

Anthony Usher Planning Consultant

63 Deloraine Avenue, Toronto, Ontario M5M 2A8

(416) 425-5964

auplan@bellnet.ca

June 6, 2024

Mr. Adam Kozlowski
Senior Planner
County of Haliburton
Box 399
Minden, Ontario
K0M 2K0

Dear Mr. Kozlowski:

Re: LRC Campbell, Dysart et al, Proposed Plan of Subdivision and Condominium Description

I am responding to one point in Greer Galloway's peer review, and one point raised in discussion with Dysart. Please consider this as an addendum to my Planning Report of August 2, 2023.

Greer Galloway - northeast portion of common element block

Point 7 of Greer Galloway's letter of February 2, 2024 is as follows:

What is the plan for the area north-east of the driveway that will not be part of the lots. More information about the future of this area should be provided and whether is [sic] should be maintained it as [sic] a green space.

Block A in the draft plan includes a 16 m allowance for the north-south driveway, centred on the existing travelled driveway.

Due to the configuration of the boundary of the subject land with 81 Mallard Road, there is a strip between that minimum 16 m width and the boundary with 81 Mallard that is not needed for road purposes, to which I believe Greer Galloway is referring.

That strip consists of a smaller southern part and a larger northern part. It's about 115 m long, and has a maximum depth of 22 m right at the Mallard Road intersection. It is about 1,100 m² in area. The land is fairly sloped up from the driveway, and entirely forested (its attributes are described in Michalski Nielsen's Environmental Impact Study). As such it is entirely unsuitable for development, either on its own or as part of Lot 4 which only the smaller part abuts. I should note that my planning report already said, "[the common element] block would also include some lands along the east side of the north-south driveway that would not be developable due to property configuration." (p. 7).

The applicant has no reason or intent not to retain this area as a woodland. However, the EIS made no recommendation regarding its future use, and we did not wish to unduly bind the common elements condominium corporation, so we did not propose any restriction. That said, if the County

or Dysart believe that this area's natural or open space attributes are such as to warrant requiring the woodland be retained, we would certainly be prepared to discuss that.

Please note that all other points in Greer Galloway's letter have either been addressed by Michalski Nielsen in its letter of June 6, 2024, or were agreed between Kris Orsan and me as not requiring reply.

Dysart - sewage servicing

As you'll recall, Dysart, you, and I had some dialogue earlier this year about site servicing.

While it was always our intention the lots be served by municipal sewer, we considered this further in light of questions raised by Dysart. We decided to make no changes in this regard.

As discussed with Dysart, the only sewer line is along County Road 21, so servicing the new lots will require a connection across the intervening lands.

The shortest and simplest connection would be extension of the current service into 5065 County Road 21. As you know, LRC Campbell Ltd. owns that property as well as the subject lands. So, I can formally confirm, as indicated in my April 19, 2024 email, that LRC Campbell agrees to providing an easement in favour of the future common elements condominium corporation, for a sewage line to cross 5065 County Road 21 from the highway to the subject plan's Block A.

* * *

I hope this information is what you need but please let me know of any questions.

Yours sincerely,

[original signed by]

Anthony Usher, RPP

cc. Kris Orsan
Jeff Iles