

Kari Hanselman

Subject: FW: Input to Council re Lavigne Subdivision
Attachments: Lavigne-Corbeil Rd-Quae Quae subdivision submission to East Ferris Planning Committee - Supplementary.docx; Lavigne-Corbeil Rd-Quae Quae subdivision submission to East Ferris Municipal Council.docx

From: Phil Koning
Sent: May 20, 2026 9:09 PM
To: Kari Hanselman <kari.hanselman@eastferris.ca>
Cc: Rick Champagne <Rick.Champagne@eastferris.ca>; Terry Kelly <terry.kelly@eastferris.ca>; Nicholas B <breaunick@hotmail.com>; Steven Trahan <steven.trahan@eastferris.ca>; Lauren Rooyakkers <lauren.rooyakkers@eastferris.ca>
Subject: Input to Council re Lavigne Subdivision

Hi Kari,

I couldn't hear what you said at the meeting regarding the timing for submitting to council in time for the next meeting, but I assume it must be done ASAP

I would like to know who has the expertise to challenge the Geological Report in its adherence to the Guidelines D-5-5? Rick mentioned Valerie Murphy, the Enforcement Officer is a geologist. Will she sign a report evaluating the Tulloch study?

We heard a lot about the guidelines but no one ever compared the processes undertaken in the Tulloch report to those recommended by Guideline D-5-5

Having the PAC committee meeting 5 days before the council meeting where the recommendation is being considered does not leave enough time for residents to evaluate the answers provided by the proponent.

Although there was an effort to reassure residents that the municipality is responsible to ensure no resident's wells are impacted by the development, the reality is it needs to be proven in court that the subdivision was the cause of the problem and the municipality was negligent in applying the approval process before any costs could be recovered. We are all aware of how legal costs can add up, and what we are expecting is a council that will ensure the developer is not only submitting the necessary reports, but that they are within the guidelines as they are set out.

I have seen nothing about how well the Tulloch report abided by Guideline D-5-5

My questions would be

1. why is this subdivision not part of a staged development? Stage 1 was the consents along Corbeil Road, Stage 2 is this subdivision and Stage 3 is the lot touching Meadow Drive. In my opinion, there should be updates to the geological report for each stage and testing done to ensure the projections are matched by the reality later.
2. How many test wells are required for a development that has the number of lots overall this development has?
3. Of the 173 wells that were analyzed what are the current flow rates?
4. Why were there no surveys done of nearby residents for any problems with their wells.
5. Are 1 hour pump tests sufficient for test wells or are 24 hour pump tests required?

6. Mr Parfitt assures us the aquifer has lots of water....if most wells are drilled into fractured bedrock how is the aquifer measured?
7. The precipitation records from NBMCA are from 2006...how does current precipitation recharge the groundwater based on current demand?

None of the information I submitted to the Committee was discussed during the meeting and it seemed like the Committee ignored it and only asked their own questions.

I include my Committee submissions for Council to review and evaluate with the hope that the concerns expressed in those documents and the questions in this email can be answered by someone who has the expertise to fairly evaluate them.

Hopefully council can come up with the answers to these and other questions that an independent peer review would raise.

Most municipalities have now moved to peer review as the means to prove they have done due diligence in assessing the geological report, how has East Ferris evaluated the report?

Thanks

Phil