

Kari Hanselman

Subject: FW: Questions for Council regarding May 26th meeting

From: shawn nelson

Sent: May 20, 2026 9:55 PM

To: Municipality of East Ferris <municipality@eastferris.ca>; Kari Hanselman <kari.hanselman@eastferris.ca>; Kim Rose <kim.rose@eastferris.ca>

Subject: Questions for Council regarding May 26th meeting

To Councillors,

This is in regards to the Planning Adjustment meeting May 20th, 2026.

Why was a pump test not done to determine if this subdivision will affect existing residence wells? The questions was asked by a citizen and there was no response given. Also not addressed was the concern of water usage by the Quarry located on Lavigne Rd. in the Hydrological Study provided by Tulloch. Currently they are allowed to pump water (more than likely with little to no restrictions that I am aware of) to remove up to 250K tonnes/yr of material as it is an industrial property.

We agree with Phil Koning's submitted concerns and documents. The Municipality should have peer reviews done (by independent companies) of all the submitted studies at the expense of the applicant. The peer reviewed Traffic Study, as an example, that was submitted to the Planning Committee shows many concerns regarding the accepted study. This accepted study had conclusions without proper testing and data.

As the NBMCA indicates in their review the area is located within an area of a highly vulnerable Aquifer. Which contradicts the Hydrological Study prepared for the Applicant. We believe this alone constitutes a peer review.

Concerns regarding run off water from 41 subdivision+ 9 lots for Lavigne Rd. residents as the road has recently been flooded (April 14-15). The ditch is currently full of aggregate from the flooding; to which we were instructed at the meeting, to contact the municipality if there are any ditching concerns. Would this not have been part of the job repairing the road for traffic to resume as it is clearly evident of the aggregate in the ditch.

Lastly, there was no ability from the public to interject when the Applicant's Consultant made statements that were inaccurate . Specifically the road clearing for the proposed subdivision was done in accordance with recommendations both the NBMCA, and the MECP. In fact, The NBMCA were aware of the project but had yet to visit and were waiting for warmer conditions but the MECP was totally unaware of the project. The road was being built outside of those times and there are multiple witnesses and even a member of counsel was notified. Counillor Kelly made sure that the public could not question these statements.

Recommendation when it is a significant adjustment committee meeting allow for a longer time for residents to express concerns. As it stands the applicant gets 45 min of the hour to present. Concerns receive 5 min. and are hurried along with no opportunity for follow up, questions or rebuttals.

Thank you for taking these matters into consideration prior to your regarding this matter.

Thanks,

Shawn Nelson