THE MUNICIPALITY OF LAMBTON SHORES

Report PL 47-2021 **Council Meeting Date: December 21, 2021**

TO: Mayor Weber and Members of Council

FROM: Will Nywening, Senior Planner

RE: ZBA Application ZO-16/2021
Plan 24, Part Lots 372 and 405
17 Pine St, Grand Bend

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Report PL 47-2021, relating to a Zoning By-Law Amendment Application, submitted by MFL Properties Ltd., be received; and

THAT Zoning By-Law Amendment Application ZO-16/2021**,** submitted by MFL Properties Ltd., requesting an amendment to Zoning By-Law 1 of 2003 to rezone portions of 17 Pine Street to permit an R3 Zone with site-specific provisions for construction of a triplex dwelling, be refused.

SUMMARY

This report relates to the Zoning Amendment Application submitted by MFL Properties Ltd. affecting lands known as 17 Pine St, Grand Bend. The applicant seeks to amend Zoning By-law 1 of 2003 by changing the (roadside) portion of the lands from the current "Residential-4 (R4) Zone" to a site specific "Multi-Residential-3 (R3) Zone Exception". In this respect, the applicant proposes to construct a 3-storey, triplex dwelling with special provisions:

- Permitted uses limited to a triplex dwelling (a building with 3 dwelling units divided horizontally);
- A 2.5m minimum rear yard (measured from the lakeward, "Lakeshore (LS) Zone" portion of the property);
- A maximum permitted height of 11.2m;
- An allowance for a 1m high guard rail above the maximum permitted height (to permit a roof top amenity area);
- A limitation that the roof top amenity not exceed 40% of the roof top; and
- A requirement that the property be subject to site plan approval.

BACKGROUND

The agent/planning consulting firm for the application has prepared a well-composed and detailed planning justification report. It is attached to the agenda for Council's reference and summarizes the proposed development, applicable planning policies and considerations, and the proposed zoning amendment. Rather than go through all those matters again in this report, Staff wishes, in the "Discussion" section of this report, only to highlight some items from the applicant's submissions and add a few additional policies and points Staff has taken into consideration in forming its opinion on the appropriateness of the proposed amendment.

At the time this report was submitted, Staff had received written submissions from a number of individuals. These are included in attachment 2. An additional individual indicated he is coordinating a list of questions and concerns from a number of neighbours that he intends to submit prior to the public meeting. Planning Staff has also received questions and comments verbally from a number of residents.

The Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority has provided written comments (not attached) indicating that the proposed rezoning presents no natural heritage or natural hazard concerns given the "Lakeshore (LS) Zone" boundary extends further inland than the ABCA's regulated area, and the proposal includes no change to the extent or provisions of the LS Zone.

DISCUSSION

Public Input: The applicants conducted their own public consultation session in advance of developing the current development proposal. The results are appended to their planning justification report. Staff notes that the documented discussion includes a mix of questions, concerns, and support. Staff also notes that some of the letters of support appended to the summary come from addresses not in the immediate area of the proposed development and/or from properties owned by the applicant. Staff is concerned that some of the support expressed may be for broader adoption of a form and scale of development contrary to Official Plan policies for preserving a certain community character in Grand Bend (as opposed to support for this particular location where the applicant's feel the site-specific circumstances justify).

In contrast to those who chose to participate in the privately-initiated consultation, the feedback received by Staff to date through the notification provided under the *Planning Act* for this public meeting (other than one or two simple requests for information) has been entirely negative – questioning the appropriateness of the development and/or outright opposition. This is true also of any verbal input given to Planning Staff respecting this proposal. The written comments are included in Attachment 2 and include a letter from the owners of the single detached dwelling immediately to the north of the proposed development.

Staff would summarize the concerns directed to the Municipality as including perceived restrictions to air flow and views, loss of privacy, lakeward setbacks (views), change of use from single detached to multiple-dwelling, increased density and height, precedent, additional density in an area congested with foot and vehicular traffic, storm water concerns at this intersection, and the village's character.

Official Plan: The Lambton Shores Official Plan designates the subject lands "Residential". Section 15.4 of the Official Plan incorporates community design policies from the 2008 Community Design Plan, specific to each community within Lambton Shores. In addition to the Official Plan policies noted in the applicant's planning justification report, Staff notes that Section 15.4.2 includes the following policy specific to Grand Bend:

> *To maintain Grand Bend's seaside village resort "feel", future development is restricted to low and medium density development in low rise buildings. Building heights are generally restricted to a maximum of three storeys, with building heights generally decreasing from Ontario Street to the lake to preserve views. In addition, new low density residential in the "Grand Bend Residential" area is restricted to 7.5 units per hectare or less to preserve the existing tree cover and natural environmental features.*

Also, section 5.3 of the Official Plan outlines permitted uses and densities within areas designated Residential. It includes that statement that:

> *High density development is not permitted in Lambton Shores.*

Density: The subject lot extends relatively close to the water's edge and is significantly deeper than the other single detached dwelling lots located to the north. Generally, for low density residential development, the Official Plan sets a target density of 17 units per hectare and permits a maximum density of 20 units per hectare. For Grand Bend however, section 15.4.2 sets a maximum density of 7.5 units per hectare. Taking the lot as a whole (approximately 2200m^2 lot area), 3 units equals a density of approximately 13.6 units per hectare. However, looking only at the portion of the lot that is zoned for residential use (approximately 783m^2) equals a density of approximately 38.3 units per hectare. Either way, these exceed the 7.5 unit per hectare maximum.

Only the portion of the lot abutting the residential lot to the north is zoned R4 (an estimated distance of 140.4 feet). The balance of the lot is zoned "Lakeshore (LS) Zone", which permits only conservation, passive recreation, parks, existing parking areas, and marine facilities. As the LS Zone includes portions of the lot well outside the lakeshore hazard area (it is not limited to the ABCA's regulation limit), this suggests the boundary of the R4 and LS Zone on this property was intentionally set to keep development of the subject lands similar in alignment, character, and scale with residential lots to the north. It suggests the lot's increased depth does not entitle it to additional density, scale, or proximity to the lake. Note that under section 3.9.3 of the Zoning By-law, the lot coverage is to be calculated based on the R4 portion of the lot only. Section 3.9.3 states:

3.9.3 More Than One Zone on a Lot

When a Lot is divided into more than one Zone, each such portion of the Lot shall be considered separately for the purposes of determining Zone provisions such as Lot Area, Lot Frontage, Lot Coverage, Required Front Yard, Required Side Yard and Required Rear Yard and development on each such portion shall conform to the provisions of the appropriate Zone… [emphasis added]

The R4 Zone portion of the lot is approximately 8424 square feet (783m^2) in area. Page 10 of the applicant's justification report indicates the proposed building footprint is 3703 ft^2, which equals 44% in lot coverage (of the R4 portion). The current R4 Zone would only permit 35% or 2948 ft^2 lot coverage. The application proposes to rezone the R4 portion of the lot to the R3 Zone but has not requested any site-specific provision respecting lot coverage. The standard R3 Zone permits only 30% or 2527 ft^2 lot coverage for a triplex. Page 39 of the planning report suggests the applicant has calculated lot coverage based on the entire lot area, not just the residential zone portion, contrary to section 3.9.3.

All of the above suggest that a density of 3 units on this property is inconsistent with Official Plan density policies and the scale of development intended for this lot in context of surrounding uses.

Westerly Setback: Section 3.9.3 of the Zoning By-law, quoted above, also requires that the rear yard setback is to be measured from the boundary of the LS Zone, which is even with the rear lot line of the residential lot to the north. The proposed building would have a 2.5m setback from the LS Zone boundary and the proposed patio would actually encroach into the LS Zone. The R4 Zone that currently applies to this lot and the lot to the north would permit a 6m setback, so the proposed building would be located 3.5m forward of what would be permitted on the neighbouring lot, not in alignment with the residential lot to the north.

The application material indicates that neighbours' views were considered in the position of the building. An additional 2.2m in height sitting 3.5m further west will have a notable difference from the perspective of the abutting lot in terms of how prominent the building appears from the abutting property. This is especially the case for a flat-roofed building that reaches the full building height right to the perimeter of the building, not just at the central peak.

Transition: 9 Pine Street is a 7 storey apartment building constructed in the 1990's after approvals granted by the former Village of Grand Bend. In Planning Staff's experience working in the community and with the planning documents, it seems this development is viewed as a mistake not to be repeated. It seems this "experiment with big development" was influential in the community forming the vision for a seaside village resort "feel" expressed in the Official Plan, a vision that points away from any further development of this nature. For example:

- High density development is prohibited in the municipality (section 5.3).

- The Grand Bend-specific community design policies restate and emphasize this requirement by noting only low and medium development is permitted in Grand Bend, specifically only in low rise buildings (section 15.4.2).
- The Grand Bend-specific community design policies set a maximum height of generally 3 storeys and add that heights should decrease closer to the lake. This implies the heights should be less than 3 storeys at the lake, which is notable given that 9 Pine is Grand Bend's tallest building by far and at the same time its closest building to the lake by far.

The apartment building at 9 Pine Street is quite separate and isolated from development on abutting lots. Based on the noted policies, in Staff's opinion, 9 Pine stands as an outlier of fundamentally different character from the rest of the village, not as something that can be blended into the community. Further, the low density residential development of this area continues further south on Pine Street than the proposed development. The (newly built) single detached dwelling at the northwest corner of King and Pine, south of the proposed triplex, is the edge of the low density residential area, not the subject lands. In Staff's opinion, the proposed triplex is not located in a transition area to the high density residential building on 9 Pine St or to the downtown area. It is located within the single detached residential area cluster. Although the proposed triplex is a medium density and 9 Pine a high density use, Staff views the proposed development in the proposed location as a further encroachment on the low density area, rather than a transition, especially at the scale and height of building proposed (e.g. 808m^2 gross floor area).

While there are several medium density residential developments existing, mixed in amongst the single detached dwellings of this larger neighbourhood, they are of a modest scale that does not, in Staff's opinion, justify additional medium density use or the scale of development proposed by this triplex development.

Height: Council recently passed by-law 56 of 2021 to lower the permitted height for flat roofed buildings in the R4 Zone from 9m to 7.4m and to make roof-top patios subject to height restrictions municipal-wide. This addressed a concern that the original zoning provisions were not intended to permit houses with a third storey such as is possible with modern flat roof designs. There was concern that dwellings have been constructed out of scale and character with existing neighbourhoods in Grand Bend and not in keeping with the "seaside village resort "feel"" considered important for Grand Bend. The intent of the amendment was not to prevent modern building designs, but rather to address scale and character and control the elevation of roof top patios for reasons such as privacy and safety. In Staff's opinion, the proposed triplex height is not in scale or character with the neighbourhood and directly contrary to the intent of By-law 56 of 2021.

The proposed site sits on lower ground than some adjacent properties. Staff takes the view that allowing increased height in this situation compromises the advantage that nature has afforded the lots with a higher elevation. Grand Bend has additional areas of undulating ground. Staff recommends caution in viewing lower elevation as justification for increased height on this scale. Also, caution should be exercised in assuming the proposed building foundation will start at existing grade. A triplex would be subject to site

plan approval and stormwater management, which may require that this low-lying area be built up somewhat as part of detailed building and site grading plans.

Although it is not implemented through the Zoning by-law, Section 15.4.2 of the Official Plan, actually directs that permitted building heights should be less on properties closest to the lake. This proposal to rezone this lakeside lot to allow a greater height than currently permitted on the lot as well as greater than allowed on adjacent and more landward lots is contrary to these Grand Bend-specific height policies, in Staff's opinion.

Community Character: The information provided in the application materials suggests the building design and site layout focus much on the view of this building from the north and east. Consideration should also be given for the views from the main tourist areas of Grand Bend back to these residential areas. The proposed building is three storeys and 11.2m in height and over 80 feet in length. By comparison, the R4 Zone allows 9m (7.4m for a flat roof) and the downtown C10 Zone allows 10m height. The proposed building would also have a roof top amenity area and stairwell and elevator penthouse on top of that making the total height of the south face of the building 13.6m and giving the appearance of a partial fourth floor (stairwells and elevator penthouses are exempt from height provisions).

The Official Plan promotes the preservation of a "seaside village resort "feel"". Currently, the apartment building at 9 Pine sits well forward of the existing cottage areas. A large portion of the lot for 9 Pine is wide open space and parking, leaving the residential area open to view from the public and tourist areas. In particular, viewed from the downtown, main beach, and municipal parking areas, the views back to the cottages to the north are quite open and allow one to see the "stepped" aspect of that area caused by the natural increase in ground elevation moving north and east. This large building will stand prominently in this gap and, in Staff's opinion, significantly alter and obscure the view of the northerly cottage areas, particularly how they intersect with the beach. In Staff's opinion, this would have an appreciable and negative impact on the appearance of this neighbourhood and the community's "seaside village resort "feel"".

It is not the intent of the planning policies to prevent new trends in building style, but Staff notes that the single detached dwellings built to either side of this proposed development within the last 3 years are of a more traditional cottage design with peaked roofs. More significantly however they are of a more modest scale (height, footprint, and number of floors) and are more in character with existing development in the neighbourhood.

Sanitary Services: As Council is aware there are capacity constraints within the Grand Bend sanitary sewage collection system. The applicant's planning justification report's appendices include correspondence between engineers in this respect. However, given the detailed concepts submitted with the zoning application, Staff asked that their engineer estimate the increase in sanitary flows for the proposed development compared to a single detached dwelling. The proposal is 3 dwelling units with a total of 13 bedrooms and 808 m^2 (8697ft) in gross floor area. The report, dated November 26, 2021, by

Johnson Engineering is attached and predicts the increase in sanitary flows would be somewhere between 0.376 and 1.7 litres per second.

While the expected increase in flows of the proposed development compared to a singled detached dwelling is relatively minimal, it is an increase nonetheless. What reserve sanitary capacity is available for new development has already been committed, with additional developments waiting for more capacity to become available. Part of the committed reserve capacity had included an allowance for minor infilling and redevelopment within already developed areas, but it is Planning Staff's understanding from Community Services Staff that even this allowance is more or less used up. Staff would recommend reserving what sanitary capacity may be available, if any, for developments that, in Staff's opinion, more clearly align with community goals or are already permitted by zoning provisions.

Tenure: The applicants indicate they intend for the 3 units to be owned and occupied by family members and not let out as short-term rentals. Further, they would eventually seek to establish a plan of condominium to allow individual ownership of each unit. There is nothing to prevent the sale of these units, and land use decisions should not be based on an assumed tenure or occupant. Prohibitions respecting short term rental could be included in site-specific R3 zoning provisions, but Staff suggests such concerns would be better dealt with through a consistent, municipal-wide approach to zoning and licensing. Staff notes that, between the 3 units, there are a total of 13 bedrooms.

Draft Amending By-law: Staff has not drafted an amending by-law as it is recommending refusal of the application. The zoning provisions proposed by the applicant are summarized on pages 38 and 39 of their planning justification report. One of the proposed conditions is that a building permit be conditional upon the owner entering into a site plan agreement with the Municipality. Staff is not certain about the legitimacy of conditional zoning. A holding provision might be more appropriate, but it is a moot point as a triplex dwelling would be subject to site plan control whether it is required by the zoning provisions or not. The proposed R3 Zone would also require a site-specific provision allowing 45% lot coverage for the proposed development to proceed.

Summary: Based on the foregoing, it is Staff's opinion that the proposed land use does not provide an appropriate transition between existing high and low density uses. Rather, it encroaches on and detracts from existing low-density residential areas and does not conform with Official Plan goals respecting height and community character. It is Staff's opinion that the proposed development is not in character with the scale and density of abutting low density residential development and that the lower site elevation is not a justification for increased height. Staff does not support the proposed zoning amendment or development of the site as a triplex dwelling. Staff recommends that Council refuse the application.

ALTERNATIVES TO CONSIDER

If Council wishes to approve the application as presented or some modified form, instead of the second point in this report's recommendations, Council should pass a resolution, "That Staff be directed to prepare an amending by-law for presentation at a future Council meeting".

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

That Council:

- Receive Report PL 47-2021; and
- Refuse ZBA Application ZO-16/2021.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The applicant has paid the Municipality a $1200 application fee.

CONSULTATION

The applicant and their agents.
Steve McAuley (CAO), Nick Verhoeven (Engineering Specialist), Lawrence Swift (Chief, Fire Protection and Emergency Services), and Randy Lovie (Chief Building Official) of the Municipality of Lambton Shores
Staff received various comments and inquiries from members of the public respecting this application. Written submissions are attached.

Attachment 1: Subject Lands

Subject Lands

Portion to be Rezoned R3-* Zone

Attachment 2: Written Submissions

The following written submissions were received prior to this report being submitted.

From: DONNA MCNAIR
Sent: December 4, 2021 4:50 PM
To: Stephanie Troyer-Boyd <STroyer-Boyd@lambtonshores.ca>
Subject: Zoning By-Law Amendment Application ZO-16 Location: 17 Pine St. Grand Bend Plan 24, Part Lots 372 and 405

I strongly object to this application because of the impact this build will have on the land and beach as well as the surrounding cottages/homes which will no longer have the air flow and view they have had for many decades. This Council has allowed several high rise builds with absolutely no consideration for the residents of the Bend contrary to what the restrictions used to be in an effort to protect the surrounding properties, landscapes and environment.

Just like what has now taken place with an historical hotel which you refused to designate as historical, the destruction of many very old necessary trees on Main Street as well as throughout the town for new construction and with no consideration for the environment, I will support any petition to stop this uncaring Council from going forward.

Donna McNair
27 Huron Street
Grand Bend

From:
Date: December 11, 2021 at 11:40:54 AM EST
To: Stephanie Troyer-Boyd <STroyer-Boyd@lambtonshores.ca>
Subject: Proposed condo at 17 Pine St. Grand Bend

As a year-round resident of Grand Bend, in close proximity to this proposed development, I strongly object to the concept of 3-story condos with roof-top patio in a residential area. Ask any/every member of council if they would be in favour of a towering roof-top condo unit as their neighbour! Ask them how much privacy they think they'd get with a 4th floor roof-top patio gazing into their once private back yard! If any one of them answered honestly, they would also strongly object.

Council seems to have totally forgotten the permanent residents of this town. The ones who live, work, spend money here year-round. The ones who make the town viable and make it work/operate as a town.

You are going to see an exodus of permanent, year-round people if this path continues, the path of greed with big city developments taking over and no clear vision of where we're going. Just grab the money and hope for the best. You need to be making a decision such as this a town-wide one, by seeking input in a much more open way than has been done thus far. This is huge! You can't just plan a meeting for Dec. 20th and that be the end of it, knowing full well that such timing won't accommodate many. Shame on you all.
I urge you to take a big step back and think about those who voted you into your position, those who you are supposedly there to serve. You know full well this does not align with the wishes of Grand Bend residents.

Heather J. Tieman
[25 Hill St]

From: Jarett Schneider
Sent: December 14, 2021 4:04 PM
To: Will Nywening <wnywening@lambtonshores.ca>
Cc: Stephanie Troyer-Boyd <STroyer-Boyd@lambtonshores.ca>
Subject: Re: Zoning by-law application ZO-16/2022

Will, thanks again for submitting my opposition regarding this matter. My specific issues are as follows. Zone changes from a single unit dwelling to a multi-unit dwelling. Zone changes from a maximum building of 9 meters to 11.2 meters. With proposed build having a maximum height of 11.2 meters, plus a 13.4m stairwell/elevator shaft and another 1 meter for the roof top patio railings, it will block a lot of views of the lake for the properties in the area. My other concern is setting a precedent with these amendments for others to do the same potentially creating a bunch of high density units in a very small already congested area. Again I thank you for your time and consideration. I hope my opposition is considered and taken seriously as this will directly affect my property value and enjoyment of the property.

Jarett Schneider
[18 Huron Ave]

From: Jarett Schneider
Sent: December 12, 2021 4:36 PM
To: Will Nywening <wnywening@lambtonshores.ca>
Subject: Re: Zoning by-law application ZO-16/2022

Thank you for for the information Will, it was very helpful. I won't be able to make the meeting on December 21, but I would like to officially oppose the proposed amendments. How do I go about doing this? Do I just email you directly or do I need to fill out a form. Thanks again for your help and time.

Jarett Schneider

From: Jarett Schneider
Sent: December 7, 2021 6:13 PM
To: Will Nywening <wnywening@lambtonshores.ca>
Subject: Zoning by-law application ZO-16/2022

Hello, I received a notice of public hearing regarding application ZO-16/2021 for 17 Pine St. Grand Bend. I'm looking for more information regarding the differences between Residential-4 and Residential-3 (R3-*). My main concern is the maximum build height difference between R4 and R3*. This build will directly affect my view of the lake. Thank you for your time.

Jarett Schneider.

12/12/2021

Honorable Mayor Weber, Council Members, And Planing Committee

Lambton Shores, Ontario. Ref. Zoning variance application ZO-16/2021

First off let me introduce ourselves. We are Margaret & Gary Van Hulle the owners of 19 Pine Street, the property immediately to the north of the property requesting the variance. We have the following concerns with the rezoning from R4 to R3 and the location of the proposed building:

1) **Front alignment:** Currently all of the homes along the waterfront are in the same line which makes for a pleasant view from the "beach side" and doesn't infringe on a neighbor's view to the north or south. In its proposed location, the proposed property will interfere with several homeowners views. The proposed property footprint could be relocated rearward and line up with the rest of the homes along the beach without reducing it's overall size. In fact this would help with the drainage concerns we also have.
2) **Drainage concerns:** In addition to the above we are concerned with the amount of water runoff from the proposed complex. As you may or may not be aware of, there is currently a big problem in several areas of Plan 24 with flooding after it rains. One of those areas is at the bottom of the driveway of this proposed development. Every time we get a heavy rain "Pine Lake" develops and all of us homeowners on Pine Street worry how high will it go? Several homes have had water in their lower levels. With additional runoff from a larger driveways at the proposed site this can only get worse. Along these lines I would encourage council to develop a storm sewer master plan to manage the storm water. Currently the collector drains (sand sewers) in several areas are inadequate. In some cases it takes several days for these flooded areas to drain. Additional problem areas within Plan24 are on Center and Queen, Walker and Huron and of course Pine Street.
3) **Single family dwelling:** Becoming a 3 family residence concerns us with the additional volume of traffic, parking etc. As more and more of this rezoning is allowed within the community (particularly Plan 24) we worry that the infrastructure of Plan 24 and its

surrounding areas will not be able to support the additional traffic/people. Our roads are already too narrow for the traffic we have currently (Limiting parking within Plan24 to residents only by permit may be a solution). With no sidewalks for pedestrians to walk on they are forced to walk on the streets to get to the downtown area or the beach. With more and more of these rezonings in the future, it is possible to see three times the traffic and the potential for three times the parking issues. Considering the parking issues we currently have, we encourage council to consider limiting the number of rezoning requests in the Plan24 residential area. Limiting building to single family home's within the residential areas while allowing the downtown area to grow would reduce the load on an infrastructure that was never intended to support the additional population density.It would also allow the village to retain some of its original charm.

In conclusion we support rejection of this variance and hope that our thoughts have given you something to think about before approving any future ones. Plan 24 is currently a very dense area and needs to be studied concerning its future population density, road structure, pedestrian safety, and storm water management. Grand Bend is a unique growing community with a bright future, but it will need some help from all of us to keep its charm.

SINCERELY,

Gary Van Hulle Margaret Van Hulle

GARY & MARGARET VAN HULLE
19 PINE STREET

From: Sikke Hoiting
Sent: December 15, 2021 11:43 AM
To: Stephanie Troyer-Boyd <STroyer-Boyd@lambtonshores.ca>
Subject: Zoning Amendment Application for 17Pine St GrandBend

I am writing in regard to the property being proposed on the beach. I can't understand why this is even considered. Higher and higher Bigger and bigger. When is this going to stop. This company is destroying our town.They are buying up all the property they can taking down trees not getting permits and not giving a dam about anyone else. They want to build this condo(which it is) on the beach for family they say. What a bunch of bull. They will rent it out just like all the other properties they have bought .why does this company have so much pull and are being allowed to get away with this and why weren't the taxpayers informed. Why people ask have they got so much pull to keep doing this. Our friend on King Street had to jump through hoops to build her beautiful house and she followed all the rules. Now she will have her view which she built her home around blocked by this monstrosity. Also the places that spent millions building their places will also be affected. Please do not allow this and look in to this company further. Thank you

Diane and Sikke Hoiting. Woodward Ave. Grand Bend.

From: James Strand
Sent: December 15, 2021 2:00 PM
To: Stephanie Troyer-Boyd <STroyer-Boyd@lambtonshores.ca>
Subject: ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION ZO-16/2021

In regard to the application of MFL Properties Ltd at 17 Pine St, Grand Bend. I do hereby oppose the request of this application in its entirety. I find the applicant is extremely short sighted wanting to overdevelop this parcel of land and has failed to take into consideration the detrimental effects this project would have on not just the neighbours but on the entire community. Creating a triplex dwelling at this location would create a dangerous precedent to our community and allow these developments to spring up in any residential neighbourhood. Building an 11.2 m high triplex would not only eliminate sensitive beach areas but would go directly against the work the community has already done to preserve the small leisure areas that currently exist. As well, rooftop patios reduce privacy for the neighbours, are anti-social, and create logistical problems for first responders to access and deal with medical/criminal emergencies. As well the summertime noise issues in Grand Bend would be compounded with the addition of these rooftop amenity areas. These particular types of developments have no place within a residential area at all.
I also have concerns with the fact that I found out about this application through an affected neighbour. The proposed creation of a "new" zone application affects the entire town and as such we should all have a say. As well the application seems to suggest that the developer is creating their own zoning policy. Is the Municipality giving them preferential treatment? It is the responsibility of the Municipality to ensure that the community is kept informed and I feel that is greatly lacking in this respect.
I would like to be notified of the decision of the Council of the Municipality of Lambton Shores at this email address. Please consider this email miy signed letter of opposition. Thank you.

Mr. J. Strand
11 Warwick Ave,
Grand Bend ON.