

Deputation – Long Point Road Draft Plan of Subdivision/ZBLA

Council Meeting – November 14, 2022

Pascuzzo Planning Inc. – Andrew Pascuzzo (agent) on behalf of Terra Brook Homes (owner and applicant)

Purpose of the Deputation

1. To provide additional information to Council on behalf of the developer re: section 51 (24) of the Planning Act
2. To request that Council support the recommendations in PDS.22.115 including that Council support a recommendation to the County to grant DPS 42T-20018-14 subject to conditions
3. To request that Council enact a ZBLA

Report To:	Committee of the Whole Meeting
Meeting Date:	November 1, 2022
Report Number:	PDS.22.115
Title:	Recommendation Report – Long Point Road Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment (P2677)
Prepared by:	Travis Sandberg, Intermediate Planner

A. Recommendations

THAT Council receive Staff Report PDS.22.115, entitled “Recommendation Report – Long Point Road Plan of Subdivision (P2677)”;

AND THAT Council support a recommendation to the County of Grey to grant Draft Plan Approval of Subdivision 42T-2018-14 subject to the Draft Plan Conditions attached to Planning Staff Report PDS.22.115;

AND THAT Council enact a Zoning By-law Amendment to rezone the subject lands from the Development ‘D’ zone to the Residential ‘R1-3-X-h6’ Zone and Open Space ‘OS’ Zone and to amend Table 9.1 of Zoning By-law 2018-65 to add a new Exception XXX to permit a maximum building height of 9.5m (2.5 storeys).

The November 1 COW recommendation regarding staff report “PDS.22.115 Recommendation Report, including to direct staff to consult with the developer how the Town of The Blue Mountains meets section 51 (24) of the Planning Act.



Recommendation Report – Long Point Road Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment (P2677), PDS.22.115

THAT Council receive Staff Report PDS.22.115, entitled “Recommendation Report – Long Point Road Plan of Subdivision (P2677)”;

AND THAT Council direct staff to consult with the developer how the Town of The Blue Mountains meets section 51(24) of the Planning Act as it relates to the requirement to provide a mix of residential housing types, and to report back to Council

Please consider the following before making a decision on this matter:

- A) The staff report clearly indicates that the proposed DPS and ZBLA are consistent with the Planning Act. In fact there are 3 pages of detailed responses in the staff report. (pages 3-5) The opinions of Planning staff should be reconsidered carefully.

Based on the above, Planning Staff are satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the requirements of the *Ontario Planning Act*.

- B) The staff report indicates that the proposed DPS and ZBLA are consistent with the 2020 PPS. The opinions of Planning staff should be reconsidered carefully (See bottom of page 11 of the staff report).

Range and Mix of Housing

Section D7 of the Plan provides policy direction on housing, requiring the Town to monitor the housing supply within the municipality and to maintain a ten-year supply of residential land. These policies further identify that a variety and range of housing types shall be encouraged.

The proposed R1-3 lots allow for smaller building envelopes than typically provided for in the R1-1 zone. The minimum lot area for R1-3 is 360 m² opposed to 550 m² for R1-1. The zoning provisions will encourage the development of smaller single detached dwelling units and in turn further diversify the housing supply in the community.

Planning Staff are satisfied that the proposed applications are consistent with the direction provided by the Provincial Policy Statement (2020).

County Planning staff were involved in the crafting of the proposed Draft Plan and ZBLA.

- C) If Council refuses the applications they will need to hire a private planner to support Council's position at an OLT hearing.
- D) The Town of Blue Mountains Official Plan does not include any requirement for affordable housing.
- E) Terra Brook does not intend to include any affordable housing units in this development.
- F) Since the original submission in 2018 the applicants have complied with all staff requests and provided additional studies. Just when we thought staff would agree to conditions the goal posts moved again. We have gone through 3 different planners on the file and are well beyond the Planning Act requirements with regard to "lack of decision"
- G) Both the PPS and TOBM OP include policies that encourage a mixture of housing across the municipality yes. Please consider that the subject property is relatively small and doesn't lend itself to a high density residential development that would be compatible with the surrounding lot fabric.
- H) A more appropriate location for affordable/attainable housing would be in the settlement area of Thornbury.
- I) Consider pre-zoning lands within the Thornbury instead of the majority of vacant lands still being zoned Development D.
- J) Please also consider that the RR designation requires a 40% open space requirement, of which we are proposing to provide 25% in land and the other 15% cash in lieu. Staff had originally indicated that they did not want a smaller open space dedication because of long term maintenance and liability.
- K) The EIS indicated that there were a small number of Black Ash on the property which are on the list of endangered species and have a high potential of dying off in the future. The Black Ash have been included in the lands to be dedicated as open space to the Town.

- L) The proposed R1 zone only permits singles. The R1 Zone does not permit semis, towns, multiples. The neighbors would more than likely object to “upzoning” to an R2 zone that would allow multiples.
- M) Short Term Accommodation would not be permitted.
- N) Accessory Apartments would be permitted.
- O) It is not the responsibility of 1 developer to provide a mixture of housing across the entire municipality.
- P) The proposed lots are narrower than the standard R1-1 lots down from 18 m to 15 m frontages. The homes will be limited in size to around 2000 sq feet first floors. The proposed lots would not permit larger homes as the R1-3 zone provisions limit the building envelope beyond the provisions of the R1-1 zone.
- Q) The proposed development is located in close proximity to the Regional bus line.
- R) The design of the proposed lot fabric in the current Draft Plan was carefully considered by the development team to provide a balance between the surrounding lot fabric, providing open space and a housing product that fits the area.
- S) The subject lands are much smaller in size than the nearby Aquaville project which provides them with an increased ability (i.e. with more lands) to provide a location for multiples/walk up units.
- T) It is my professional opinion that the DPS and ZBLA are consistent with the Planning Act and the PPS and conform with the County of Grey OP and the Town OP.

Andrew Pascuzzo MCIP, RPP