreased to not sustainable level even for rural residents. Only after precipitation, aquifer temporary rise up and in some places where with impermeable surfaces, the groundwater flow was redirected to our roads, Parks and in some cases to subdivisions instead of to our wetlands and streams. This **special aquifer MUST be protected**, since it is the only supply of clean, cool water. **Attachments for LIS: Aquifer pf Courtice, Darlington Ward,**

Aquifer – clay, LIS in the Greenbelt, LIS protection in Durham Envision, LIS uplift continues, Regional vulnerable aquifer.

Conformation to PPS:

The above two added points would only to conform with PPS, Regional Envision 4.18 b) document to protect Lake Iroquois Shoreline and their **Aquifer vulnerability - see the attachments above, - Clean Water Act, Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 Under the Planning Act PPS must be adhered to.**

- 1. Managing and Directing Land Use to Achieve Efficient and Resilient Development and Land Use Patterns
 - b) affordable housing and housing for older persons), and open space**
 - c) avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns;**
 - h) promoting development and land use patterns that conserve biodiversity; and**

i) preparing for the regional and local impacts of a changing climate.

1.1.3 Settlement Areas

b) avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion;

c) minimize negative impacts to air quality and climate change, and promote energy efficiency;

1.6 Infrastructure

1. financially viable

1.6.2 Planning authorities should promote green infrastructure

to complement infrastructure

1.6.4 Infrastructure and public service facilities should be

strategically located to support the effective and efficient delivery of emergency management services, and to ensure the protection of public health and safety in accordance with the policies in Section 3.0: Protecting Public Health and Safety.

1.8 Energy Conservation, Air Quality and Climate Change 1.8.1 Planning authorities shall support energy conservation and efficiency, improved air quality, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and preparing for the impacts of a changing climate through land use.

2.0 Wise Use and Management of Resources

2.1.1 Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term.

2.1 The diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area, and the long-term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems, should be maintained, restored or, where possible, improved, recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features.

2.1.6 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in fish habitat

2.2 Water 2.2.1 Planning authorities shall protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water by: a) using the watershed as the ecologically meaningful scale for integrated and long-term planning, which can be a foundation for considering cumulative impacts of development;

b) minimizing potential negative impacts, including cross-jurisdictional and cross-watershed impacts; c) evaluating and preparing for the impacts of a changing climate to water resource systems at the watershed level; d) identifying water resource systems consisting of ground water features, hydrologic functions, natural heritage features and areas, and surface water features including shoreline areas, which are necessary for the ecological and hydrological integrity of the watershed; e) maintaining linkages and related functions among ground water features, hydrologic functions, natural heritage features and areas, and surface water features including shoreline areas; f) implementing necessary restrictions on development and site alteration to: 1. protect all municipal drinking water supplies and designated vulnerable areas; and 2. protect, improve or restore vulnerable surface and ground water, sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features, and their hydrologic functions;

2.2.2 Development and site alteration shall be restricted in or near sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features such that these features and their related hydrologic functions will be protected, improved or restored.

The end of PPS policies.

Continuation of our comments:

The residents who trusted in promises of developers are very disappointed with their proposal. The Agreement prepared by regional lawyer, signed by our Municipality, Region, developers and residents, stating that this area will be designated as SS instead of Living completely failed all Ministries and other professionals support for this change. Even the OMB approved this change. Residents lost trust in developers completely. **Attachments: OMB 1, OMB 2, Modification of OP,**

Clarington OP Review 1992, pg. 30 stated that: “The health and integrity of watershed is tied to the movement of water through the watershed. Alteration to this flow alters the functioning the watershed ecosystem.” This is very true conclusion for our area aquifer, to PSW functions, safety (see the attached flooding) and health of residents. Fish habitat must be

protected - see the attachment salmon run – this habitat below Pebblestone Road was destroyed. **Attachments: flooding at CH, fish habitat south of Pebblestone**

Priority 3, climate change and sustainability could be implement only with consideration of our points 1 and 2.

Priority 4, If the Excellence in urban design is really meant, new, more energy efficient building products must be used. Clarington Greening Program should be adhered to as well.

We do not understand what affordable housing in priority 5 is being proposed?

PPS 1.1 b) affordable housing and housing for older persons

Affordable housing financial contribution – Ontario, feds:

The investments will particularly help young people, low-income Canadians, people experiencing homelessness, and women and children fleeing violence find a safe and affordable place to call home.

Does this mean that only housing for the most vulnerable people will be built here? If not, this priority should be deleted.

Community engagement priority 6 was broken right from the beginning – some local people were not even notified about proposals.

How will the public be involved?

Coordination of initiatives priority 7: We didn't even see Regional representative at the Council meeting who could answer residents concerns.

Considering servicing in this land that is sticking above the urban area alone (See the attachment), with no amenities, choice of school, etc. what is the purpose of Adelaide Avenue into this area? East -west and vice versa roads were not supported by the Regional EIS, 1994 because this direction will impact the groundwater flow even more as it is now. It will take more land from the Farewell Heights. Also, see the PPS 1.6 mentioned above –

there are no services, amenities along this Avenue, it will promote unnecessary car use, it is not financially viable, it will affect the groundwater flow even further, etc. For these reasons, Adelaide will certainly not create green infrastructure.

Money used for the extension of Adelaide could be used for the Transit instead. Attachments: !992 OP map

We need to be assured that **trenchless technology, paid for by the owners of lands, will be approved to avoid PSW, setbacks and Farewell Creek fish habitat.** This technology would be less intrusive to this aquifer and well users, it is faster, not messy with less soil removal.

Who will pay residents for the **loss or shortages of well water**? Will it be FHLG group, who would cause it? I would like to see this in writing and with signatures. This well water loss doesn't have to happen immediately, but in time, the loss well water will be sure reality.

Comments on WPPC:

There was no monitoring of the effluent to the Lake Ontario for many years. Shouldn't this be done prior to large development in City of Oshawa and Courtice? Did anybody noticed the odor coming from this plant along and past the waterfront? Our insufficient waterfront trail cannot be walked on in certain days when the wind blows from west to east or directly from south to north.

Effluent regulations: **monitoring** requirements for wastewater systems that deposit an annual average daily effluent volume of greater than 2,500 m³
Ontario regulation 435/93

The Courtice WPCP is designed to treat wastewater at an average daily flow rate of 68,200 cubic metres per day (m³/d) with a peak flow rate of 180,000 m³/d. The plant is an MECP **Class 4 conventional activated sludge treatment plant that utilizes the following processes to treat wastewater:** • raw influent pumping, • preliminary treatment, • primary treatment, • secondary treatment, • phosphorus removal, • disinfection (chlorination/dechlorination), and • solids treatment.

Tertiary treatment would be necessary.

Comments on SWM ponds in Courtice:

Are our **SWM facilities ready to accept more flows? So far, none of them can address effluent quality. See why not in the attachment. Attachment: Hubicki – SWM should not be build on high water table areas because their purpose would be defeated.**

To which pond will FH drain into? (Attachment SWM in Courtice). After rehabilitation of PSW, setbacks which should be done prior to the building, there will not be room enough for Adelaide Ave, SWM pond or housing.

This is all I could put together – just email and attachments.

Hopefully, these comments will be accepted. There were so many of us concerned about this application. It will affect all people living in Courtice north and Darlington Ward, not just people living near by FH.

I would be able to contact the interested parties in person under normal circumstances to help me to put this doc in Word or PP, not during Covid 19 or ...

Libby Racansky

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Parish, Sarah

From: LIBUSE RACANSKY [REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: December 11, 2021 8:59 AM
To: Windle, Ryan; Parish, Sarah
Subject: Farewell Heights map of green spaces to Council NOW
Attachments: LIS 3.GIF; LIS in Courtice.GIF

EXTERNAL

Hello,

Displaying Farewell Heights EP map precludes their identification in future studies.

FGLG will consider it as final. Setbacks and rehabilitation is not showing on this Map. There was even more clearing recently.

Could there be explanation of MAP display given to Council during the meeting?

See the LI importance, significance, and their recommendation in CLOCA's doc – excerpts (plus 2 maps with no setbacks yet):

Glacial Lake Iroquois was a larger version of Lake Ontario that existed over 13,000 years ago.

Well, the combination of gravels and sands filters precipitation quickly until halted by the underlying tight tills and clays. These shallow aquifers support vast wetland areas and provide important baseflow to local creeks, sustaining cold water fisheries. This complex substrate contributes to groundwater recharge and discharge, **playing a critical role in water storage that helps to maintain baseflow, water quality, downstream ecological health, and flood attenuation. Seeps, springs and vernal pools can be found throughout.**

the significant natural features and functions concentrated in this area are at increased risk from disturbance and other growth related impacts including more traffic, future infrastructure improvements, increased water usage, changes in property ownership and changing land uses on the rural/urban fringe.

Wherever possible, optimization of opportunities to expand upon and connect fragmented sections of the green space system should be facilitated.

Libby Racansky

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Parish, Sarah

From: [REDACTED]@hotmail.com>
Sent: December 13, 2021 5:59 PM
To: Parish, Sarah
Cc: dcheng@cloca.com
Subject: Farewell Heights Secondary Plan

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

EXTERNAL

Good Day Sarah,

As an existing residential owner on Timberlane court, I wanted to reach out to you regarding the recent public meeting to initiate the Farewell Heights Secondary Plan as well as the status and our initial concerns of the Plan in general.

First off, we are not against residential development and actually think it can be a good thing, however we feel like a lot of 'niche' or 'smaller' municipalities often get it wrong and as quickly as the area becomes desirable, it ends up being transient and undesirable, which is why we are providing our concerns today.

Courtice as you know is a small community which has a mix of newer housing developments as well as older more established homes and properties. What attracted us to the area, and what put Courtice in the same echelon of communities as Uxbridge, Ashburn, Hampton etc., is that the newer density developments have been kept buffered from any of the older more established 'character' areas. We need to maintain this in order to maintain the character of the community.

It is our belief that aside from the list of issues that are currently unsettled, (trees, ground water, existing roadways being unsuitable to handle any sort of density of homes, wildlife, noise levels, deterioration in property values etc.) there are many more suitable and more easily serviceable plots of land within Clarington that would not only provide future homeowners with the same type homes, but already have far superior infrastructure close at hand - sewers/watermains, newer roads, and access to public transportation. This makes more planning sense, and ultimately would have less impact on the overall community in which we live.

It needs to be understood that subdivisions like ours are desirable and rare, part of this is for *not* having large roadways, or public transportation, or sewers/water etc. These are the homes that people look for after they have started in the higher density neighbourhoods - like we all did at one time. We are paying an absolute premium to live here by way of home cost, but furthermore by property taxes and if that is disrupted by being mixed in with homes on 30' lots with no trees, large amount of roadways, etc. then we as existing property owners are losing something tangible. How does this end up equitable?

As far as we understand in this country, the rights of developers and or future home owners can only be *as* important as our rights - not more important. So we will be looking to the municipality to ensure that we are not losing anything that we have already paid for, for many years in order for the municipality or a developer

or future home owners to gain from it. This process will need to maintain us as existing owners in at least the position we are currently in, in order to be equitable.

Lastly, we don't believe for a second that there is not more detail available from the development group. I work with developers on a daily basis at a high level and they have plans in place prior to even considering purchasing land, we would like to see these plans to understand the magnitude of the project as this has a major effect on us as existing residents for the next 10 years. For some, this could be their last 10 years and some compassion to allow us all to plan for our future is just as important as the developer or future residents to plan for theirs.

Please add myself and my wife to the list of concerned residents and include us on any correspondence regarding this secondary plan.

██████████@hotmail.com
██████████@hotmail.com

Best Regards,
Kevin