



## Town of The Blue Mountains

32 Mill Street, Box 310

Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0

Phone: 519-599-3131 Fax: 519-599-7723

www.thebluemountains.ca

---

**Date:** March 22, 2024

**Re:** 125 Peel Street Servicing Project - Public Information Centre #1

This memo is intended to provide a summary of the questions, comments and answers that were received prior to, or asked during, the Public Information Centre (PIC) held on March 7, 2024. The PIC was held virtually on Microsoft Teams from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. A total of 31 individuals attended the meeting.

Included below is a summary of the primary themes heard throughout the PIC, as well as a table with the verbatim written questions and comments that were submitted regarding the meeting. To see all of the questions and comments that were brought forward during the PIC, please view the [full recording of the meeting](#).

**1. Location/inclusion of proposed multi-use trail on Peel Street South**

Respondents voiced concerns about the proposed inclusion and location of the multi-use trail (MUT) on the west side of Peel Street South given that it would cross private residential driveways.

*Staff Response: A MUT is common within a right-of-way. The Town's Engineer will take all appropriate measures to ensure the trail is designed to be safe for everyone. The Town has no concerns regarding a MUT or conflicts with cars/driveways. This situation is similar to sidewalks all over Town and the trails throughout the Blue Mountain village, including Jozo Weider Boulevard. Both Peel Street South and Alice Street are identified as "Core Routes for Active Transportation" in the recently completed Transportation Master Plan. The contemplated MUT on Peel Street South will link CR 113 and Campus of Care with the MUT on Peel Street North and the Georgian Trail as well as with the future MUT on Alice Street.*

**2. Costs related to servicing extension to other properties in area**

Respondents voiced concerns about the costs that would be incurred by property owners if a servicing extension was pursued, and that this would be unfair given that the option for the extension was prompted by the 125 Peel Street Servicing project and not by resident request. There were some suggestions that the Campus of Care developer should pay for the private residential servicing as well. There were also questions regarding the Town's Affordability Policy given recent inflationary changes and the rising cost of living.

*Staff Response: A servicing extension would not proceed without additional public consultation. Any servicing extension would have to follow the current policies and by-laws of the Town and obtain Councils endorsement prior to proceeding. . This would include a review of the Town's Affordability Policy regarding wastewater servicing extensions, and a review of potential benefitting property owners feedback once costs are known.*

**3. Incorporation of active transportation**

Respondents voiced support for active transportation routes to the Campus of Care property to be considered as a priority.

*Staff Response: None required.*

**4. Selection of access points to Campus of Care property**

Respondents questioned why the access points to the Campus of Care property were being incorporated on Peel Street, and not exclusively incorporated on Grey Road 113.

*Staff Response: An Active Transportation Study and a Traffic Impact Study are underway and nearing completion. These studies are based on the design concept provided by the developers of the Campus of Care which includes two access points off Peel Street South and one access point off Grey Road 113. The Campus of Care consists of two separate lots which both front Peel Street South, and should have access off Peel Street South. This will be resolved with Planning and Development services review of the development proposal.*

**5. Need for urbanization of Peel Street South**

Respondents questioned the need for the full urbanization of Peel Street South.

*Staff Response: The primary objective of this project is to service the 125 Peel Street South property which requires watermain, sanitary sewer, drainage/storm sewers and third-party utilities including hydro, natural gas and communications. The most efficient method of providing most – if not all – of these services is via Peel Street South from Arthur Street/Highway 26. This work will require the full reconstruction of Peel Street South. An urban cross-section has been identified as the preliminary preferred alternative as the rural cross-section would require extensive excavation and complete tree loss for the construction of ditches. Peel Street South has also been contemplated through the Town’s Development Charges Background Study which classifies this road as an “urban collector” to be reconstructed to full urban standard. The Town’s Transportation Master Plan was also recently completed and identified Peel Street South for “core active transportation”. The findings of these studies has led the project team to its current position of recommending a full urban cross-section with a 2.7-3.0 metre MUT.*

**6. Initial Tree Inventory and tree impacts**

Respondents questioned the accuracy of the results shown on the Tree Inventory slide within the presentation materials given the time of year at which the inventory was completed. They also raised concerns regarding the number of trees that may be impacted by the planned works.

*Staff Response: The full arborist’s report has not yet been completed. The design will be advanced and the Arborist Report will be completed once the scope of the project has been confirmed through Council consideration of the alternatives presented during the PIC. However, it is common practice to complete tree assessments during periods after the leaves have fallen in order to assess the condition of tree trunks and branches that cannot be seen during period when the leaves are on the tree. The tree condition assessment presented in the PIC was completed by a Certified Arborist.*

**7. Drainage improvements**

Respondents has questions regarding the private property drainage work that may be required as referenced during the PIC presentation.

*Staff Response: The Town’s Drainage Master Plan currently sits at 60% completion and has identified culverts on Alice Street and Baring Street that are recommended to be upsized to handle stormwater flows. The upsizing of these culverts would likely result in increased flows towards private property which could result in flooding if work on private property is not completed. The Town’s project team will be contacting and consulting directly with potentially impacted property owners.*

**8. Public consultation**

Respondents stated that they were caught off guard by the announcement of this project and voiced concerns about a lack of public consultation up to this point. There were also concerns expressed regarding the amount of time allotted to prepare and provide feedback on the PIC materials.

*Staff Response: The 125 Peel Street Servicing project was approved through the Town’s 2022 Budget process which included presentations to Committee of the Whole and a Public Meeting. The servicing project was also referenced in Staff Reports [FAF.22.096](#), [FAF.23.036](#) and [CSOPS.23.038](#). It is not Town*

*Policy to send written notice when staff reports concerning a specific area of the community are being considered. A dedicated project web page for the 125 Peel Street Servicing project was published to the Town's website in July 2023. At this time, an email was sent to 47 individuals subscribed at the time to the Town's "125 Peel Street – Community Campus of Care" Development Project web page to notify them of the servicing project. Following the award of the servicing project engineering contract, the Town's consultant has been working on the necessary background studies needed to inform the project. The first PIC held on March 7 provided an opportunity for the public to learn more about the project scope and provide comment on the alternative solutions that had been identified based on the background studies. A follow-up Staff Report will be presented to Town Council to provide a summary of the comments heard in response to the material presented at the Public Information Centre. When the Staff Report is presented, members of the public will have another opportunity to provide comments for Council consideration.*

**9. Intersection improvements at Highway 26/Grey Road 113 and Highway 26/Peel Street**

Respondents voiced concerns about the potential for increased traffic to create hazards at multiple intersections in close proximity to the project boundaries.

*Staff Response: Intersection upgrades have not been included in the scope of this work. Portions or the entirety of the intersections in question are under Provincial and County jurisdiction. The Ministry of Transportation and Grey County would need to be consulted prior to any intersection upgrades being implemented.*

**10. Impacts to property values**

Respondents voiced concerns about the negative impact to their property values that could result from the servicing work as well as the construction of the Campus of Care. Some suggested that the Town should compensate property owners for any negative impacts to property values.

*Staff Response: Town staff are not certified real estate appraisers and cannot speculate on the impacts to property values resulting from reconstruction work.*

**Written Comments Received**

<p>Paul Reale Emailed 3/7/2024</p>	<p>As a long-time resident of [REDACTED] please accept and consider these questions and comments for tonight's virtual meeting as I will not be available to attend.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We have a proposal to run the trail along Peel Street South. This seems to be a very reckless recommendation considering that the trail will run along the front of residential homes and their driveways, which means car and truck traffic will be crossing the path of the trail. Members of council need to consider the dangers imposed on residences of Peel Street South as they pull in and out of their driveways to access their homes. We run the risk of hitting pedestrians and cyclists on the trail. Moreover, there is no area in Blue Mountain that I can think of where the trail runs in front of residences. Instead, the trail runs along the backyards of residences. Also, how necessary is this trail? The Campus of Care has already allotted for a trail from 10th Line to Alice Street.</li> <li>2. The servicing of Peel Street South has not been recommended to improve the infrastructure for the residences of Peel Street South. On the contrary, the servicing is recommended entirely to support the Campus of Care Project, which received MZO designation and, as a result, left our community with no voice to share our concerns about the project. Now, we are being asked to unilaterally incur extensive costs for the servicing of sewage and municipal water. We would like to ask council to consider subsidizing these significant costs because the Town of Blue Mountains has received funding from the government to service Peel Street South and earned a record profit from the sale of 125 Peel Street South.</li> </ol>
<p>Maureen McDonnell Emailed 3/11/2024</p>	<p>Thank you for your Public presentation on the 125 Peel Street Project.</p> <p>I am writing from the perspective of a resident of Thornbury living in [REDACTED]. I am thinking of a safe route for accessibility to the Campus of Care. My preference is to think beyond driving a car to the site to visit future residents of the entire facility. I am aware that couples are often in need of different levels of care and one may be a resident and the other living at home. I think to be able to access this site with ease and safety is a priority for not only myself but all residents of Thornbury. We may want to use a bike, a walker, a scooter, or just walk to the C of C. We may not have access to a car. There are enough streets for cars to access the site.</p> <p>My feedback therefore focuses on the Alice Street Alternatives offered in the presentation.</p> <p>I prefer Alternative #4 which maximizes Active Transportation and protection for trees. I also give my next preference to #3, which gives priority to active transportation between the community and the C of C and allows One Way traffic. When I think of the possibilities for shopping, recreation, restaurants and knowing there is space for relaxed movement then my choice is to prioritize my support for a MUT linking the C of C with the Thornbury community. Children will also be coming and going to the C of C and offering a wonderful MUT that links to schools and recreational opportunities is an excellent choice. With the makeover of the Moreau Park, what a lovely destination to and from C of C. I also want to stress my preference for maintenance of the tree canopy for cooling and the beauty of this community.</p> <p>With Gratitude for all the work you are doing.</p>
<p>Richard Lamperstorfer Emailed 3/12/2024</p>	<p>As the owner of [REDACTED] the use decision I make depends on the option/choice made for servicing subject lands *</p> <p>At the moment I have a severance application with TBM that appears to be ignored, frozen, other, perhaps for the benefit of the "greater good", that being future residential density.?</p> <p>So, having attended meeting*, I strongly support the option of servicing that would allow a future development on my lands to the more appropriate use of DENSITY/housing, than one, my current "D" TBM limit. That being adequate pipe capacity reaching Baring Street and Alfred Street West. And, for the record, my professional planners FOUR plans are now over 6 years old, and the highest density of</p>

	<p>over 100 townhouses is no longer allowed under County of Grey updated greenfield density within the Thornbury settlement boundary, that being my side of 10th Line.</p> <p>Summary: highest and best use of my land, others, is to be serviced with water and sewer. Our plan, a secondary plan was in the works with several neighbouring "D" lands in West Thornbury over 5 years ago. we had some disagreements so it failed.</p> <p>I am waiting on a severance decision at TBM that is in limbo, though I asked them to proceed. Planning fails to return emails.</p> <p>My thoughts are TBM Planning should discuss placing a NUMBER on the units in the zone, or on individual lots, or the whole 'closest to the CORE' area will be lost to ONE single family house per large acreage, ... as with mine!</p> <p>It's clear to see 2 acre lots that are 'lost" best use.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
<p>Tom Maloney Emailed 3/19/2024</p>	<p>1) We as neighbours are confused about the timeline for providing responses to your presentation on the evening of March 7. Perhaps you can clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The press release (link below) posted March 7 gave the public until March 10 to respond to a 12-point list of components.</li> <li>• During the presentation we were given two weeks, until March 21, to respond;</li> <li>• My spouse Wendy called the Town clerk's office last week and was informed that 20 days (March 28) had been allotted.</li> </ul> <p>Which is (was) it?</p> <p><a href="https://www.thebluemountains.ca/town-hall/news-notices/public-feedback-requested-regarding-community-campus-care">https://www.thebluemountains.ca/town-hall/news-notices/public-feedback-requested-regarding-community-campus-care</a></p> <p>2) During the Q&amp;A on March 7, if I denoted correctly, you indicated that the Town did not ask you to consider 10th Line as a primary traffic access point to the Campus of Care. Which Town staff manager(s) is responsible for excluding that option?</p> <p>It is entirely perplexing that the Town would choose to use the existing, quiet neighbourhood along Peel street and, in the "full urbanization" option, Alice St as traffic access points to the Campus. Using 10th Line would correspond to the Town's traffic management plan that was completed less than two years ago, would it not?</p> <p>3) The commissioned arborist seemingly spent two of the very coldest days in the middle of this winter visually inspecting trees in the study area. As far as anyone in the neighbourhood knows, no other testing was performed on the trees.</p> <p>My brother, an arborist, was the manager responsible for the City of Mississauga's bylaw enforcement. He did extensive pruning work on our property [REDACTED] and I'm certain he would have been surprised to see the slide classifying a tree next to our driveway as "dead".</p> <p>That tree, which sprouts leaves bountifully from spring until fall, would of course also be stunned by that arborist's assessment. Which leads us to question the integrity of that arborist's full assessment of all trees in the area. On the basis of this one report, is the Town considering levelling all these trees? Will there be more comprehensive testing done in the spring?</p> <p>4) The waterway referred to in your presentation as a "ditch" is actually a tributary protected by the local Conservation Authority. That stream flows through our property and the two-acre property directly</p>

	<p>across the street. Your slide indicates, "Drainage Improvements associated with ditch crossing may include private property works."</p> <p>What exactly would those "works" entail?</p> <p>Thank you. As you might imagine, we as neighbors have many more concerns and questions. A response to the Town is being formulated.</p>
<p>Paul Reale Emailed 3/20/2024</p>	<p>Please accept my comments as a response to your presentation on "125 Peel Street South – Campus of Care Servicing and Peel St. South and Alice Street Reconstruction" held on March 7, 2024 from 5:00PM-7:00PM.</p> <p>As a long-term resident of Thornbury with a family history of living here for over 100 years, your recent presentation raised alarm bells in our household. Specifically, we are extremely worried that your proposals, if approved by the Town of Blue Mountains, will have catastrophic consequences on our home by devaluing our property and causing us to take on an insurmountable debt to the Town of Blue Mountains for a service extension that is driven solely by the Campus of Care project. In fact, we fear a worst-case scenario of being forced to sell our home in a fire sale to a developer with the prospect of having to leave Thornbury altogether in search of affordable housing in another community.</p> <p>After your presentation on March 7th, our family now feels as though we are in the way of a project that would like to see us pushed out of our home. The Campus of Care project is the biggest project the Town of Blue Mountain has ever taken on. Yet, we have not been consulted or approached by anyone in the Town and, therefore, have had no opportunity to include our input before your proposals were presented to our neighbourhood.</p> <p>We have already been shut out from the democratic process by the Minister's Zoning Order (MZO) at 125 Peel Street South, which completely silenced our voices. Your proposals for serving Peel Street South and Alice Street have moved in the same unilateral manner in that neither public information events nor resident surveys were ever held to seek our input before any studies or measures were conducted by WT Infrastructure. At the meeting, we were told that this project will have a significant impact on our area and that our area is going to change, yet we've had no opportunity to voice our opinions until now when you are in the final stages of preparing your recommendations to the Town of Blue Mountains. You provided us with less than 14 days to submit comments, which leaves me wondering why you are not amenable to listening to the residents affected by your proposals. To be sure, you and your colleagues have had ample opportunity to come knock on my door and introduce yourself on the numerous occasions that you've been walking around on the periphery of my property [REDACTED]</p> <p><b>Transportation Studies</b></p> <p>During your presentation, you proposed using Peel Street South as a main artery for traffic to the Campus of Care. Acknowledging the negative impact that this increased traffic would have on Peel Street South, your presentation recommended a future roundabout at the intersection of Peel Street and Highway 26 to help deal with the increased traffic congestion.</p> <p>In your presentation, however, you made no mention of using the intersection of Grey Road 113/10th Line and Highway 26 as a possible route to direct traffic to the Campus of Care and install a roundabout at this intersection. The Town of Blue Mountains' Transportation Master Plan clearly states that "[t]his intersection carries significant east-west traffic and increasing north-south traffic, particularly once the Community Campus of Care is completed." When asked during the presentation why the intersection of Grey Road 113/10th Line and Highway 26 was not considered for traffic access to the Campus of Care, the engineer, Jamie Witherspoon, responded that his firm had not been authorized to consider this option. Your presentation did not make clear why this option was not considered.</p> <p>During the presentation, you also mentioned that there would be no expropriation of property for this project; however, a future roundabout for Peel Street South would more than likely require the</p>

expropriation of property belonging to the residents of Peel Street South who live at the intersection of Peel Street South and Highway 26.

In the Town of Blue Mountains' Transportation Master Plan, the intersection of Grey Road 113/10th Line and Highway 26 has been identified as a Community Gateway and a proposed route for a potential Thornbury bypass where the traffic will flow down Grey Road 113 and Alfred Street. The report also points out that the intersection of Grey Road 113/10th Line and Highway 26 is shown to "have high collision rates or frequent mention from the public as having safety or speeding concerns." In fact, the report cites a fatality at this intersection in April 2022. The report maintains, moreover, that this intersection may in the near future require a roundabout to mitigate these issues. Yet, your presentation remained silent on these findings of the Transportation Master Plan, an impartial study which makes no mention of the intersection of Peel Street and Highway 26 as a problem area in need of traffic lights or a roundabout.

The transportation studies you presented during your presentation run counter to the Town of Blue Mountain's Transportation Master Plan and do not take into account the problem intersection of Grey Road 113/10th Line and Highway 26. We need to have alternatives presented that use the intersection of the intersection of Grey Road 113/10 Line and Highway 26 for traffic access to the Campus of Care. This way, we are tackling the issues presented in the Transportation Master Plan. That the Campus of Care has an address of 125 Peel Street South in no way removes the possibility that the main access area for the Campus of Care can be moved to Grey Road 113 and accessed from the intersection of Grey Road 113/10th Line and Highway 26.

In the final analysis, your proposal to direct traffic via Peel Street South will turn the intersection of Peel Street and Highway 26 into an intersection with safety issues now plaguing the intersection of Grey Road 113/10th Line and Highway 26. As the Town of Blue Mountains' Transportation Master Plan recommends, the next prudent step would be to work with the Ministry of Transportation to conduct a study that advances a regional Highway 26 Transportation report with consideration for measures shown in Figure 8.2 of the Town of Blue Mountains' Transportation Master Plan, which outlines using the intersection of Grey Road 113/10th Line and Highway 26 as a potential Thornbury bypass.

#### **Multi-Use Trail on Peel Street South**

Your presentation also recommended a multi-use trail on Peel Street South as a way to facilitate crossing between Peel Street South and Peel Street North. During the presentation, it was not clear why we would need a multi-use trail on Peel Street South, which, as your proposal recommends, will have traffic directed onto it with up to 300 cars a day. A road projected to have a heavy flow of traffic with a trail adjacent to the road and crossing the Campus of Care entrance and residential driveways is a very serious safety hazard and exists nowhere else in the Town of Blue Mountains.

With the increased traffic load on Peel Street South, moreover, it is not clear why people using the Georgian Trail would be encouraged to cross Highway 26 via Peel Street to connect to the multi-use trail on Peel Street South. A possible alternative would be to resolve the transportation issues at the intersection of Grey Road 113/10th Line and Highway 26 with traffic lights or a roundabout and make a connection from the Georgian Trail to the multi-use trail that will be running down the Campus of Care. Nevertheless, you provided no proposal for this to be an option even though this alternative is in keeping with the findings of the Transportation Master Plan.

Again, your proposal is fraught with serious safety hazards and does not seem to be based on any major studies conducted on creating new multi-use trails that would connect to the Georgian Trail. The Town of Blue Mountains should conduct a proper study on new multi-use trails in Thornbury. The Transportation Master Plan offers no concrete recommendations for new multi-use trails, and it is not clear what empirical studies you are using to substantiate your proposal.

#### **Clear Cutting of Trees**

The proposal of servicing 125 Peel Street South and the inclusion of a multi-use trail on Peel Street South also identifies a clear cutting of over 200 trees, most of which are mature trees in good shape. Your

	<p>statistics reveal that only 16% of the trees have been designated as a quality of poor to dead. Also, the GIS/Topographical surveys that the engineering teams displayed during your presentation are not accurate identifications of property lines and the Town’s Right of Way.</p> <p>The Town of Blue Mountain is obliged to assess the WT Infrastructure proposals against its Tree Preservation Report by commissioning an independent engineering firm to perform accurate land surveys and commissioning an independent arborist to assess the trees. Needless to say, the environmental impact of your proposal will be extremely severe by choosing traffic over trees.</p> <p><b>Servicing Costs</b></p> <p>The servicing of 125 Peel Street South has not been recommended to improve the infrastructure for the residences of Peel Street South, Alice Street or Baring Street. On the contrary, the servicing is recommended entirely to support the Campus of Care Project, which received MZO designation and, as a result, left our community with no voice to share our concerns about the project. Now, we are being asked to unilaterally incur extensive costs for the servicing of sewage and municipal water. We would like to ask Council to consider subsidizing these significant costs because the Town of Blue Mountains has received funding from the government to service Peel Street South. The individual cost to the homeowners along Peel, Alice and Baring streets are estimated by WT Infrastructure at up to \$85,000 each for sewage tie-in alone. We will then bear additional costs connecting the water and sewage lines to our homes.</p> <p><b>Final Remarks</b></p> <p>The “full urbanization” proposal for Peel Street South and Alice Street should be rejected. It is a project with little foresight for an area that has been designated for future secondary planning, which, as you pointed out in your proposal, is more than 10 years away.</p> <p>Your current proposals, moreover, are not rooted in longitudinal studies like the Town of Blue Mountains’ Transportation Master Plan and the Tree Protection Plan. Instead, your proposals conducted by WT Infrastructure will result in increasing traffic enormously on residential roads, destroying mature trees, placing unbearable individual costs on the residents of Peel, Baring and Alice Streets and permanently altering the character of the surrounding neighborhoods – all with no input from the residents of the Town of Blue Mountains.</p> <p>We need a proper plan for this area that is based on both the voices of the community and longitudinal empirical studies before we change the character of this area and come to have</p>
<p>Betty Muise, Tree Trust TBM</p> <p>Emailed 3/20/2024</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of Tree Trust TBM regarding the above referenced proposed servicing project. Several residents have contacted Tree Trust regarding potential tree removals associated with this project. I understand that no options have been decided upon at this point but, as we move forward, I would like to remind Staff and Council about the exceptional engagement of community residents who have repeatedly expressed concern and advocated for tree protection in TBM.</p> <p>As this servicing project evolves, residents and Tree Trust will be looking for the Town to prioritize trees versus cars. Healthy, established trees and the natural ecosystems they support are not easily replaced. Town projects – from assessment through to design and implementation – can and should prioritize tree preservation, certainly over increased car traffic through our Town. Residents want a liveable town, with a mixed tree canopy, that includes healthy and cared for legacy trees.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and work on behalf of TBM residents and our local environment.</p>
<p>Tom Maloney</p> <p>Emailed 3/21/2024</p>	<p>In response to the March 7, 2024 presentation by WT Infrastructure Solutions and the Town, the following comments and recommendations have been gathered from numerous property owners located east of the proposed Campus of Care development.</p>



While the noble concepts underpinning the Campus are appreciated, we believe the Town is rushing this development. In doing so, Staff are failing to consider both reasonable alternatives to the existing proposals, and the potentially negative ramifications to be imposed on existing neighborhoods.

**The “Full Urbanization” proposal in the WT Infrastructure document should be rejected** as it will result in:

- increasing traffic enormously,
- destroying dozens if not hundreds of mature trees,
- placing an unbearable cost burden on individual landowners for water and sewage hookups,
- straining the Town’s overall capital-cost and maintenance budgets,
- creating a safety hazard for pedestrians and cyclists,
- permanently altering the character of the bordering neighborhood, and
- arguably devastating property values, particularly along Peel and Baring streets.

**Use 10th Line as the Primary Access:** The infrastructure required for Traffic and Water/Wastewater are separate issues.

Regarding Traffic, The Town of the Blue Mountain's Transportation Master Plan (TMP) – based on extensive staff and consultant research -- designates Grey Road 113/10th Line to take on traffic flow, complementing Hwy 26.

In contrast, the Campus of Care developer and the consultant, WT Infrastructure, are instead proposing that a minimum of 300 vehicles per day be routed through an existing, quiet residential neighborhood along Peel, Baring and possibly Alice streets.

In an email on behalf of the Town, project manager Mike Humphries writes to us that the Active Transportation Study and Traffic Impact Study are “based on the design provided by the developers which includes two access points off Peel St. South ...”

The question then, is why the Town is granting the developer a mandate to determine traffic flow, and why that developer’s plan is being endorsed in apparent contrast to the TMP?

The Town is urged to instruct the developer to route traffic into the Campus directly and solely from the 10th Line, without using Peel on either end.

The primary intersection would be at 10th Line and Hwy 26, which is already in dire need of a traffic light or circle.

**Adopt the WT Infrastructure recommendation** to shut down the gravel strip connecting Baring and Peel streets. and to place a cul-de-sac at the Alice St. bridge. These actions will prevent traffic from using Alice as an alternative to Hwy 26 – a practice already being pursued by Town staff driving maintenance vehicles.

**Tree preservation:** To maintain the character of Thornbury, and consistent with Phase 1 of the Thornbury West construction, the Town is urged to apply the Tree Preservation Report practice against proposals which presently appear to favour ‘traffic over trees’.

Before plotting street reconstruction and trails, the Town may commission an independent engineering firm to perform proper land surveys, as has occurred on Peel St. North.

The Town should further observe The Forestry Act which defines boundary trees. [RSO 1990, c F.26 | Forestry Act | CanLI.](#)

By following due process, we believe the Town would determine that Peel St should not be used from either Hwy 26 or 10th Line as access points.

Sewage and water lines can be installed without destroying mature trees.

**Obtain a proper arborist report:** WT Infrastructure's Power Point presentation cited an arborist classification of trees in the area to be in conditions ranging from "dead" to "excellent". That survey was conducted by visual inspection, in the midst of winter.

**Safety hazard for bicyclists and pedestrians:** The proposal calls for a trail to be installed along Peel Street across existing driveways, while at the same time routing a minimum of 300 motorized vehicles per day along the same street. This is illogical.

**Compensation for mitigating property values:** We request that the Town obtain an independent assessment of the impact on property values in the adjoining neighborhoods to the east of the Campus of Care.

If that study finds that Town policy has resulted in destroying value, present landowners should be compensated accordingly.

Millions of dollars have been invested privately in these properties. No one could have reasonably anticipated that the Town would install a compound consisting of 896 beds, plus daycare and other uses, from farmland [REDACTED].

**Include private water and sewage tie-in as a component of the Campus of Care construction budget:** WT Infrastructure estimates individual cost to homeowners along Peel, Alice and Baring streets to range up to \$85,000 each, only for sewage tie-in only.

Town neglect has left the water pipe under Alice and Baring streets in need of repair or replacement.

Residents currently using septic systems and/or wells would have been under no legal obligation to tie-in following repair.

The installation being recommended is entirely to support the Campus of Care and future development.

According to the WT Infrastructure, servicing the Campus of Care will represent up to 99% of costs, while private resident servicing will account for 1.5%. That estimate excludes monthly water and/or wastewater charges not presently being borne by residents.

This represents an unbearable financial burden, no matter the level of subsidies -- the formula for which seems to be based on quizzical mathematics.

Moreover, the short- and long-term disruption being inflicted on the neighborhood will have an enormous impact on lifestyle.

Accordingly, the Town, province and region should assume all costs associated with servicing private residences, and to exempt this action from existing bylaws as required.

**Study the social, cultural and policing consequences associated with the Campus of Care:** How will Thornbury be affected by adding a 160-bed long-term-care facility, 260-bed retirement home, 160 attainable housing units and 316 multi-family units? Has the notion of placing subsidized housing adjacent to daycare and seniors housing been considered appropriately?

**Communication and consultation:** TBM Council has endorsed and adopted a Communications Strategy as Town policy.

To quote the core concept: "The Strategy has a single goal that underscores the importance of listening and proactive communication that includes all residents and stakeholders in The Blue Mountains community."

	<p>Communication about the Campus of Care development has been anything but proactive – passive, at best -- consisting almost entirely of posting notices to the TBM website.</p> <p>Only surrounding neighbors to the east of the Campus have been consulted directly, and that consultation came in the form of a Microsoft Teams event on March 7, 2024, with a consultant reading WT’s Power Point presentation, rather than in a face-to-face public meeting.</p> <p>No wonder the people on that video call, especially homeowners on Peel, were gobsmacked to discover proposals which would wipe out mature trees, inject massive traffic flow into a quiet neighborhood, install a bike path across driveways, cost tens of thousands of dollars to tie-in, subject them to construction for a year-plus. ...</p> <p>They were given less than two weeks to respond from the time the Power Point was posted to the website.</p> <p>A TBM press release posted to the website on the same date two years earlier, on March 7, 2022, presented a 12-item list of components and objectives regarding the Campus. Council gave the public four days to respond.</p> <p>Up until the Microsoft Team event, there had been no public meetings, excepting an amateurish conference call between the former mayor and the BVO seniors group.</p> <p>Objective #4 from the Town's communications strategy: Foster engagement. ... Actively listen and engage residents to instill public trust and confidence."</p> <p>No such practice has been observed during the development of proposals presented on March 7. The Town instead appears to be following the directive of the former mayor, who was quoted by Collingwood Today saying this in a Council meeting: "I sincerely hope it doesn't go the way of the previous senior’s living five-storey building. Community engagement killed that – community engagement has killed a lot of good projects in this community."</p> <p>Neighbors to the north and east of the proposed Campus are largely ignorant of construction proposals. Likewise, taxpayers as a whole in the Town of the Blue Mountains are ill-informed. Relying on residents to consult the website for updates does not constitute “proactive” communication.</p> <p>The Town should be diligently, openly, honestly communicating the estimate of total Campus of Care capital and ongoing maintenance costs to taxpayers. Those details have not been revealed. Public information sessions have not been conducted for the population as a whole, despite the Campus of Care being one of the largest public projects ever undertaken by the Town.</p> <p>The Town should also inform stakeholders and residents responsibly about the policy for admission into seniors housing and the provincially subsidized long-term-care facility, because presently many may wrongly be under the impression that locals will be granted priority access.</p>
<p>Jillaine Thomson Emailed 3/21/2024</p>	<p>For past 48 years I have been part of the small community of Thornbury, the last 26 years in which I have resided in our family home [REDACTED] It has always been a peaceful neighborhood that reflects the lovely rural nature of our town. Considering the long-standing vernacular architecture of our community, I would never have anticipated the approval of the Campus of Care - a vast and aesthetically urban commercial development Furthermore, I never would have expected such a blatant disregard for the residents who deem this neighborhood their long-term home.</p> <p>As an attendee at the Public Information Centre presentation, I was further incensed by the proposed servicing plans and significant alterations proposed for Peel Street South. From a resident’s perspective, these initiatives negatively impact the quality of our lives and the quiet enjoyment living of our peaceful homes. In summation, the proposed alterations and our associated concerns include:</p>

- Why is the added burden of the Community of Care’s traffic (both vehicular and pedestrian) being placed in an area of residential homes on Peel Street South, when there are other viable non-residential options that could be explored?
  - Why is Peel being utilized rather than Grey 113/10th Line?
  - Comments made at the Public Information Centre Presentation presented verbal assurance that there would be no expropriation of land nor that there is a necessity to widen Peel St. South. I feel uneasy that this will ultimately not be the case. In reference to your staff report of January 2023: “Setbacks and road widenings as may be required by the Ministry of Transportation.” It is my understanding, that this leaves the window open for expropriation to take place, particularly since we have no guarantees to the contrary.
  
- Proposed traffic solutions for Peel Street South:
  - Logistically speaking, the proposed traffic solutions for Peel Street seem unclear and provide no concrete and effective solutions for such a heavy flow of traffic on a small sideroad. With the increased congestion, the intersection of Peel St. South and 26 becomes even more problematic than the intersection of 10 and 26, which has already been identified as a major problem intersection.
  
- A multi-use trail in front of Peel Street South driveways:
  - Presents major issues with safe entry/exit from driveways and places the burden of pedestrian, wheelchair and cyclist safety directly on residents’ shoulders and no mention was clearly made of what measures would be put into place by the town to lessen this safety burden. Additionally, navigating out of a driveway and attempting to avoid trail traffic while simultaneously trying to merge into heavy traffic onto Peel (particularly at peak hours) will be nothing short of a nightmare.
  - A multi-use trail will impede upon residence’s existing structures, in some instances.
  - Removal of existing and established tree lines that currently provide resident privacy and enjoyment.
  - The pedestrian traffic of a multi-use trail facing the front of our house, further impacts our rights to peaceful enjoyment of our property and home. I do not recall any discussion about preserving the private enjoyment of our property and home, particularly if there is no plan implemented to provide a new tree line on the residential side of the trail.
  - No reasonable explanation was provided as to why the trail was to be placed in front of driveways as opposed to an alternate location and, to my knowledge, this is not a common scenario in the town of Thornbury. No alternate locations for this trail were presented or discussed. In fact, if there were more residential homes on our street, it is highly unlikely that this location would have even been considered as an option due to safety concerns.
  
- A mandate to hook into new sewer/water lines:
  - An exorbitant cost to individual homeowners that in most cases, is higher than individual land valuations.
  - Creates a financial burden on residents that does not account for the median household incomes of homes in our area nor the individual financial situations of resident families.
  - Payment options that are as unreasonable as the upfront cost and do nothing to truly ease the longterm financial burden of such a mandate.
  - No option for residents to “opt out” of services.
  - Does not consider the added costs that residents will incur out of pocket to bring the lines to their home. Our home [REDACTED] is a good distance from the road and no mention was made of whether the TBM limits mandatory connection orders, if a home is a certain distance from the main lines.
  - The servicing is solely for the Campus of Care and not for the benefit of residents.

In reference to the Council Meeting of March 6, 2023, it is noted that your mandate was to, “advise the community of all actions and decisions to take place” and to “enhance communication and engagements

	<p>between Town Staff, Town Residents and stakeholders". Why were the neighboring residents of 125 Peel Street not included in early key decision-making processes that would ultimately impact our lives and properties? There appears to be a clear lack of intent to have left us out of this process. Though we are a small neighborhood this does not render us negligible. The lack of transparency and the town council's unilateral decision making process was further evidenced by the expedited nature of the approval and planning process. The town council's decision to finally open a Public Information Centre (and might I mention at such an advanced date into the Campus of Care development process) is seemingly disingenuous considering the way communications have been handled since the project's early planning stages. In addition, providing town residents a mere two weeks for preparation and to provide feedback on servicing proposals presented at the Public Information Centre reinforces the lack of due diligence afforded to the neighbouring residents of 125 Peel Street. That you are now willing to hear our feedback at this advanced stage of development proceedings is frankly "too little, too late".</p> <p>Last but not least, I would be remiss if I did not mention that there appears to be a blatant disregard for the "human" element of these proposals and for the freedoms and rights of tax paying citizens. I feel I can confidently speak for many of my fellow neighbors, when I say that the new development has unexpectedly thrust upon us, an extraordinary financial and emotional burden. On a personal level, it has placed my family in a highly unfavorable emotional and financial situation. Consider the following untenable situation which we have been put into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are no longer young and had envisioned living out the rest of our lives in our long-term home and now this is not a reasonable option. Remaining in our home means foregoing all the reasons that attracted us to this area and the very essence of a rural neighborhood (peace, nature, low traffic, small neighborhood). Facing multiple major disruptions and noise over an extended period and the intrusion of multi-story dwellings abutting our property line will create tremendous emotional stress and significantly affect the quality of our lives.</li> <li>• We face the harsh reality that our home is now significantly devalued as a residential property and most likely not sellable, as no reasonable buyer will want to endure the construction phase of your project. The increased valuation of our home after decades of ownership may now be rendered negligible.</li> <li>• If unbeknownst to us, our land has been slated for future development by TBM, then we will be further restricted as to whom we will be able to sell our home, how we might zone our property, or subdivide our property if we so desire and this further hampers our freedom to pursue options to ease our financial burden.</li> <li>• Adding insult to injury, we are being forced to pay an exorbitant cost to hook into water/sewer service, a service for which we have absolutely no need, which will incur significant personal cost to bring into our home, and for which we will never recoup the cost.</li> </ul> <p>In closing, the entire Campus of Care and associated proposals for our neighborhood far surpass a mere disruption of our lives. They have caused and will continue to cause us a great deal of distress, forcing us to abandon our retirement plans, and are no less than absolutely devastating.</p>
<p>Bill Abbotts Emailed 3/21/2024</p>	<p>I attended the virtual Public Information Centre #1 – March 7, 2024 - It was a little difficult to prepare comments or questions for the PIC when the PIC Power Point presentation was only offered at the meeting. I have just recently returned from out of the country so not able to prepare a detailed response.</p> <p>I would like to now submit my comments, observations, suggestions, and requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I don't believe the two-way traffic MUT (Multi Use Trail) aligns with current practices, nor is it a municipal standard any more than Beaver St between GR 113 and Alice or Elma St between Hwy 26 and Louisa with sidewalks and "paved shoulders" are municipal standards.</li> </ul> <p><b>A much more functional, safer, and preferred Alternate design would include a 1.5 metre sidewalk for pedestrians, including folks with mobility devices, two 3 metre drive lanes, and two 1.25 metre "paved shoulders" for cyclists with semi mountable curbs.</b> This configuration will still fit in the 20 metre right of way as it only increases the pavement by 1.0 metre but replaces the MUT with a 1.5 metre sidewalk. This</p>

	<p>could possibly help in the saving of the large trees along Peel St. Most cyclists should, and will use the roadway so why not make it safer for these vulnerable users and avoid the obvious pedestrian / mobility devices / cyclists conflicts we hear so much about on other shared facilities in town? Rental e-bikes with inexperienced operators are creating chaos on trails in the Blue Mountain Village area.</p> <p>The MUT may have been a workable solution some time ago but is definitely not the best solution in today's environment with a more active community including pedestrians, pedestrians with walkers or strollers, joggers, cyclists, including the huge explosion of e-bikes. A sidewalk and bike lanes on the paved road is a much safer alternative for everyone separating cyclists (including e-bikes) from pedestrians and will fit in the existing topography. My experience shows a properly based asphalt path will perform as well as concrete and may be less expensive in the long run. Why wasn't this alternative presented to the public as an option?</p> <p>Please be forward thinking and consider the e-bike explosion, the vulnerable users, the pedestrians, seniors pole walking, seniors with mobility devices and others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrowed motor vehicle lanes (3 metres), semi mountable curbs, and paved shoulders (1.25 metres) for cyclists with painted lines as on the new Elma St will be much more effective <b>traffic calming</b> than the current preferred alternate configuration.</li> <li>• My experience shows a properly based asphalt path will perform as well as concrete and may be less expensive in the long run. An asphalt surfaced path does not have the uncomfortable cracks as concrete that eventually create sharp rises that can "snake eye" puncture bicycle tubes.</li> <li>• Modern streets <b>should be designed around people</b> not just snow plows and motor vehicles.</li> </ul>
<p>Melissa Herod Emailed 3/21/2024</p>	<p>Please accept my comments as a response to your presentation on 125 Peel Street South – Campus of Care Servicing and Peel St. South and Alice Street Reconstruction held on March 7, 2024 from 5:00PM-7:00PM.</p> <p>As a homeowner in the Town of the Blue Mountains since 2016, I was devastated to learn of the preferred plans presented by the town. The impact of this plan on our family is enormous and will be detrimental to our property value, privacy, and ability to enjoy our home. It will also have a very high financial burden to our household as the proposal eliminates our current driveway, has exorbitant charges for sewer, and a complete re-landscape of our property bordering our home [REDACTED]</p> <p>There are numerous aspects to this plan that make no sense to me.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The direct access point to the Community Campus of Care project being off Peel Street is of great concern. It will direct any traffic coming from the east up Peel St, which is currently a quiet residential street. The logical place for this access would be 10th Line as it is already a higher traffic road, connects to both Thornbury and Clarksburg, and has no buildings, homes or trees to eliminate or work around. There was no valid reason given in the March 7th call for this route.</li> <li>2. A MUT along Peel St to Highway 26 is also of great concern. The impact to the trees along the west side of Peel St is staggering and includes the potential elimination of 5 maple trees that are over 100 years old. It would eliminate our driveway and require us, at great expense, to create a new one. Additionally, we would have to cross the MUT with our car, trucks and AXED trailer which is not safe and would put us at an increased risk of an accident. The trail ends at Highway 26 at the north end of Peel st., an unsafe intersection for crossing to the Georgian Trail. So, the expectation is that trail users would cross unsafely or turn back and walk south on Peel St. Given the previously mentioned impacts, how is this cost logical or justified?</li> </ol> <p>These are two of my numerous concerns, but to be frank, I have not had time within the VERY short response period to address all them all in this letter. As a homeowner, business owner, female entrepreneur, and parent in the TBM, I resent that I have been forced to respond quickly and not given</p>

	<p>the opportunity to do my due diligence on a project that is going to cost my family a staggering amount of money, decrease our property value and ability to enjoy our home and adored community.</p> <p>We are a small neighbourhood community, but our voices are coming together, and they are STRONG. You SHOULD expect that this proposal is challenged, questioned and fought with loud voices. You SHOULD expect to be challenged on the way this project has been communicated and the complete disregard for the residents of our neighbourhood and town. To say I am horrified is an understatement.</p>
<p>Daniel Pasta, 2872991 Ontario Ltd.</p> <p>Emailed 3/21/2024</p>	<p>I would like to respectfully submit comments pursuant to the 125 Peel St Servicing Project PIC on behalf of 2872991 Ontario Ltd, the landowner of the property [REDACTED]. See the attached ownership report with aerial mapping for your reference. [REDACTED]</p> <p>The lands are designated as Commercial Corridor within the Town Official Plan which allows for various employment, commercial, institutional, service and retail uses. A concept development plan is being prepared for pre-consultation submission in the near future. Development of the site is expected to be within the 10 year horizon.</p> <p>We generally support the fully urbanized and serviced proposal to enhance Alice and surrounding streets so that future development of the 2872991 Ontario Ltd lands are not limited or encumbered in any way. Town investment into the best long term options today should be utilized and implemented along Alice, Peel, and Baring Streets to prevent future duplicate costs associated with upgrades and restoration. Implementation of best long term options will also promote, facilitate, and support future development in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>Below we offer specific comments related to the Public Information Center presentation deck :</p> <p><a href="https://www.thebluemountains.ca/sites/default/files/2024-03/125%20Peel%20Street%20Servicing%20PIC1%20Presentation.pdf">https://www.thebluemountains.ca/sites/default/files/2024-03/125%20Peel%20Street%20Servicing%20PIC1%20Presentation.pdf</a></p> <p>#1 - pg 17 - 125 Peel St South Servicing Alternatives - Alternative 'C' should be utilized as it will promote and facilitate infill development between the proposed Campus of Care to the North West and the current developed as built serviced boundary to the South East.</p> <p>#2 - pg 23 - Alice St - Alternative No. 1 : Full Urbanization should be utilized as it will connect pedestrians and vehicular traffic to the Campus of Care most safely and conveniently from the as built developed boundary to the South East. There are no sidewalks along Arthur St/ Hwy 26 to connect pedestrians to the proposed Campus of Care.</p> <p>#3 - pg 30 - Baring Street Cross Section Alternatives - Full Urbanization should be implemented. Access from Alice St to Hwy 26/ Arthur St should be maintained. Closing Baring St will limit vehicular access to future development on lands in the immediate vicinity and make access difficult for current residents.</p> <p>#4 - pg 6 - Re : Transportation Study. Costs associated with the requirement of a signalized intersection at Hwy 26/ 10th Line should not be the responsibility of preceding adjacent developments if the increased traffic flows are the result of the Campus of Care development.</p> <p>We request to be kept informed with all design decisions related to Alice and surrounding streets that may impact the ability to develop our herein referenced lands. Please see attached again our initial comment letter in response to notice of the PIC for your records, prepared by our consultant engineers C.F. Crozier and Associates dated March 1, 2024.</p>
<p>Tasha and Anthony Carter</p> <p>Emailed 3/21/2024</p>	<p>I was copied on an email that Tom Maloney sent on the subject, we share all of his concerns as set out in his letter.</p> <p>We do understand the Town of Blue Mountains will grow and evolve, however, I do think this project is being rushed in order to spend Federal Government grants that will expire.</p>

I do feel that the population density of the Campus of Care is very high and being pushing into a small part of Bob's land.

In general discussions with [REDACTED] and other neighbours I am unaware of anyone with intentions of increasing the housing density on our properties for a long time ( greater than 10 years) and plan to continue to use the land as is.

The economics of adding sewer services for Alice Street as noted in the meeting do not make sense as their are additional sewer costs to be borne by the utility due to low flow.

Sewer service would not be considered for Alice Street if it were not due to the Campus of Care, as I'm unaware of any developments in planning creating this higher density bringing the cost down per unit.

Additionally, I fail to understand the math in the means test for affordability. The town's report is stating that up to 10% of average after tax income is an acceptable charge to a resident?

In this high interest inflationary time, I think that number is grossly misstated and quite outdated. I think that study needs to be updated to current times, I think the last study is now quite old and based on economic factors that do not exist today.

The capital cost to add the sewer services based on the low population density make the cost per household extremely high and materially greater than the increase in Fair Market Value of the property in essence making the charge a one time tax on the homeowner. If the total cost is \$75k and the value of the house increases by \$15k in effect this is a true cost of \$60k. Based on FMV of properties in the local area this would eradicate up to 15% of the homeowners equity, which seems grossly unfair given the only reason the project is going ahead is due to the Campus of Care.

Thank you for reviewing and taking our concerns into consideration.