



64 Jardin Drive, Unit 1B
Concord, Ontario
L4K 3P3
T. 905.669.4055
F. 905.669.0097
klmplanning.com

File: P-3232

February 16, 2021

Haldimand County
53 Thorburn Street South
Cayuga, Ontario N0A
1E0

**Attention: Ms. Shannon VanDalen, MCIP, RPP
Manager – Planning and Development**

**Re: Haldimand County Municipal Comprehensive Review
Hagersville Holdings Ltd. (c/o DG Group)
Part Lot 16-18, Concession 12 Walpole 1, 4 & Part Lot 17 & 18 Concession 12
Walpole Parts 2 and 3**

Dear Ms. VanDalen,

Further to our submission dated February 1, 2021, we were in attendance (virtually) at the public meeting held on Tuesday February 9, 2021. In accordance with the County's requirements, we provided an email in advance of the 11:30am deadline to ask some follow up questions that arose out of the presentation by Mr. Reiners.

As noted in Mr. Reiners, presentation, he advised as it relates to Hagersville, there was "lack of justification" as it pertains to the inclusion of my client's land as part of the settlement boundary for Hagersville. We have provided a detailed submission, which includes some questions from Mr. Daryl Keleher of Altus Group that also identify some potential flaws in the analysis that has been used to determine the amount of land required to be included in the Hagersville settlement boundary. We believe the questions raised in our letter should be addressed prior to Council making a decision on the current draft.

As a result of questions sent via email, we were able to obtain a copy of the letter from Mr. Luke MacLeod of Lafarge which identified a number of concerns of the proposed lands to be included in the Hagersville settlement boundary which are in close proximity to their existing aggregate operation. Mr. MacLeod identifies a number of issues, one which must not be overlooked is whether the proposed parcels of land to be included in the settlement boundary are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2020). As noted in our original letter, we do not understand why lands which appear to be sterilized as a result of the active aggregate operation, would be chosen as part of the settlement boundary, when there are lands, such as those proposed by my client, which are

not impeded by such restriction. This in our view is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2020).

In our view, the lands which are sterilized would likely be appropriate for future residential development, only once the aggregate operation ceases to exist. By designating these lands as future development, they can remain within the Hagersville settlement boundary, but would not be counted towards the land budget exercise. In turn, this will enable the County to designate lands that can be developed in the short term, such as my clients parcel, without any restriction and thus ensuring the County meets the growth targets as set out in the Growth Plan.

In conclusion, we respectfully request before any decision is made on the draft Official Plan that all comments and submissions provided have been thoroughly reviewed and responded to and the above be considered in the context of the land budget exercise. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned. Yours truly,

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.



Keith MacKinnon, MCIP, RPP
Partner

Copy: Alexa-Rae Valente - DG Group
Darren Steedman – DG Group Daryl
Keleher – Altus Group
David Stubbs – Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

