

**City of Port Colborne
Public Meeting Addendum**

Date: Monday, May 16, 2022
Time: 6:30 pm
Location: Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, City Hall
 66 Charlotte Street, Port Colborne

Pages

4. Special Public Meeting-Road Ends

4.1. Final Road Ends Report, 2022-99

*a.	Delegation from Brendon Bulger, Resident	
*b.	Delegation from Carlie Winger, Resident	
*c.	Delegation from Betsy Brady, Resident	
*d.	Delegation from Ingrid Copland, Resident	
*e.	Delegation from Jay Cardwell, Resident	
*f.	Delegation from Rick Froese, Chair-Lorraine Bay Association	1
*g.	Delegation from Carey Benvenuti, Resident	
*h.	Delegation from Chris Comfort, Resident	4
*i.	Delegation from the McCreadie family, Residents	6
*j.	Written Delegation material from Carol Domenicucci, Resident	11
*k.	Written Delegation material from Dean Cutting, Resident	14
*l.	Written Delegation material from Jennifer Repec, Resident	15
*m.	Written Delegation material from John Lynn	16

From: [Rick Froese](#)
To: [Chris Kalimootoo](#); [Harry Wells](#); [Ron Bodner](#); [Road Ends](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Road Ends Final Report
Date: May 10, 2022 3:33:06 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Port Colborne Staff, Councillors and Sierra Planning Consultants,

We are submitting our written reply to the Road Ends Final Report - April 2022 as follows:

The Lorraine Bay Association submitted a number of concerns that are summarized as follows:

- 1) Increased use of beach by unauthorized vehicles; atv's, dirt bikes, etc.
- 2) Garbage at road ends and no garbage bins
- 3) Cars parked in violation of parking restrictions with no enforcement
- 4) Maintain the Lorraine Road gate and provide keys to residents to access their beaches.
- 5) Install a gate on Weaver Road only if residents are given keys to access their beaches.

It seems that the concerns of the Lorraine Bay Association have been heard and reflected in the Road Ends Final Report Recommended Solutions. The most important being our ability to continue accessing the beach front areas of our properties through the Road Ends.

We ask to be included in the development of the detailed policies and plans associated with the Road Ends in our community, namely Lorraine Road & Weaver Road.

I plan to attend the virtual Public Meeting on Monday, May 16 at 6:30 pm and ask to be registered to speak if required to support our position.

Thank you,
Rick Froese
Chair - Lorraine Bay Association
W - [REDACTED]

On Fri, Apr 29, 2022 at 2:46 PM Chris Kalimootoo <Chris.Kalimootoo@portcolborne.ca> wrote:

Rick,

As you may have seen on the City Website, Public Notice, Paper ads or Social Media posts, the final Road Ends Report is now ready.

The [final report](#) will be presented to Council at a special **virtual** Public Meeting on

Monday, May 16, 2022, at 6:30 p.m.

Due to the importance of this topic to council, staff, and our community, this meeting will be virtual to ensure council can hear from all delegates.

To register as a delegate at the Public Meeting, or to submit a written delegation, email roadends@portcolborne.ca, call 905-835-2900 x115, or drop off written delegations to the attention of the Deputy Clerk at City Hall, 2nd floor, 66 Charlotte Street, by **12 p.m. on Friday, May 13, 2022.**

For more information about this project, visit www.portcolborne.ca/currentprojects.

To stay up-to-date on all city information and projects, [Subscribe - City of Port Colborne](#) to our news channel.

Since you previously registered for the Public Open House on this subject, I thought I would send this email as an additional communication to let you know and provide the link above.

Thank you,

Chris.

Chris Kalimootoo
Director of Public Works
City of Port Colborne

Phone 905-835-2900 x223

Email Chris.Kalimootoo@portcolborne.ca

1 Killaly Street West,
Port Colborne, ON L3K 6H1

www.portcolborne.ca



This message, including any attachments, is privileged and intended only for the person(s) named above. This material may contain confidential or personal information which may be subject to the provisions of the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone, fax or e-mail and permanently delete the original transmission from us, including any attachments, without making a copy.

Road Ends

My name is Chris Comfort. I have lived in the area of Humberstone Centennial Park for the majority of my 64 years. I currently live at 2855 Tammy Ave and grew up at 473 Pinecrest Road. My mother and several other family members lived on Pinecrest Road dating back to the 1800's.

I would like to address the current no-parking situation at the following road ends. That being Lorraine Road, Weaver Road, Pinecrest Road and Silver Bay Road. All of which I am very familiar with from the early 1960's onward to today.

Summer of 2020

- The City of Port Colborne saw unprecedented usage due to Covid-19 restrictions and lockdowns by surrounding municipalities and many areas in the Province
- Crowds at local public beaches and road ends with lake access saw crowds never before experienced
- The City acted as best they could to control these crowds that were resulting with the beaches and lakefronts being overcrowded and parking being haphazard at best
- At this point, there was no indication how long the pandemic would be upon us, or how severe it would or would not become

2021

- Scot Luey initiated a Road End Survey performed by consultant Sierra Planning
- The survey had flaws as it was distributed to local residents only. It assumed one survey per household would be enough, not considering different views from the same household members.
- Anyone could fill out the survey as many times as they pleased. Also, the
- The survey later went out to the entire town, though not through direct mailings
- Throughout the summer of 2021 the City had staff at Centennial Park as well as an outside Security firm limiting access to the park
- The City also claimed it increased Bylaw Enforcement patrols to control parking as well
- No parking signs that were temporary along the roads leading to the lake were still in place from the Friendship Trail south to the lake
- I later found out from Bylaw enforcement that these temporary restrictions were not enforceable. I called several times to test apparent infractions and was told such by the Intake Officer. I have confirmed this again as recently as this month (May 2022) through several phone calls and emails to Bylaw Enforcement
- There were days in the summer of 2021 that Centennial Park had fewer than 5 vehicles parked there, with staff and security personnel totaling 4 individuals
- Prior to Covid, the park has had no capacity control implemented since likely the 1960's
- Other municipalities as well as the Province backed off on restrictions
- Overcrowding and parking was no longer an issue

2022

- Since Sunday May 1, 2022 the day signed restrictions stating these areas are again under restricted parking limits, I have visited these 4 road ends daily
- Each time I encountered an infraction, I sent an email and/or voicemail to Bylaw Enforcement including pictures. I copied Chris Kalimootoo on my emails
- I stopped sending emails as I found it redundant. Everyday I personally witnessed an infraction and the City had none of the vehicles removed even though it is well signed that vehicles parking at road ends would be towed.
- My last receive reply stated that the complaints I initiated were waiting for sign-off of the new bylaw
- The document on the City's own website, as well as what has been reported in the local media was/is incorrect.

In Summary

- People with vehicles are currently showing a desire, if not a need, to utilize road ends and on road parking
- The need or desire is for many reasons such as,
 1. Recreation at the waterfront
 2. Construction projects with little or no available parking at homeowners property
 3. Festive events such as Mother's Day etc. with limited parking in their own driveway
 4. Visits to St. John's Lutheran Cemetery on Pinecrest on a singular visit or by an entire funeral procession
- The city has attempted to provide a solution that is fluid and changing dependant on the season at Wildwood and Pleasant Beach Roads. These two roads are very different but parking is available. The parking allowed is well marked and well patrolled and enforced. It appears to be working.
- Private property and City Limits are also well marked. No one should trespass.
- As for the other roads which I am speaking to, Lorraine, Weaver, Pinecrest and Silver Bay, the desire for parking has certainly been demonstrated over several days for several reasons
- A few designated, well marked and well patrolled and enforced spots is required (1 – 3 ?)

Thanks for you time.

Chris Comfort

From: [The McCreadie's](#)
To: [Road Ends](#)
Subject: Delegation Letter and Request to Speak
Date: May 13, 2022 10:41:30 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

This delegation report on behalf of the McCreadie family is specific to the road end allowance of Wyldewood Road where we have resided for 10 years. Overall we are pleased with the Final Draft of Road Allowances as Informal Beach Access Report prepared by the Sierra Group of April 2022 with exception of one important item that will be addressed later. We appreciate the opportunity to share our input and feedback.

Before we share that feedback we would be remiss not mention the reality of the unnecessary, stressful and concerning events we residents have been forced to deal with concerning the attempts to **deny our long standing status quo access** to the Wyldewood road allowance by our City of Port Colborne as well as by our corporate resort neighbour Sherkston Shores/Sun Retreats to their property and beaches.

City of Port Colborne attempts to lock us out without cause or warning:

- Monday, August 23, 2021 Item 14.1 of City Council meeting during Councillors remarks our Ward Councillor arbitrarily attempts to move that staff be directed to obtain new security locks with numbered keys and limited key distribution. Effectively locking residents out without notice or cause and to this day has not explained when questioned the rationale behind that arbitrary move. Motion Lost.
- September 27, 2021 Council Meeting - a second attempt with Council's request of staff to prepare a report that concludes that "Council restrict key access to currently barriered and locked beach front road ends to construction projects as facilitated and approved through the Municipal consent process." Therefore, again the city proposes a complete lock out of residents who for many years the City approved and granted access via a gate key register. The report was deferred to the October 25 Council Meeting and then at that meeting it was deferred again in anticipation of the these issues being addressed in the Sierra Planning survey report.
- January 25, 2022 a third attempt was made again during remarks where a staff member declared that gates would be locked effective immediately due to Sherkston Shores lack of some sort of permit or compliance for access onto the Wyldewood road allowance. When you lock contractors out (for whatever reason) and change the keys you lock good, honest residents out as well. Again residents paying the price.
- Finally after almost two years, the long exhaustive process of the Sierra Survey that started in the fall of 2020 may be coming to some conclusion.

Sherkston Shores/Sun Retreats:

Our neighbour is a large resort corporation and likely the largest third party rental property marketer in Ontario. And, this corporate neighbour treats its small, quiet neighbours (us) very poorly by:

- Suddenly discontinuing to honour a decade's long standing agreement with the City of Port Colborne that provides residents within the postal code L0S1R0 access to their beaches (road allowances) and cemetery. Other than the legal agreements made between the City and Sherkston, the relationship between hamlet residents and Sherkston has been a mutual give and take. We residents put up with a lot. Noise, speeding, line ups on our road, drunk and disorderly, drug overdoses, exposure, nudity, physical violent acts, harassment, garbage, urinating and defecating on our properties. The list goes on.
- Contractors hired by Sherkston Shores using our city road to improve their property by carrying boulders up and down it and through the Wyldewood road allowance to their properties shoreline for many months (perhaps longer than permitted) creating great disturbances to our peaceful neighbourhood with constant loud noises and some damage and destruction of road and road allowance.
- Leaving boulders in the water that are extremely dangerous for swimmers, passerbys/walkers. And, that will alter the waters flow and natural ecosystem around it.
- Leaving a mess of cement blocks, fencing fragments and boulders along the property line between Sherkston Shores and the City's road allowance that is dangerous for all visitors, especially children. And, it is very unpleasing to see amongst our otherwise beautiful natural surroundings and window to the lake.

*All the above statements are supported with City council meeting minutes, documents, correspondence, emails etc.

At this point, and two plus years in, it is safe to say we the residents are growing exceedingly weary of the lengthy and ongoing attempts on behalf of the City of Port Colborne and our neighbours Sherkston Shores/Sun Retreats who consciously and consistently create distress within our otherwise peaceful community. What should be a peaceful, harmonious living experience, is routinely stressed with the political and corporate decisions that have dire and profound impact on our community at large. And, though we are exhausted from getting caught in the political and corporate crosshairs we will never give up fighting for what is right, just, and fair.

***Of this Sierra Planning Report of April 2022 we agree with the following with exception of this item. ***

2.3 Historic Bylaw Mechanism (copy and pasted verbatim)

Parts of Empire and Michael Roads sold to Sherkston Shores in 2018, easement granted by SSI Property

- L0S1R0 residents' access to Sherkston's beaches granted by pedestrian traffic only during resort beach dates/hours of operation
- L0S1R0 residents' access is restricted to Elcan Hwy and Wyldewood Beach which access Sherkston Beach
- L0S1R0 residents do not have access to resort amenities
- City granted access for maintenance of abandoned cemetery next to Road Allowance Lands
- SSI Property confirms understanding that title to the Road Allowance Lands must be merged with adjoining lands at time of Road Allowance Conveyance
- SSI Property will deliver a covenant in favour of the City not to allow legal access from and to Michael Road to and from any residential or other properties that are within the Sherkston

resort lands except as provided in agreement

***This section must be exempt from the Sierra Group final report prior to its acceptance or any other passing or motion because at the May 10th, 2022 meeting of City Council, City Council “moved that staff be directed to obtain legal advice and interpretation of the 2018 agreement and provide a legal position with regards to that. And, that staff contact former and current municipal representatives that were involved in establishing that agreement to provide input and historical perspectives on the agreement for the intent. Also, ask that the City approach Sherkston Shores Resort and request that entrance to the park be allowed as it has in the past until these matters are resolved”. Passed unanimously.

Capacity

Capacity concerns of the 66 feet of road allowance to the waters edge has been brought to the city’s attention on many occasions but has never been a serious consideration as the public beaches were and are. Therefore we are very pleased this is considered and we support these statements - “Capacity of this narrow space supports passive use of visitors and limited time parking opportunities. “ and “The crux of the matter is achieving the correct carrying capacity for visiting the beach ends, the use of beach ends by local residents and low impact visitors such as hikers and cyclists may be appropriate moves in terms of gaining the necessary balance.”

Parking

In terms of parking on Wyldewood Road, we agree with the draft report that recommends:

- that time limited parking that is metered and non-renewable would benefit the passive use of the road allowance and not encourage all day visitation which would require the need for amenities such as washrooms etc. Signage to direct the public and visitors to the city of Port Colborne public beaches that have the amenities to support these visitors should be posted clearly, with a QR code sign for visitors to navigate their way to those public beaches and their amenities that the city provides there.
- “that permit parking is warranted for residents - enable existing property owners to obtain permit parking for on street parking for their own purposes.”
- “The question of whether to charge for parking is an important one, our view is that in peak summer season, July and August the imposition of a charge for parking on the street along those road allowances that have highest visitor demand which are Wyldewood Road and Pleasant Beach Road has merit alongside prohibitions to alleviate overuse. Technology can be deployed to ensure easy payment, compliance and enforcement during the summer. And this should be a priority. The city should focus its efforts on effective organization of the roadway approach to the road and identification of a modest time limited parking provision in the immediate vicinity with dedication of several spaces to accessibility challenged persons.”
- “the city should educate all visitors as to the status of the beach and that they are not operable parks, that staff including lifeguards are not present and private property should be respected.”
- “Most importantly the city should invest in communications both online and in signage and wayfinding to advertise, direct and attract visitors to the public beaches example Nickel Beach, Centennial Park, HH Knoll Park and is coupled with enforced time limits on parking and can help redirect people to the public beaches where amenities are

offered.”

- Of the the number of parking spots that were available in 2021, no more or perhaps fewer parking should be made available.
- No overnight parking at all.

Gate

While the entire world is moving forward by including and accommodating all people of all abilities so that everyone may have equal access, opportunities and choices - this was by far the most emotionally challenging for us as a family to understand and see clearly that the City and Sherkston Shores do not appear to get it. With aged parents, and a new baby in the family, as well as a son with a life long disability it doesn't get more personal than this. And, we know we are not alone. Many families living in our Hamlet and everywhere in the world for that matter are also navigating these same realities. It is 2022 after all. Let's all look and grow forward together.

In terms of the gate at the end of Wyldewood Road we agree with the draft report that recommends:

“It is also the case that the City must enable access to the road ends by those people that require the use of assistive mobility devices, including both wheeled and non-wheeled assistive devices. Whether this requires raising the gate or ensuring a dedicated access point and pathway is determined by the capacity of each road end and an appropriate design solution.”

The intent of City policy, if implemented, is in alignment with the goals under this plan. Specifically:

“Emergency vehicle access is required at all times, and as noted access to the beach road end by those with assistive mobility devices is required.”

“As demonstrated in the consultation, there are property owners that consider access to the beach with vehicles important and hence have a requirement for keyed access to the gates. In our view, the City should institute a more effective control mechanism in relation to access to keys. This requires the effective use of technology and database management to issue keys to verified local residents, with the ability to ensure that the use of the gates is for specified, registered vehicles and their owners.”

“Moreover, technology should be deployed – including the use of programmable FOBs that cannot be replicated and for which re-coding on an annual basis can be achieved. While this may seem cumbersome, it is not – rather it is a balance between resolving the problems of the existing gate access protocols and ensuring that those residents that have reason to enter the beach end in a vehicle, can do so. This policy also would permit access by those persons with accessibility challenges and for which accessibility/mobility assistance vehicles are required.”

“The gates themselves should not constrain the ability of the public to access the beach ends on foot. Neither should those persons that require accessibility and mobility assistance be constrained by virtue of the gate. In our view the decision should be made as to what efforts should be made within the road allowance to recognize that people do, and will continue to visit the beach ends, and determine a modest level of amenity provision. This is a primary

need at Wyldewood and Pleasant Rd.”

“there are property owners that consider access to the beach with vehicles important and hence have a requirement for keyed access to the gate. The city should institute a more effective control mechanism in relation to who has a key and has a right of access limited to the ROW itself. This requires the affective use of technology and database management to issue keys to verified local residents with the ability to ensure use of the gates are for specified registered vehicles and their owners. Moreover, technology should be deployed including the use of programmable fobs that cannot be replicated and for which recoding on an annual basis can be achieved. This will resolve the problems of the existing gate access protocols and ensuring that those residents that have legitimate purposes to enter the beach and in a vehicle can do so. This policy would permit access by those persons with accessibility challenges and for which accessibility mobility assistance vehicles are required.”

“Eligibility for key access ability to access the beach and vehicles for specific recreation purposes need to be categorized however reasonable accommodations should suggest that infrequent access for recreational purposes involving access to the water should be provided for.”

Sierra Group Exhibit 30. F – Wyldewood Road

The issues of concern at this road allowance stem from the proximity to the western edge of Sherkston Shores and access to that site from this roadway. Recognizing that Sherkston Shores has, as its responsibility, a desire to secure access to its site through its designated entrances, it is assumed that efforts can continue to be made to limit the extent to which Wyldewood Road is utilized by visitors to the cottage park community.

The City should focus its efforts on effective organization of the roadway approach to the road end, identification of a modest time-limited parking provision in the immediate vicinity, with dedication of several spaces to accessibility challenged persons. Recognizing the residential nature of the firelane to the west, it is important again to recognize that people will visit the beach end and accordingly, some level of amenity is warranted. That can be as limited as garbage receptacles, landscape enhancement of the road end in this location, signage and wayfinding to promote the City’s official beaches.

Lastly we leave a practical note that would help all parties. That any future changes, deletions or alterations to this report be marked appropriately or colour coded to assist with forensic comparisons.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback, our sincerest best wishes to everyone involved and may we all come to a mutually respectful and agreeable outcome.

Marsha, Mike, Megan & Connor McCreadie
“Create A Great Day!”

From: [carol domeniccucci](#)
To: [Saima Tufail](#)
Subject: Fwd: February 19 comments sent to Sierra
Date: May 5, 2022 5:52:37 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

These are the comments. As you can see they went to the deputy clerk. My intent is that they become part of the public record for this road study.

Thank you
Carol

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: carol domeniccucci <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 4, 2022 at 12:40:04 PM EST
To: Bill Steele <mayor@portcolborne.ca>, Ron Bodner <ron.bodner@portcolborne.ca>, Harry Wells <harry.wells@portcolborne.ca>, Mark Bagu <markbagu@portcolborne.ca>, Donna Kalailieff <donnakalailieff@portcolborne.ca>, Eric Beauregard <ericbeauregard@portcolborne.ca>, Angie Desmarais <angiedesmarais@portcolborne.ca>, Gary Bruno <garybruno@portcolborne.ca>, Frank Danch <frankdanch@portcolborne.ca>, barbarabutters@niagararegion.ca, deputyclerk@portcolborne.ca
Subject: February 19 comments sent to Sierra

((I am sending my response to the road end study to everyone, as I would like them to be part of the council records))

I have studied (truly) this report. I am willing to work more on this if council needs help. My feedback is brief here, concentrating on Wyldewood. Forty years on this road has given some wisdom.\

Brief summary for council: (of the report, as I translate it)

8 road allowances. Leave Lorraine alone. Weaver is unsafe. Pinecrest needs a bench. Leave Cedar Bay alone. Leave Silver Bay alone. Wyldewood needs a parking bylaw established, and controlled key access for verified residents who are eligible to access the beach for recreation purposes, and a path is needed for accessibility that needs no key. Pleasant Beach could use more parking spaces and a path for accessibility that does not require a key. Controlled key access for verified/eligible residents. Parking bylaw also. Try out paid parking. Holloway Bay, leave it alone. No one knows who owns

it.

My feedback/suggestions:

Council needs to establish parking bylaw. As it relates to Wyldewood, what was recently put in place, worked great. Thank you. Please extend the 'no parking' from the trail to highway 3 this summer, as it was ending at the trail.

Institute time-limited parking, sufficient to deter an all-day barbecue/picnic event by non-residents.

Establish resident permit-parking for our unique cottager situations.

Continue to ticket and tow. That has been a game-changer.

Establish a 'key inventory' for residents who desire a key. Establish parameters for a code of conduct for this key, signed for by resident as part of a deposit.

Move wigwags to our road end for pedestrian, mobility/accessible devices/golf carts, but that prevent vehicular (car/truck) access, and front-end loaders, and caterpillar tractors, and tri-axle truckers and incredibly monstrous dump trucks, such as were witnessed for the past six weeks on Wyldewood.

Allow us to continue to groom and maintain the road end, as a neighbourhood, which would include providing us regular garbage pickup, and would allow us to do the occasional levelling of a random dune, in order to keep an open area for local residents to park their carts along the boundary, leaving as much beach as possible for beachgoers.

No BBQ on road allowances bylaw.

Signage indicating public beaches at Cedar Bay and Nickel.

Pinecrest Point – does not need a bench. It will only become famous as the "Pinecrest Point-less" bench, just ask anybody.

Weaver Road has had no history of safety issues but if people need a sign posted to say "beware of the ditch", then fine. It most certainly does not need a gate. I have pointed out that the survey both recommends a gate, and says no gate is needed. Others have taken up this issue with Sierra, and I have thanked them for that.

Holloway Bay is owned by Fort Erie. Accept it.

Pleasant Beach has always been the crux of this headache. I could care less what happens there, with the exception of one glaring issue – Sherkston Shores does not maintain a secure boundary, and your citizens and your council are paying the price. If Sherkston refuses to acknowledge their contribution to this, then the city should consider securing their road allowance with a seasonal fence of their own.

There have been complaints – but there are always two sides to them and nothing council does will change that. There will always be trespass. There will always be speeding. And there will always be neighbourhood squabbles. There has been a HUGE failure on the part of city staff/procedures to have nothing in place regarding a key

inventory, or any sort of key etiquette. This failure of accountability needs to be corrected. Residents are willing to be accountable. Our established enjoyment of our neighbourhood does not need to be negatively impacted by intervention by the city; rather it should be enhanced. Empower your established locals to look after your road ends. We are willing.

Until you as a council step into the lack of security, and lack of secure boundaries, and continued expansion of Sherkston Shores, you will have problems at your road ends, problems on your trails with stolen golf carts, and problems for your local residents.....which is why this study was required in the first place. Your problem is the resort. You were given a half million dollars by them – use it toward making Nickel Beach rival the resort. Lift remaining capacity limits because there certainly are none between Wyldewood and Pleasant.

Page 13, Section 3.1

“Any vehicular access to the beach should require keyed gate access and by doing so the recipient of the key maintains full liability for ensuring safety, property rights and observance of all municipal requirements”.

I just want a key. And I want the neighbourhood enjoyment we on Wyldewood have carefully cultivated.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Dean Cutting](#)
To: [Road Ends](#)
Subject: Road end beaches
Date: May 10, 2022 3:44:27 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To whom it may concern.

I am a resident that lives within 200 meters of the Pinecrest Road dead-end beach and I've recently been made aware that a council meeting is taking place on May 16th 2022 to discuss and debate the future of the Port Colborne's road end beaches.

I've also recently read the Sierra Planning report which clearly indicates that the road end beaches are NOT public beaches, do not have access to public washrooms, do not have adequate parking and are in fact tiny stripes of land (66 feet wide) which obviously means people will inevitably venture (trespass) onto the neighbouring private beaches.

Specifically with regard to Pinecrest Road dead-end beach – there is a wonderful public beach just around the corner. Centennial Beach is well maintained by the city and has all the infrastructure that a public beach require – primarily parking, public washrooms, kids play areas, picnic tables, tennis courts and lots of space.

The report mentions “creating a public lookout” or some other treatment – boat launch etc. on Pinecrest dead-end beach.. In my opinion this is inviting trouble - particularly with respect to parking, washrooms litter, late night noise and potential trespassing. As previously stated- there is a public lookout just around the corner at Centennial Beach – complete with the previously mentioned infrastructure.

Allowing public access to city owned dead-end beaches that do not have the proper infrastructure would, In my opinion, create a liability issue for city.

Please accept this note as my wish that council decides to keep the current restricted access to dead-end beaches.

Best regards,

Dean Cutting


From: [Jenny Repec](#)
To: [Road Ends](#)
Subject: Beach Road Ends
Date: May 12, 2022 10:13:58 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Council,

As a local property owner with beachfront, I have concerns with proposed changes to Port Colborne's 66 ft road allowances.

I am not in favour of allowing expanded access to unregulated beaches with boat ramps or other new infrastructure on these 66 ft allowances.

The Pinecrest entry point in particular is a known entrance for vehicular traffic onto the private beaches, mainly ATVs.

I own extensive beach-front land, including riparian rights into the lake. We are within meters of the Pinecrest Road 66 ft road allowance, and I have lived here personally with this situation for over 50 years. This has included dealing with frequent trespassing, and more recently vehicles driving through and parking on the property.

The Sierra Planning report highlighted many issues which affect the area, namely:

- Environmental impact:

There are no washroom facilities, as well as the unsanitary waste caused by dogs that are brought to the area, unleashed and allowed roam the private beaches.

There are no trash facilities.

In the immediate vicinity there are environmentally sensitive flora and fauna which would be impacted by any new development such as a boat ramp, and should require the conservation authorities' input and approval.

- Liability for the City of Port Colborne:

There is no parking for the cars or trailers to bring their boats and water vehicles to a ramp.

Increased access and traffic at the 66 ft road allowances will lead to trespassing, vandalism and therefore increased nuisance calls to the police.

In the case of the Pinecrest Road 66 ft road allowance, the regulated Centennial Park Beach is located almost adjacent to Pinecrest. Centennial provides public access for all who want to enjoy the beach and lake, with infrastructure in place.

There is no need to provide increased access at Pinecrest Road.

Please consider this my written delegation on this matter for the council meeting to be held May 16th, 2022.

Thank you,

Jennifer Repec

From: [JohnLynn](#) [REDACTED]
To: [Road Ends](#)
Subject: Holloway Bay Road - large sand dunes - protecting rare species and wildlife habitat.
Date: May 13, 2022 4:24:34 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To the Clerk: Correspondence.

Re: "road ends and beach access" for the meeting of Council on May 16, 2022: - Holloway Bay Road.

The large sand dunes that block access here are an extension of Marcy Woods, an Area of Natural Scientific Interest.

Partial studies of the dunes have rare plant species on record at the Natural Heritage Centre of Ontario.

The dune formations also provide habitat sanctuary for deer and the endangered American turkey.

Michigan has a dune protection act and unfortunately Ontario does not. There are PSWs on each side of Holloway

Bay Road, it is narrow with ditches on each side and parking would be near impossible.

It is very difficult for fire and ambulance access for rescue and people kept off the dunes. A "No Trespass" sign is needed.

The public should be discouraged from entering this area and a "Protected Natural Area" sign be posted along the road.

From: John Lynn, PO Box [REDACTED], Fonthill, [REDACTED]