

To: Mayor Hankivsky and Council Members  
Municipality of Port Hope

Date: July 18, 2025

**Re: Formal Objection – Zoning By-law Amendment ZB03/2025 & 13-Lot Subdivision at 4646 County Road 2**

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

We are writing as owners of a directly adjacent property to formally object to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment ZB03/2025 and related Draft Plan of Subdivision (SU01-2025) for 4646 County Road 2. The application to rezone the site from “FD” (Future Development) to Site-Specific Hamlet Residential (RESV1-X) and permit a 13-lot residential subdivision is deeply concerning to us and many others in the community.

Our objections arise from a combination of technical review, lived experience in Welcome Hamlet, and analysis of the developer’s own reports. We believe this proposal is premature, incompatible with the existing community, and poses multiple risks to health, safety, heritage, infrastructure, and the environment.

**Key Objections**

**1. Overdevelopment & Loss of Hamlet Character**

The proposed subdivision introduces a dense, suburban-style layout with compact lots, small lot frontages, internal road, and no meaningful transition to surrounding properties. This directly conflicts with the rural nature, low-density, open character of Welcome Hamlet. Despite the applicant’s claim of “compatibility,” the proposal disrupts the established community fabric. It undermines both the intent and policies for rural hamlet development.

**2. Fire Protection Deficiency**

The developer’s own *Watermain Hydraulic Analysis* confirms that fire flow requirements are not met and no upgrades are proposed. The Port Hope Official Plan prohibits extending fire infrastructure to rural hamlets. This confirms the site is inappropriate for intensified development without compromising public safety.

**3. Stormwater Management**

The underground stormwater management (SWM) tank is located behind existing homes, with no fencing, signage or engineered overflow safeguards. This design presents serious safety, privacy loss, and liability issues for adjacent residents.

**4. Environmental and Tree Loss**

The *Tree Inventory Report* identifies the removal of 27 trees—including mature, heritage species like Black Walnuts and Maples. While a few trees are marked for preservations, there is no clear binding replanting strategy.

These trees serve as ecological buffers, shade, noise mitigation, windbreaks, and privacy screening. Their removal will negatively impact neighbouring properties and alter the landscape.

#### **5. Noise Levels Above Provincial Limits**

The *Noise Impact Study* shows Lot 13 will exceed noise thresholds and requires warning clauses, and forced air heating with provisions for central air for mitigation. This indicates the site is not suitable for the proposed density.

#### **6. Lack of Privacy and Visual Buffers**

There are no requirements for fencing, trees or landscape buffers between existing rural properties and the new lots. This directly affects privacy, quality of life, and permanently alters sight-lines, property value and enjoyment.

#### **7. Traffic Safety Hazards**

All traffic will access the site from County Road 2, where average speeds exceed 60km/h- lacks sidewalks, signage or traffic calming measures. This raises serious risks for pedestrian and vehicular safety, particularly children and seniors.

#### **8. Omission of Cultural Heritage Protections**

The archaeological assessment confirmed 485 artifacts at the Samuel Jacobs Site (AIGo-64). However, the required Stage 3 study is still pending. Proceeding now risks potentially destroying a culturally significant area, violating heritage policy.

#### **9. Incomplete Application Documentation**

Key supporting reports are still incomplete or missing, including the Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment and Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment. Despite this, the Planning Justification Report suggests the project is “complete,” which is misleading. Proceeding without them is contrary to proper planning and risks uninformed decision-making.

#### **10. Contradiction of “Complete Community” Language**

The Planning Justification Report claims the development supports a “complete community,” yet offers no mix of housing types, affordability housing strategy, or walkability street network. It fails to meet the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS 2024) definition.

#### **11. Negative Impact on Property Value**

The removal of mature vegetation, loss of buffering trees, increased traffic and noise, addition of rear-facing lots, and proximity of infrastructure such as the SWM tank and internal roadway directly next to our property will reduce the privacy, character and appeal of our property. These changes are likely to result in diminished real estate value-with no protections in place for affected homeowners.

**Our Request to the Mayor, Council and Planning Division:**

We respectfully request that Council and Planning Division reject this application in its current form and defer any decision until the following are completed or amended:

- Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment and Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment are finalized and reviewed
- Fire flow infrastructure upgrades are secured and approved
- A formal tree replanting strategy and visual buffers are mandated in the zoning or site plan
- The subdivision layout and density are revised to better reflect Welcome Hamlet's rural character and protect adjacent homes

**Conclusion**

This proposal fails to demonstrate responsible, context-sensitive development appropriate to the area's character and needs. It fails to meet provincial and local planning goals, endangers public health and safety, and damages the unique fabric of Welcome Hamlet. We urge Council to consider the long-term impact of this precedent and make the right decision for current and future residents.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Dana Grisold & Kyle Paeden  
4697 Dale Road, Port Hope, L1A 3V5



Cc- Mike Melinyshyn- CAO  
Ken Scullion, Senior Planner

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Ken Scullion; Planning](#)  
**Cc:** [Josh Vandermeer](#)  
**Subject:** Official Comments regarding Zoning Bylaw Amendment (ZB03-2025)  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 10:22:12 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

Our names are Josh and Laura Vandermeer, residents of 4753 Dale Road in the hamlet of Welcome. Below are our comments for Council stating our position on the proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment (ZB03-2025) and Plan of Subdivision (SU01-2025).

Firstly, it is shameful that the Public Meeting regarding the rezoning of 4646 County Road 2 is held via Zoom. It is impossible that another venue could not have been arranged - such as a school or town meeting room - and we are deeply disappointed with the lack of support for existing residents of Welcome.

Although the Port Hope Official Plan states that the Hamlet of Welcome could be internally infilled, this small location does not seem to be the right fit for development. In our opinion, this plan of subdivision does not comply with the criteria listed in the Official Plan. E3.1 b) states that council must determine if the new Plan of Subdivision is within public interest, and this proposed plan is greatly opposed by our small, friendly community. The residents of Welcome have all purchased these homes expecting a level of privacy and quiet - building a road and homes right outside our backyards is not at all in line with what our community needs.

We acknowledge the housing crisis that exists in Ontario, however, the development of a small, irregularly shaped lot into estate style subdivision homes does not address this problem. Ontario needs affordable, high density homes within town boundaries that are serviced by public transportation and accessible for a greater number of Ontarians. There are many lots and hamlet/country homes currently available on Realtor.ca - this is no lack of estate homes. Building homes in other peoples backyards is not what Ontario means by adding housing!

Regarding the sizes and shapes of the lots as per E3.1 d) - we understand the developers desire to maximize the number of lots and profit, however this proposed layout is very disruptive. We ask for Council to consider the way that lot 12 has been laid out alongside the backyards of 3 existing residents, which will result in a home being built right next to existing backyards. Because laws for side yard development are only 3.0 meters, this is VERY close to our property line. We believe that developers need to consider the fact that their lots are backing onto existing lots and should provide the 6.0 meter distance from property lines due to this irregular layout. The developers current planned location for a stormwater holding pond is also very close to the existing homes on Dale Road (the documents from the developer are very inconsistent in stating whether this would be a pond or tank, and some submitted drawings don't even show this space and list it as a lot- there are many inconsistencies). If Council is seriously considering approving the bylaw change, it is pertinent that the lot layout be revisited and not approved as is. Fencing and tree allowance needs to also be provided surrounding the planned subdivision to minimize the construction and development noise, dust

and pollution to existing residents.

Another concern is the layout of the cul-de-sac in relation to the existing intersection. The Welcome intersection, even with its planned improvements, is known as a dangerous intersection and we are concerned for the planned layout, where the cul de sac comes out right near the intersection. Planned improvements at the intersection will be completed in October and we feel that approving this by-laws amendment before reassessment of the traffic flow on Toronto Rd is premature and irresponsible of Council. This small cul de sac and tight entrance from Toronto road is difficult navigation as well for fire trucks, snow clearing and more.

We ask that Council consider the ACTUAL needs of our community, not the millions of dollars that a developer from Brampton seeks to make off of this property. It is a complete joke that this developer claims that this subdivision is in line with the needs of our community. There are MANY more suitable places to build homes that Ontarians ACTUALLY need. This is not it.

Laura and Josh VanderMeer

**From:** [Planning](#)  
**To:** [Ken Scullion](#)  
**Subject:** FW: ZB03/2025 - 4646 County Rd 2  
**Date:** Monday, July 7, 2025 3:00:36 PM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: [noreply@porthope.ca](mailto:noreply@porthope.ca) <[noreply@porthope.ca](mailto:noreply@porthope.ca)> On Behalf Of Scott Hagerman  
Sent: Friday, July 4, 2025 12:12 AM  
To: [Planning](mailto:planning@porthope.ca) <[planning@porthope.ca](mailto:planning@porthope.ca)>  
Subject: ZB03/2025 - 4646 County Rd 2

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Based on a brief read of application.


Traffic study is over 2 years old. Average speed is 75 to 90 km/h. Operational speed is 81 km/h. Placing a residential road at a blind intersection without traffic lights is not a positive addition, social economic health and well being to the street. (False claim) The subdivision will add a minimum 39 vehicles not including school bus and service vehicles entering at a known dangerous intersection the Northumberland County cant solve.

I would like to see the flood plan and nitrate study as this will impact current wells on County Rd 2. It is proven by the highways that ground water flows West. Research the contamination of current wells from road salt.

Noise impact study is also false. The neighborhood is currently at 61dBA daytime and 53dBA nigh time. The addition of 12 homes plus garden suites with 39 plus vehicles is not a positive addition and health wellbeing.

Currently, this acareage is a fire hazzard as it is not maintained.

Looking forward to your reply to the concerns above.

Scott Hagerman 

-----  
Origin: <https://www.porthope.ca/en/business-and-development/current-zoning-by-law-and-official-plan-amendment-applications.aspx>  
-----

This email was sent to you by Scott Hagerman< > through <https://www.porthope.ca>.

August 6, 2025

Good Afternoon

I am drafting this letter to voice my family's concern and strong opposition to the proposed new subdivision (Draft Plan SU01-2025), as well as the zoning bylaw amendment (ZB03-2025) associated to the plan application.

My wife and I currently own the property located at 4713 Dale Road, and we do not agree with this proposal. We purchased our home in 2022, with the intent of this being our “forever home”, as we wanted to escape from the city life. What attracted us most to this property, was the unobstructed views to the south, the large trees and a bright view of the night sky with no additional light pollution. Our real estate agent at the time even suggested that we could put up a fence if we liked, but the lack of a fence helped to remove that claustrophobic feeling of the city. At the time we believed we had found the Oasis we were looking for and we just needed to make it our own. If this new subdivision was to be constructed, our plans for this home and our futures would be destroyed.

I notice and accept, that developer has done their due diligence and there are several reports, and plans all created and generated to show how this new subdivision is only a benefit to the local community, and will not be detrimental but I think everyone understands that these reports are purely conceptual at this time, and based on theories. Come back a year after the new homes are built, and tell me there was no significant change to noise levels, traffic hasn't gotten worse, property values have not decreased.....etc.

With respect to the proposed subdivision, we have the following concerns.

- How will we be compensated for the loss of financial value to our home, as our property value will severely decline once construction starts, our property will be even less marketable when we attempt to sell, which will be our intent if this new development goes as planned. We will be forced to declare our knowledge of a new subdivision if its not started when we list the home for sale, or people who come to view the home will loose interest once they see the construction mess to the rear of the property
- A new road running along my rear property line is nothing more than an eye sore, and potential junk and debris generator. I can only wait until the new home owners start parking their cars, or visitor's cars along this road, it will greatly add to the severe appearance degradation of the neighborhood. “No Parking” signs won't work, everyone knows that already.
- This new subdivision is nothing more than a potential eye sore that ruins the sightlines, privacy, and intimacy that our current pocket of rural Port Hope provides. This plan ruins that “Rural Feel” that currently makes this area attractive.
- What assurances will be put in place to protect the aging trees on my property that run along the property line, the arborist report indicates “Preserve” but that does not detail the effects of the trimming required, how will this be completed, how will the privacy they provide be reinstated after trimming,
- My property is home to a large number of birds, bats and rodents, that make my property enjoyable, construction of new homes will just drive the wildlife away, with the exception of

field mice, that I am sure will flood my property once the development begins – what is the compensation for this loss of enjoyment, how will we be compensated for pest control.

- What are the plans to control construction noise, dust and debris during all stages of construction. I work from home, and will not tolerate excess noise, or “construction” behaviour. Where will the temporary washroom facilities be placed for the workers, as I can only imagine how much I will enjoy looking at/smelling them. The Ontario ministry of labour is only 1 call away, and all my other construction related complaints will go directly to the premier's office.
- What are the impacts to my well water – I spend a lot of money every year to clean and purify so it is safe to drink. Construction vehicles break down, leak and contaminate the groundwater. What guarantee will I have that I will have adequate ground water after the new homes have been constructed?
- Why would a storm water drainage block with a “parkette” get installed – this does not make sense. The town cannot keep up with the garbage along the roads and existing ditches as it is. What is the plan to keep this area free of garbage and debris? What will be done about insect control – how do we get assurances that this will not become a mosquito and bacteria breeding ground. I don't own the ditch at the front of my property, yet I clean the garbage out regularly.
- How will the drainage area be maintained – grass cutting for example, or will it just become an over-grown field and eyesore.
- What provisions are in place to minimize the impacts of noise that this new subdivision will create, once everyone has moved in. This area is very peaceful and quiet, not a party area. How can I be expected to believe this will not change? What is the impact of adding the new subdivision to my current home Noise levels, I don't see any mention of how the new homes will affect the current homes in the area with respect to noise levels
- Who will clean my current home, daily, inside and out, while construction is on-going – we clean our home regularly, and leave the windows open to the fresh air,
- What will be done to eliminate the view of a construction site from my window and patio during the construction of this new subdivision?
- What will the city do in regards to additional police patrols to monitor the community? How does adding a subdivision in my backyard make me feel more safe? A construction site will be a magnet for vandals and thieves.
- What is the design plan for these homes, I think I have a right to know the potential impacts of my “new” neighbors. What assurances do we have that these new homes don't become rentals? I think we all realize that these homes come at a steep price, and will be difficult for people to finance. The proposal is for 12 new “Single Family Homes”, not rentals or Air B&B's.
- My current property has a drainage swale that runs parallel to the rear property line, how will this be accommodated in the new design? What provisions will be done to ensure that I do not get extra water run-off on my property in the spring.
- The consultants report indicates that there are employment opportunities nearby – please elaborate. Where are these mystery jobs located that would provide sufficient income to support these new homes? Any new jobs of that pay level would be outside of Port Hope, let those towns provide the housing.
- Currently there appears to be a large number of homes already for sale in the Port Hope Area., that have been on the MLS website for several weeks. Does Port Hope really need the 12 additional homes? Seems like there is already a large inventory of homes for people to choose from.

- If this proposal is approved, it will only open up all other areas of farm land to residential development. Is the plan to turn Port Hope into the next Mega City? Why start the path of turning a nice rural community into a metropolis.
- Please address how snow removal will be provided, from what I can see in the draft plan, the snow will end up piled in our backyard, causing increased spring runoff and potential property damage and contamination to the existing ground water
- Please address fencing of this area, at minimum our yard needs to be completely fenced in separating us from this construction project. All sides and to built to our satisfction

This request for a new subdivision should immediately be rejected by the city of Port Hope, as it is very clear that no thought has been put into the potential concerns of the surrounding homeowners. If this is passed, the only consideration taken was about the potential taxes 12 homes would generate. Is it really worth that extra \$60k per year in tax Revenue, to disrupt the lives and lower the property values of the people who already live there. This Notice of application should not have made it this far, the city and its staff should not have even sent this out, all it has done is create upset people on Dale Road – just to make a numbered company 12 houses richer.

Squeeze in 12 homes somewhere else and leave the property for much needed farming and greenspace. Keep the rural feel.

We are looking forward to your reply to our concerns.

Dan Whitney & Shannon Watson