

To the Council and Staff of the Township of King regarding the proposed Zoning By-law Amendments at 962 Graham Sideroad (File No. Z-2025-08).

I am writing to express my concerns with allowing this Zoning By-law Amendment due to problems with the stormwater management plan that has been presented. Stormwater management issues already exist at 962 Graham Side Road, which negatively impact the property at [REDACTED] Graham Side Road. These issues are not addressed in the stormwater management plan presented. Allowing the severance and the building of an additional residential structure on the retained lot will further exacerbate the existing stormwater issues.

The stormwater management plan presented states in its Summary, "Adjacent private and public properties will be unaffected by storm drainage from the site up to a 100-year storm event." (Stormwater Management Brief p.17). It also states, within the Stormwater Management Calculations section, "...the site has a large landscape area, and after redevelopment, the increase in imperviousness is minimal and can be considered negligible, meaning the implementation of additional stormwater management practices is not necessary." (Stormwater Management Brief p.12). Stormwater management issues already exist, and the addition of another structure without a robust stormwater management plan will certainly impact neighbouring properties. Another issue with the Stormwater Management Brief is that it contains errors or omissions. There is a catch basin on the property that is inadequate during spring or times of heavy rain, let alone the 100-year flood. There is also a low area, near or where the proposed residential structure would be situated, which floods. These two areas are pumped off during spring and times of heavy rain, showing that stormwater management is not currently adequate, and stormwater management practices are necessary. The catch basin is not identified in the SWM Brief, which indicates that the calculations and flow directions may be incorrect. Finally, the presence of derelict buildings and vehicles, stored vehicles and trailers, rubbish, and shipping containers on the property, in the area negatively impacted by drainage, has not been considered when calculating the imperviousness of the site. The presence of these has been consistent in the time I've lived next door and should be considered, as they are all near the lot line where the grade diverts water towards neighbouring properties.

Further, there is currently legal action from the Township of King related to Site Alterations at [REDACTED]. My understanding is that this is associated with the addition of fill on the property, which has changed the grade within the Greenbelt Natural Heritage Zoned area. I'm only using publicly available by-law information. I may have the details of the legal action wrong, but the grading changes I refer to exist regardless. Although these issues exist within the retained lot, on a different part of the

property, they divert water towards the area of the proposed residential structure and [REDACTED], which negatively impacts neighbouring properties.

I have submitted documents to Zoning to back up the comments I am making here.

It is my opinion that the severance should not be allowed until the stormwater management issues of the proposed retained property have been fully addressed. This should be achieved by rectifying the cause of the problem, where applicable, such as the removal of fill, and by controlling water flow where necessary, for example, around the proposed dwelling.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns.

Sean Mahoney

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]