

**Thornbury Meadows  
(Adult Lifestyle Community)**

**Supplementary Planning Report**

**in support of proposed development approval applications for:**

**Zoning By-law Amendment  
Site Plan Review  
Consent**

**in the  
Town of The Blue Mountains  
(formerly Thornbury)**

**proponent:  
Telfer Homes Inc**

**October 2011**

**submitted by:  
John L. Tennant MCIP RPP**



**The Community Advocate**

PO Box 181 Owen Sound ON N4k 5P3

(519) 375-2259

[thecommunityadvocate@sympatico.ca](mailto:thecommunityadvocate@sympatico.ca)



---

## **Supplementary Planning Report**

### **Thornbury Meadows (Adult Lifestyle Community)**

**Proponent: Telfer Homes Inc**

### **Proposed Development Approval Applications (Zoning By-law Amendment, Site Plan and Consent)**

---

#### **Part 1 Introduction**

##### **1.1 Purpose**

The purpose of this supplementary planning report is to support the approvals process for a proposed adult lifestyle community development within the Town of The Blue Mountains, to be known as Thornbury Meadows. The subject lands are located at the corner of Napier and Victoria Streets in the southwest portion of Thornbury.

##### **(a) Original Proposal**

The original development proposal included 97 units with internal access along a private road. The private road obtained primary access from Napier Street, with a secondary access to Victoria Street. No individual unit access was proposed to Napier or Victoria Streets.

A private recreation clubhouse was proposed in a central location with a large open space block surrounding the facility. The recreation centre included meeting rooms, a swimming pool, and maintenance facilities.

Some visitor parking was provided at this location, with additional visitor parking spaces scattered throughout the development.

The subject lands comprise 4.29 hectares (10.6 acres) of land. These lands are designated under the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan as Residential. The lands are included within the Development (D) Zone under the Town Zoning By-law, which is holding zone that requires rezoning prior to development. The original proposal was in general conformity with the Official Plan and the proposed Residential Multiple RM1 Zone Zoning By-law. Some exceptions to the standard zoning provisions were requested for rear yard setback and lot coverage.

Following a series of preconsultation meetings, a planning report and other supporting documents were formally submitted to the Town in September 2009 with the following development approval applications:

- **Zoning By-law Amendment**
- **Site Plan Approval**
- **Blanket Consent**

The proposed applications were deemed complete by the Town on January 27, 2010, in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act.

### **(b) Background – Public Meeting and Review Process**

There has been a very lengthy review process. During the initial review period, the Town met with the proponent on several occasions to discuss general planning and engineering design issues. The Town expressed concerns about a number of matters, including the small scale character of the neighbourhood, orientation of development, streetscape design, adult lifestyle focus, leasehold interests, connectivity with adjoining lands, open space and walkway linkages, visitor parking, and reduced zoning provisions for rear yard setbacks and lot coverage.

Subsequently, the proponent also received notice that the Town had undertaken a peer review of the proposed development by the same design consultants contracted to prepare draft design guidelines for the downtown commercial area of Thornbury. These draft guidelines were also later expanded for residential purposes to include the subject lands (but not the

entire municipality). The peer review identified several major design considerations, including the need for broader neighbourhood planning, public connectivity, vistas, and a variety of other site planning and building design issues.

A statutory public meeting was held on September 8, 2010. At this meeting, the proposal was presented, and there was considerable concern expressed by the public. The major issues related to the design, scale and nature of the development in relation to the surrounding neighbourhood. A residents group has been formed which has also since made several submissions and delegations to the Town.

At times, the review process with the Town has been frustrating because a broad range of design issues and public concerns posed seemingly insurmountable obstacles. We are not aware of any other development proposal in the municipality that has undergone this form of municipal and public scrutiny in relation to the design elements. The recent nearby Far Hills development did not receive any such peer review, design guidelines or other analysis, yet that development introduced similar style townhouse units as well as much higher density apartment style units, with no attempt to retain a lower density neighbourhood streetscape. There have been many other developments approved by the Town without this intense design intervention.

Although there were numerous complaints raised, there were few realistic viable options or constructive solutions presented. In most cases, the issues were only stated in a very generalized and esoteric manner which makes it difficult or sometimes impossible to address.

Nevertheless, the proponents continued to meet with the Town on several occasions in an attempt to narrow the issues and obtain more detailed direction on desired changes. In February 2011, the proponents presented some preliminary design modification suggestions intended to form the basis for further discussion and subsequent formal modifications to the proposed development applications. The proponents received a generally favourable response from the Town staff at that meeting.

### **(c) Town Status Report**

The Town Planning and Building Services Department prepared a status report in a letter to the proponent dated March 31, 2011. The status report

is intended to consolidate and update comments, including matters related to the peer review, draft design guidelines, and concerns from the public.

The Town status report identifies a number of concerns, including community character, building design, and landscaping, amongst other matters. It should be noted that this status report references the preliminary design modifications which were presented by the proponent for discussion purposes, but were not formally submitted. Therefore, some references to specific units and other details in the Town status report may not be applicable to the current modified proposal herein.

The Town status report was subsequently presented to the Planning and Building Committee at a meeting held on April 4, 2011. At the same meeting, a further deputation was also made by the residents group outlining concerns about the proposed project.

## **1.2 Modified Proposal**

This modified proposal for Thornbury Meadows has been submitted in response to the various concerns expressed by the Town and the public. Particular attention has been given to ensure compatibility with the character of the surrounding area.

In many ways, the modified proposal is essentially the same as the original proposal, but much more enhanced. The basic concept for an adult lifestyle community remains unchanged, including multiple residential leasehold units and a recreation centre along an internal private road. There have been significant design modifications to address the various compatibility issues and concerns, including a low density streetscape along Napier and Victoria Streets, overall reduction in density, increased open space, extensive landscaping, public access, gateway vistas, and numerous architectural design features, as further described in Section 1.3 below.

### **(a) Supplementary Planning Report**

It is intended that this supplementary planning report will serve to modify the original development approval applications submitted in September of 2009. In particular, this supplementary planning report addresses the justification and approval requirements of the municipality based on the modification of these existing Zoning By-law Amendment, Site Plan and Consent approval applications. These modified applications would recognize the potential

development of 86 residential dwelling units for the subject lands, as described herein.

The original planning report contains extensive supporting documentation related to these applications. This supplementary planning report addresses the material changes and details of the modifications only, with particular regard for compatibility and design matters. The planning rationale contained in the original planning report also remains applicable to the modified proposal, except as otherwise specifically provided in this supplementary planning report. The general planning merits and all other planning considerations contained in the original planning report remain valid and are not duplicated in this supplementary planning report.

Accordingly, this supplementary planning report should be read in conjunction with the original planning report, including the rationale for the adult lifestyle component, conformity, and other supporting justification.

### **(b) Appendices**

The modified proposal includes the following revised supporting documents attached as Appendices to this supplementary planning justification report:

- **Appendix A Site Plan**  
(*Zubek, Emo, Patten and Thomsen Limited, October 2011*)
- **Appendix B Landscape Plan**  
(*Vogel Landscape Design and Consulting Group Ltd., October 2011*)
- **Appendix C Architectural Renderings**  
(*Unique Design, October 2011*)

### **(c) Other Supporting Documents**

In addition to the various supporting documents submitted with the original proposal, the following revised supporting engineering reports have also been submitted separately in support of this modified proposal:

- **Functional Servicing Report**  
(*WMI & Associates Limited, October 2011*)

- **Traffic Impact Assessment**  
(WMI & Associates Limited, October 2011)

### 1.3 Design Features

The modified proposal includes many design features which have been customized to enhance the character of the development. Primary attention has been given to address the issues and concerns which have been identified by the Town and the public.

The following overview generally describes the design features of the modified proposal. A detailed review of each of these design features in relation to the specific issues and concerns is also further described under Part 2 of this supplementary planning report.

#### (a) Site Plan

(see Appendix A)

The site plan shows the overall site design modifications that have been incorporated to address the concerns expressed by the Town and the public, including the following features:

- **Density**  
The density and scale of development have been significantly reduced. The modified site plan includes a reduction from 97 residential units to only 86 residential units.
- **Streetscape and Character**  
The streetscape along Napier and Victoria Streets has been transformed. Larger multiple unit blocks looking inward from these public streets have been replaced with two and three unit buildings that are more in keeping with the existing development in the area. An outward orientation has been incorporated with direct frontage and access onto the public streets. Mutual driveways are provided, where possible, to minimize vehicular and pedestrian traffic disruption.

This pleasant, low density perimeter interface provides a transition into the development that is more compatible with the character of the surrounding neighbourhood.

- **Internal Design**

The site plan retains an internal loop road design with access to Napier and Victoria Streets. Both of these entrances have an enhanced boulevard design.

The recreation clubhouse and stormwater facility have been oriented to create a combined multi-purpose amenity area in the north west portion of the subject lands. A drop-off turning lane has also been added at the entrance to the recreation clubhouse, as well as two handicap parking spaces. Additional visitor parking, loading spaces and garbage storage areas have been provided along the easterly side.

There is a much greater emphasis on building distance separations and open space amenities. Extensive open space walkways, courtyards and rest areas have been provided throughout the modified site design.

As described further below, the potential for a public parkette at the corner of Napier and Victoria Streets has also been provided, if desired by the Town.

- **Connecting Links**

The site design includes the potential future facilitation of public road and walkway linkages along the southern boundary of the subject lands. The actual extension of these linkages will depend upon similar facilitation by adjoining property owners, if desired.

**(b) Landscape Plan**

*(see Appendix B)*

The landscape plan illustrates the very extensive landscaping proposed for the subject lands. The combination of open space areas, recreational amenities and plantings will enhance the “park” like setting for Thornbury Meadows:

- **Gateway Vista**

A strong visual prominence is given to the open space landscaping around the stormwater facility at the corner of Napier and Victoria Streets. This gateway view presents a showcase vista into the development, extending to the recreation club house and clock tower that also serves as an attractive landmark feature. This area also

serves a recreational amenity with walkways, rest areas, bicycle racks and benches. Some public park access may also be considered, if desired by the Town.

- **Landscaped Boulevards**

The two primary access points from Napier and Victoria Streets are designed to present a landscape character. These features create a pleasant vista into the community that offers a calming effect and ameliorates the visual presence of the interior development. A 2 metre paving stone strip is also provided along one side of the divided entrance for visual appeal and to maintain a minimum 6 metre hard surface for fire truck access purposes.

- **Courtyard**

A large common open space courtyard is proposed as a recreational amenity between units within the central ring road. This courtyard will include a gazebo, rest area, bicycle racks, benches, walkway linkages, and landscaping.

- **Overall Character**

Additional open space walkway linkages and landscaping are also provided throughout the development. There is an overall prevalent open landscape amenity appeal and character.

### **(c) Architectural Appeal – Priority Units and Optional Features**

The design of the residential units will vary. Special attention will be given to the priority units that are located in key viewpoint locations. Particular regard will be given to the gateway units that provide significant public views from external public streets.

Although there is an overall continuity in design, some of the units will have special features that are unique to that unit or block. There are also several design features that may be incorporated on an optional basis:

- **Building Materials**

Each multiple block of units may also be distinguished with variations in building materials (brick, stone, siding, shingles, colours, etc).

- **Gateway Units**

The gateway units will have additional attention to architectural appeal along the end of the units facing the public view points,

including landscaping, roof articulation, larger windows, and wrap around porches. These units may also have second storey loft bedroom suites, if desired by the purchaser.

- **Other Priority Units**

Other priority units may also have some of the various unique design features, subject to marketing and sales.

#### **(d) Architectural Renderings**

*(see Appendix C)*

Given the concern regarding the visual impact and compatibility with the neighbourhood, this supplementary planning report includes several architectural renderings to depict the modified proposal from a public view perspective:

- **Gateway Vista – Napier and Victoria Streets**

This rendering illustrates the showcase gateway vista from the corner of Napier and Victoria Streets. An open space area with extensive landscaping and passive recreational amenities is provided around the stormwater management facility. Naturalized edges enhance the attractiveness of this area, and pedestrians are directed along the pathways away from any potential hazard. The vista into the community terminates with the landmark recreation clubhouse facility.

- **Streetscape – Napier Street**

Particular attention has been given to create a low density, compatible character along Napier Street. This interface with the surrounding neighbourhood presents a pleasant streetscape that is very attractive, but not imposing, while concealing the internal higher density development.

- **Recreation Centre – Close Up**

A close up view through the open space vista to the recreation centre is presented from a more eye level perspective. This rendering is more immersed in the open landscape amenity of this area. The recreation clubhouse building is designed as a landmark feature with articulated rooflines, large windows, and a clock tower.

- **Parkette – Close Up**

A close up view into the proposed parkette is also immersed in the

open landscape amenity of this area. This rendering depicts the passive rest area nature of this park facility, with benches, walkways, bicycle racks, and extensive landscaping.

- **Boulevard Entrance (Right) – Napier Street**

The right side close up view of dwelling units and the boulevard entrance along Napier Street shows a major feature of the enhanced streetscape. The boulevard entrance provides a calming effect and ameliorated gateway vista toward the internal development. The paving stone edge in this location also provides a pleasant separation between vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

- **Boulevard Entrance (Left) – Napier Street**

The left side close up view of dwelling units and the boulevard entrance along Napier Street also shows the attention given to design and character, with articulated roof lines, variety in layout and materials, wrap around porches and landscaping. The centre boulevard and each unit also have low ambient decorative street lamps.

### **(e) Zoning Standards – Yard Setbacks**

The Zoning By-law specifies the minimum yard setback requirements in relation to the front lot line. Typically, the front lot line has a smaller street frontage. The main access and orientation of development are also typically directed to the front lot line.

The subject lands are relatively square, with a slightly larger street frontage along Napier Street. Technically, Victoria Street is the front lot line because it is the shorter of the two. Although both streets will provide a primary access, Napier Street will probably be perceived as the main access from a functional perspective. Napier Street is the frontage seen by the surrounding neighbourhood, and will also provide access to the first phase of development.

This technical v functional distinction does not matter for yard setbacks along the public streets. The front and exterior side yard setbacks are the same (7.5 metres). The interior side yard and rear yard setbacks do vary in relation to the front lot line (4.5 metres and 10 metres, respectively). This poses an anomaly for zoning compliance purposes along the easterly property line.

The proposed yard setback for some of the units along the easterly property line is 8 metres. In the case of the two units on Napier Street in the north east corner, this is functionally the side lot line. The minimum side yard setback requirement would be only 4.5 metres.

There are also two larger blocks of units that back onto the easterly property line with an 8 metre yard setback. This functionally serves as the rear yard for these units. A third block of units in the middle has a 10 metre yard setback from the easterly property line. This staggered approach is intended to provide for more visually interesting and appealing sight lines. This is also consistent with the proposed yard setbacks within the overall development, which are typically a minimum of 7.5 metres along any road or property line, and 15 metres for shared rear yards between buildings.

Because the easterly property line is technically the rear lot line, the minimum required setback is 10 metres. The proposed 8 metre setbacks do not comply. If the front lot line was along Napier Street rather than Victoria Street, then the site design layout would comply with the standard zoning setback requirements for all yard setbacks.

From a planning design perspective, the minimum required rear yard setback along the easterly property line serves more of a technicality than any practical purpose in relation to the subject lands. The proposed setback could be increased to meet the 10 metre setback requirement. Internal setbacks can then be reduced up to the minimum zoning requirement of only 3 metres from any lane or parking area. But this is not considered desirable from a site design point of view.

If the Town accepts a parkland dedication for a public parkette at the corner of Napier and Victoria Streets, then Napier will become the front lot line and the proposed easterly setback will comply with zoning. The parkette dedication is proposed with a 45 x 8 metre strip of land along Napier Street and an additional 33 x 8 metre strip along Victoria Street. This would effectively eliminate the need for a Zoning By-law exception for rear yard setback. The rear yard would then be along the southerly boundary, which has a setback of 17.5 metres.

In the event that the Town accepts dedication of the partial road allowance and/or public walkway linkage along the southerly boundary, then a further technical zoning deficiency would result if Napier becomes the front lot line. Once the road is established in the future, then this deficiency would be corrected because the exterior side yard street setback would then apply.

Normally, such zoning deficiencies are exempt where created by a conveyance to the Town. It is not the technical issue that is relevant. These technical v functional comparisons simply illustrate that the required yard setbacks in relation to the proposed site design can be somewhat arbitrary from a practical perspective. Regardless of the technical or functional aspects, or the potentially convoluted consequences of the various dedications, an amendment to the Zoning By-law may be required to permit the proposed setbacks along the easterly property line. We ask the Town to determine which standard they consider most appropriate to apply to the modified proposal, and to amend the Zoning By-law accordingly to ensure compliance, if needed.

It is our submission that the proposed setbacks identified in the modified proposal are appropriate in any resulting technical compliance circumstance. Our preference would be to include dedication of the parkette to the Town, and the elimination of any setback issues with Napier Street as the front lot line. With the deferred dedication of the potential road and walkway link along the southerly boundary, the public road would be constructed at the time of dedication and no zoning issues would be created.

To avoid any confusion regarding these fluctuating setback requirements, it may be desirable to specify under the Zoning By-law Amendment that Napier Street is the front lot line for the purposes of the Zoning By-law.

#### **(f) Zoning Standards – Open Space and Lot Coverage**

The open space component has been significantly increased under the modified proposal. There has been a reduction in the number of residential units, and the distance separations between buildings have also been increased, with attractive open space walkways, courtyards, and rest areas.

The modified proposal comprises only 31.7% lot coverage (see Appendix A Site Plan). This is significantly less than the 35% lot coverage permitted under the Zoning By-law, and the 40% requested under the original proposal.

The lot coverage will also not be exceeded if the proposed public parkette (1.3% of lot area) and/or the future public road/walkway allowance (5% of lot area) are dedicated to the Town. With both of these dedications, the total lot coverage is still only 33.9%.

An exception to the Zoning By-law for lot coverage is no longer required.

### **(g) Other Zoning Standards**

The modified proposal generally complies with all other standard zoning requirements under the Residential Multiple RM1 Zone.

As identified in the original planning report, an exception should be included to recognize the land lease tenure, in accordance with Section 46 of the Planning Act. The holding (-h) symbol may also be utilized for development phasing purposes.

No other zoning exceptions are requested.

### **(h) Functional Servicing Report**

*(WMI & Associates Limited, October 2011 – submitted separately)*

A new Functional Servicing Report has been prepared to address the primary service infrastructure requirements for the subjects lands, including water, sewer, stormwater management, and utilities. This report is specifically designed for the modified proposal, and replaces the previous functional servicing report submitted with the original proposal.

Based on the review of existing conditions and the proposed design of required works, the Functional Servicing Report concludes that:

- The development can be serviced via connection to the existing municipal water distribution system and wastewater collection system.
- The proposed SWM block is sufficient in size to accommodate the required facility for providing post to pre development quantity control and quality control in accordance with MOE Guidelines.
- There are existing utility plants servicing neighbouring properties.

### **(i) Traffic Impact Assessment**

*(WMI & Associates Limited, October 2011 – submitted separately)*

A new Traffic Impact Assessment has been prepared in support of the modified proposal. With regard for existing conditions, this report concludes that:

- The predicted increase in traffic flow for the proposed form of attached senior adult housing development will be approximately 11 trips per hour (peak AM) and 14 trips per hour (peak PM).
- The traffic will generally be split in some fashion between the two ingress/egress points along Napier and Victoria Streets, as well as the external direct access driveways. Napier Street is expected to be the principal access (60% of internal), with Victoria Street providing secondary access (40% of internal). During the maximum peak period (PM), there would be approximately 6 trips at the Napier Street access, 4 trips at the Victoria Street access, and 2 direct access trips from the units along each of Napier and Victoria Streets.
- The additional traffic generated to and from the site is considered minimal and will not have adverse affects on the existing transportation system.
- Based on design standards, the sight distance geometry is sufficient from the proposed site entrances and from each of the direct access driveways on Napier and Victoria Streets to permit adequate driver reaction time and safe vehicular turning movements.
- The proposed development can be accommodated within the framework of the existing transportation infrastructure.

## **Part 2**

### **Planning and Design Considerations**

#### **2.1 Overview**

The modified proposal is primarily based on the response by the proponent to the planning and design considerations that have been identified by the Town. In this regard, appropriate measures have been incorporated in response to the peer review, the draft design guidelines, and the Town status report. Consideration has also been given to some additional matters raised by the public which are not addressed in the foregoing documents.

#### **2.2 Peer Review**

The Town contracted a peer review to be completed by GSP Group consultants. Although there is no specific Official Plan policy basis, the peer review recommends a number of neighbourhood design considerations. The principal issues identified under the peer review relate to urban design matters, including the following:

##### **(a) Overall Concept Plan**

A primary concern expressed by the peer review is the lack of connection with adjacent properties in the surrounding block, to ensure this area will function as a neighbourhood for parkland, pedestrian linkages, and other land use purposes. An overall concept plan is recommended for the entire block bounded by Napier Street, Victoria Street, Duncan Street and Bruce Street.

Given the private leasehold nature of the proposed development, it is not possible to incorporate public street connection through the subject lands. Such linkages with adjacent lands cannot be determined at this time, until the specific development plans are proposed. It should not be incumbent upon the proponent of this development project to undertake this type of secondary planning process. Furthermore, a public road linkage may not be desirable for this area.

In order to accommodate the concerns, the modified proposal does provide

for a potential future public road connection along the southern boundary. This would appear to be the most logical and appropriate alternative. A future public road established in this location would be suitable to facilitate access for all adjacent properties. A future public walkway connection may also be provided in this area, if desired. The proponent is willing to orient the development in this direction, and to provide one-half (10.06 metres) of the usual municipal road allowance (20.12 metres).

As an interim measure, a private road is proposed in this location. At such time in the future that a public road is determined appropriate, then these lands can be transferred to the municipality and utilized for that purpose. The design and location of the proposed residential units in this location would not be adversely impacted, albeit preferred as a private road. The adjacent benefitting property owners would be required to contribute the remaining land needed for the other half of the road allowance.

### **(b) Reverse Lotting**

The peer review contends that the principal issue with the original proposal is the reverse lotting. They strongly recommend that along the Napier and Victoria Street frontages all units should be oriented to the street. The modified proposal reorients the dwelling units, as recommended, with care taken to ensure that the garages do not dominate the streetscape.

### **(c) Inward Looking**

Concern is also expressed regarding a perceived inward looking perspective with no vehicular or pedestrian connections to adjacent properties. This concern is similar to the previous concerns, and the proposal has been modified accordingly to provide linkages and street orientation.

### **(d) Variety and Visual Interest**

In response to concerns regarding the uniformity of design, the modified proposal incorporates a range of architecture types to offer variety and visual interest, including different building elevations, articulated rooflines, facades, materials and colours.

**(e) Priority Units**

In addition to the architectural diversity throughout the development, the proposed modifications adopt the concept of priority units recommended in the peer review, including gateway units, corner units and open space units. In this regard, the more highly visible units are recognized as focal points which deserve particular emphasis in terms of articulation, massing, and detailing. Units with sides that are publicly visible have increased height and massing, similar front and side detailing, wrapped porches, and differentiated materials and colours. In some cases, corner and end units also provide an opportunity to include an additional upper storey bedroom.

**(f) Greenspace Showcase**

The peer review recommends that the prominent location of the stormwater facility at the intersection of Napier and Victoria Streets presents an excellent opportunity to showcase the development. The modified proposal places emphasis on this facility as a usable greenspace, including native plantings to naturalize the space, pathways and a rest area with benches.

The peer review suggestion to consider a regional stormwater management function for other surrounding lands is not considered necessary or appropriate for the subject lands.

**(g) Private Recreation Facility**

The private recreational facility should be seen as a prominent landmark. This building has been reoriented to terminate the vista from the corner of Napier and Victoria Streets, in combination with the showcase stormwater facility and open space area. The building design has also been enhanced to provide a distinct showcase identity within the neighbourhood, with front and rear facade detailing and clock tower which will be seen from various internal and external vantage points.

**(h) Hedgerow**

The peer review recommends retention measures to ensure the existing hedgerow is maintained along the adjacent southerly property line. The modified proposal makes allowance for potential road and walkway linkages along this southern boundary. The existing hedgerow can be maintained

with the private road in this location, and a public walkway could also be established, if desired. If a public road is needed in the future, then this hedgerow would have to be removed.

### 2.3 Draft Design Guidelines

The Town also initiated a general planning process to consider the establishment of municipal urban design guidelines. Draft design guidelines were prepared by GSP Group consultants in December 2010. This document includes very comprehensive provisions for both commercial and residential development.

Although the detailed guidelines do generally present some reasonable and desirable principles, not all of the guidelines should be considered appropriate or applicable for the subject lands. There are also some broad community considerations which extend beyond the capability of practical implementation within individual developments. This draft document has not been adopted by the Town.

Although there is no compliance requirement, the modified proposal for Thornbury Meadows has taken into account some of the more applicable aspects of the draft design guidelines, including the following provisions:

- an open space park network with entrance located at the intersection of two streets (Napier and Victoria Streets), and connected to an overall greenspace system of active and passive areas integrated with the stormwater pond through pathways with extensive vegetation plantings and sitting areas. The existing treeline along the southern boundary will also form part of the overall open space character.
- clearly differentiated sidewalks and pathways separated from streets, linking to recreation and common open space areas.
- buildings are designed at gateways and key intersections as landmarks and priority lots with enhanced design treatment, including attractive articulated facades, unique roof lines, and wrap around porches.
- particular regard is given to the design guidelines for ground oriented multiple dwelling units, including a variety of roof line types, windows, materials, colours, functional porches, and other architectural

elements. Residential units along the existing Napier and Victoria Streets have been oriented to the street with combined driveways, where appropriate, and limited to two and three unit buildings to be more consistent with the character of the area and the local context. Varied building elevations, projections and setbacks are also used to enhance the visual interest along the streetscape.

- the recreation centre is prominently located between an internal road deflection and an external visual gateway, with extensive open space and pathway linkages. There is also both internal and external visual and functional architectural orientation toward this landmark facility.
- special attention has been given to the internal road access points from Napier and Victoria Streets. The proposed centre island boulevard and planting strips create a pleasant and visually interesting streetscape, as well as an attractive gateway into the development. These features also serve to introduce traffic calming measures.
- landscaping is provided throughout the development as part of an overall open space network, with pathways, courtyards, rest areas, benches, bicycle racks, and extensive trees and other vegetation plantings.
- the stormwater facility serves a necessary utility use. It is also designed as a landscape feature amenity forming part of an overall open space network. This area will complement the passive open space with the use of naturalized edges rather than fencing to deter public access.
- some attention has also been given to the incorporation of sustainable design features. Stormwater is managed on site with runoff from hard surfaces fed into this system and no net increase in off site flows. Native/adaptive plant species will be used for landscaping purposes to reduce the need for irrigation and maintenance.
- building design will include conventional insulation, heating, lighting, plumbing and other design standards which promote energy efficiency.
- the recreation centre orientation helps to take advantage of solar benefits from north and south exposure.

- utilities, services, loading and parking areas, and maintenance facilities are strategically located and screened to provide minimal visual disruption. Lighting is designed for low level ambiance and curb appeal, with no points of glare or light cast over adjacent residential areas.

## 2.4 Town Status Report

The modified proposal for Thornbury Meadows has been carefully designed to reflect the direction received from the Town. Particular regard has been given to the considerations contained in the Town status report dated March 31, 2011. The modifications have taken these matters into account to the extent possible.

The following considerations provide an overview of the issues and concerns, and identifies any discrepancies, where applicable. These considerations also demonstrate that the modified proposal has generally met or exceeded the Town's expectations.

### (a) Character

Considerable concern has been raised regarding the compatibility of the proposed development with the character of the neighbourhood. The surrounding neighbourhood can be seen as a variety of low density and mixed higher density housing types.

There a number of existing older homes along Napier Street. The existing built up area is dominated by single dwellings, including development along Orchard Drive. More recently, some newer single dwellings have also been developed to the north on Pyatt Ave.

There is an extensive condominium townhouse development known as Applejack to the northwest. Further to the west of this area, there has also been significant multiple residential development (known as Far Hills), including townhouse and apartment style buildings. A large portion of the municipality to the immediate west is vacant/orchard and intended for future development. With this considerable diversity, the area has maintained a small town, low density feel.

The proposed development for the subject lands would be consistent with

this established character. The modified proposal attempts to provide a transition of units. Whereas the original submission proposed multiple unit blocks located throughout the development, the modified proposal maintains a much lower density along Napier and Victoria Streets. The modified proposal includes primarily two and three unit blocks around the perimeter of the site, with larger multiple blocks ranging between three to eight units directed toward the interior. The larger multiple blocks are generally not within direct sightlines with the surrounding neighbourhood. The only perimeter three unit multiple blocks are located along Victoria Street, directed away from any primary sightlines within the existing neighbourhood. Although there are no single units proposed, the two and three unit blocks should be considered more compatible and in keeping with the general character of the neighbourhood.

As requested by the Town, the modified proposal is also supported by updated architectural renderings and landscape drawings.

### **(b) Official Plan**

The Town status report identifies the primary Official Plan conformity issues in relation to the Residential policies under Section 4.27. In particular, the Town is concerned that development maintains the “unique small town feel and character of the community”, and is “consistent with the existing architectural and heritage features, and the emerging recreational and tourist function of the area”.

The modified proposal satisfies these primary compatibility and character conformity issues in keeping with the intent and direction of the Official Plan. A great deal of attention has been given to the urban design features under the modified proposal to ensure that the proposed development will enhance the existing streetscape and blend with the visual character of the neighbourhood in a compatible manner.

It should also be noted that the original Planning Report provides a more thorough review of the applicable policies and provisions of the Official Plan, as well as the Provincial Policy Statement. The proposed development is in conformity with all aspects of these planning policy frameworks.

### **(c) Rear Lotting**

The Town status report contends that rear lotting is not good urban design

and is not supported by the Official Plan for the Thornbury Urban Community. This view is very debatable. There does not appear to be any specific planning policy direction to either encourage or prohibit rear lot development. The existing Applejack development is based on a rear lot design and is very compatible with the area. This approach can be considered a desirable form of urban design.

Nevertheless, the proponent has modified the streetscape design to satisfy the Town. Direct frontage and access are now proposed for the units along Napier and Victoria Streets.

#### **(d) Multiple Driveway Access**

The modified proposal orients the residential units toward Napier and Victoria Streets, as requested by the Town. With this reorientation, the Town is concerned with multiple drive access points which they say are not supportable both from a character as well as pedestrian walk ability perspective. As requested, the modified design provides for combined access points, where possible, with maximum 6 metre wide mutual driveways.

#### **(e) Building Elevations**

The modified proposal includes building elevations and architectural renderings which illustrate design features that are intended to address compatibility and character concerns. The Town has requested that the building elevations provide for variety and avoid sameness so as to preserve the character of the community and promote good urban design. In this regard, various building heights, rooflines, setbacks and other distinctions are recommended. Design features and focus points are desired throughout the development to provide visual interest, as well as vistas into the development with architectural elements to promote the desired small town feel. As requested, the architectural renderings incorporate these design considerations, and also illustrate detailed information related to the proposed materials of construction, colours, etc.

Particular emphasis has been placed on a broader mixture of building styles ranging from two to eight unit blocks, and roof line variations with end units and other priority units. The interface with the surrounding area along Napier and Victoria Streets has also been improved with lower density two and three unit buildings. A pleasant streetscape is proposed with gateway

vistas and other unique design features, including landscaping at key locations, as well as staggered setbacks and garages.

#### **(f) Recreation Centre**

The Town regards the proposed recreation centre as an opportunity to become a prominent building within the neighbourhood in terms of the view corridor from the intersection of Napier and Victoria Streets, and to provide further integration of the development into the rest of the community. As requested, the architectural renderings submitted with this modified proposal include detailed building elevations of the private recreation facility and vista imagery to assist in demonstrating integration and consistency in architectural design and massing.

The corner of Napier and Victoria Streets can be seen as a landmark feature in the community which exhibits an open vista and attractive recreation centre with a clock tower, extensive landscaping around the stormwater facility and elsewhere, walkways and rest areas with benches. This should offer a warm and inviting people place which is not available elsewhere in the surrounding area. We encourage the Town to accept the dedication of a portion of this area as a public parkette for the benefit of neighbourhood residents.

#### **(g) Adult Lifestyle**

The Town status report contends that the proposed adult lifestyle community projects an exclusive neighbourhood that does not integrate itself with the rest of the community. The Town suggests that physical integration has been achieved with the modified proposal, but that social integration can only be attained with a family orientation. The Town staff have indicated a preference for the proposed development to be geared for all age segments (especially in light of the fact that the site is in close proximity to the local elementary school).

The “family” focus desired by the Town reflects an invalid bias, and should not be considered a prerequisite for development approval. This assertion does not appreciate the need for social and cultural diversity as an appropriate and desirable form of growth and development. A variety of housing types to satisfy a range of living accommodation needs is an essential part of a healthy community.

The residential units are designed for a specific market segment. All age groups may live within Thornbury Meadows, but the small scale units with only one or two bedrooms are not conducive to large families with children. Families without children also have needs, and make substantial contributions to the community mosaic. The proposed units will also provide a needed more affordable residence alternative for people without families.

We do not concur with the Town's proposition. We believe that the proposed adult lifestyle development will form a desirable and integral part of the community.

### **(h) Buffering**

The modified proposal achieves the Town's goals to minimize visual impacts and to ensure compatible development. Substantial buffering measures have been taken, with an intended balance between site design, transition of unit sizes, reduced overall density, increased building separations, landscaped vistas, open space and recreational amenities.

This approach serves to soften the visual impact and effectively minimize potential land use conflicts from adjacent uses and roadways. The cumulative effect of these measures will visually blend the development in with the rest of the community, and will maintain the intent and direction of the Official Plan.

### **(i) Stormwater Management**

The modified proposal recognizes the direction received from the Town to incorporate the stormwater facility into the landscape plan as a showcase feature with naturalized edges. The Town does not want any chain link fencing. The Town has also indicated that they do not want to accept dedication of the stormwater facility.

The functional stormwater management report has been revised based on the proposed site plan modifications. The basic engineering design remains essentially the same, with no net increase in pre to post stormwater flows.

### **(j) Open Space and Parkland Dedication**

The modified proposal incorporates increased building separations, as

requested by the Town. Although not specifically required under the Zoning By-law, the Town requested a minimum separation distance of 15 metres between rear wall to rear wall of buildings. This has contributed to a significantly improved open space component, and has also reduced the overall number of dwelling units. All other setbacks have also been met or exceeded under the modified proposal, except for the rear yard setback along the easterly property line (see above).

The Town has indicated that they will require 5% cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication. There are some new considerations with the modified proposal that would be desirable for the Town to accept as parkland dedication. In particular, the ability to establish a public walkway along the southern boundary has been requested by the Town. This should be properly considered a parkland dedication.

The Town has also indicated that the developer must own and maintain the stormwater facility and the surrounding landscaped open space. The modified proposal has incorporated this area as a passive recreational amenity, including extensive vegetation plantings, walkways, bicycle racks, and park benches, designed to create a relaxing rest area while diverting people away from the stormwater pond.

A portion of this area has also been shown on the Landscape Plan with a potential walkway and rest area that could be used by the public (see detailed description above). As previously noted, the Town may wish to consider acquiring this area as a public parkette. This area is optional if the Town does not wish to acquire it. If the Town does want this area incorporated as a public open space feature, then it should also form part of the required parkland dedication.

### **(k) Landscaping**

As a recurring theme in response to the Town's concerns, the modified proposal has given a great deal of attention to the increased open space and landscaping component. The original proposal requested an exception to increase the maximum lot coverage requirement of the Zoning By-law from 35% to 40%. The modified proposal more than meets the required standard, and an exception is no longer needed.

The landscape plan and architectural renderings illustrate the details of this theme in relation to the streetscape design, buffering, and other unique character elements throughout the development.

**(l) Density**

The Town status report gives no recognition to density unit yield (see public comments below), except to acknowledge that the proposed density is permitted under the maximum density provisions of the Official Plan for the subject lands. Instead, the Town reserves comment on density conformity. Emphasis is placed on the distribution of density and the creation of “great spaces for future residents”.

Although inherently desirable, this somewhat arbitrary interpretation of the appropriate density cannot be viewed as a requirement. To the contrary, the proposed density should be properly recognized to be in conformity with the Official Plan.

The modified proposal provides a redistribution of density that is attractive to the periphery with lower density, open space vistas and priority features, and also creates a very pleasant internal living environment with appealing building design, open space, and recreational amenities.

**(m) Connectivity**

As noted previously, the Town has requested that a municipal road and public walkway link be extended through the development to the lands to the east and south. The proponent cannot facilitate such municipal linkages which would divide the community. It is also not appropriate for the developer to pay the cost for a public road and walkway that may not be needed. It is not known at this time whether such linkages will ever be needed in the future.

If desired by adjacent developments, the proponent has modified the site plan design for the subject lands to help facilitate future public road and walkway linkages to be established along the southern boundary. Contributions from the future benefitting developers would be required to establish these linkages.

**(n) Building Elevations**

In response to the request by the Town, the modified proposal has adopted a neighbourhood design perspective which reflects the considerations under

the peer review and the draft design guidelines. As described previously, special attention has been given to building elevation design, articulation and detailing, with particular regard for priority gateway, corner and open space units.

### **(o) Parking**

The modified proposal provides for ample parking which exceeds the minimum requirements of the Zoning By-law. Each residential unit will have two available parking spaces, one in the driveway and the other in the garage. In order to keep free traffic movement and maintenance along the roadways, there will be no on-street parking permitted. Additional consolidated parking and loading spaces are provided at the recreation centre, which may also be used by visitors. There will also be visitor parking spaces strategically located throughout the development to provide for greater convenience.

### **(p) Blanket Consent**

The Town has indicated a reluctance to support the proposed blanket consent because they are not aware of any precedent and are concerned with the potential ramifications.

The Planning Act requires consent for the lease of any portion of land for a period of time greater than 21 years. This should be recognized as a consent approval process for permission under appropriate circumstances. It is not intended to absolutely prohibit longer term leases, any more than consent to divide land is to be prohibited. The consent is a means to ensure there are appropriate circumstances. The proposed consent for the subject lands is an appropriate use of this lease permission. The benefit for residents and land registration are further outlined in the justification planning report submitted with the original application.

To refuse the consent only serves to deny residents the ability to have long term tenure, and to needlessly complicate the title registration process. The requested consent would remove these arbitrary obstacles. It may also assist prospective purchasers with mortgage financing from financial institutions. There is no additional justification basis to consider, and there are no perceived adverse ramifications. The benefits are a logical and appropriate use of the consent process.

The proposed Thornbury Meadows is designed as a permanent residential community (that will not cease prior to 21 years), and the proposed blanket consent properly recognizes that long term nature. If the Town does not approve the consent, then the proposed development can still proceed without this advantage.

#### **(q) Archaeological Assessment**

The Archaeological Assessment Report has been previously submitted. There are no apparent issues or concerns. Acceptance of the Archaeological Assessment Report by the Ministry of Culture should be forthcoming. For this purpose, the County of Grey is the one window approval agency.

#### **(r) Environmental Study**

The Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Study Reports have been completed. In addition, a record of site conditions has also been submitted to the Ministry of Environment. Since there does not appear to be any environmental issue, these reports should be satisfactory. For this purpose, the County of Grey is the one window approval agency.

#### **(s) Servicing Allocation**

The Town has noted that servicing allocation is available upon execution of a development agreement and payment of all applicable development charges. As noted in the original submission, the proponent is requesting a phased development approach, with payment of development charges related to each phase. The first phase is intended to be 25 units, including units 1 – 17 and 29 – 36 (see Appendix A Site Plan). The recreation clubhouse and maintenance building should be permitted as an optional component of Phase 1. The remaining residential units may be developed in one or more additional phases, subject to the marketing demand for the units.

#### **(t) Development Charges**

The Town status report states that “a reduction in development charges will not be further considered by the Town”. It should be recognized that the

proponent has not requested a reduction in development charges as any special consideration for this development proposal. The request made in the original submission is directly related to the Town's overall review of the development charges by-law. It appears that the Town may have misinterpreted this request.

Firstly, it is our submission that the amount of the development charges should be related to the nature and scale of the use. The small scale residential units proposed in this application should not fairly be required to make the same contribution as larger scale, more intensive residential uses. There should be a sliding scale ratio for development charges. This approach would apply for all similar residential units in the municipality and would help encourage small scale, more affordable housing. The larger scale development would pay a relatively larger portion of the development charges.

Secondly, we are also concerned that the development charges by-law for the Thornbury West service area improperly includes costs associated for future development of vacant deferred development lands. The costs which solely benefit this future development area should be the sole responsibility of those lands. Such costs are not fairly burdened onto the subject lands or other designated development lands. Given the long term nature of any development potential beyond the planning horizon for the foreseeable future, these future costs should not even be included under the current development charges by-law. At minimum, the additional costs associated with these deferred development areas should be identified under a separate service area. A similar approach has been done for other service areas which are also distinguished on the basis of separate benefits.

These issues are significant factors in the Thornbury West service area being allocated one of the highest development charges in the municipality. This is not conducive to the attraction of affordable housing in Thornbury, where affordable housing is most warranted.

The Town's apparent unwillingness to reconsider the equitable calculation of development charges seems to discount these submissions without any consideration of the merits. There has been no opportunity to discuss the details of these concerns with the Town. These changes should be further considered by the Town under the development charges by-law, however, this matter is not directly related to the development approval process for the subject lands.

**(u) Submission**

The Town status letter makes several references to a “resubmission package”. Reference is also made to a “review for completeness”, following which “a complete submission will then be reviewed by our Development Review Committee”.

For clarification purposes, the modified proposal and this supplementary planning report together with other supporting documentation do not constitute a “resubmission”. They form part of an on-going review process. If the Town requires any additional information, then the proponent will provide whatever is needed. The formal status of the original applications has not changed. The applications have already been deemed complete for purposes under the Planning Act. The modified proposal is presented in response to the request by the Town.

Given the significant enhancements, we would appreciate the opportunity to make a presentation of the modified proposal at a formal public meeting. We have listened to the issues and concerns and have responded accordingly with this modified proposal. We are hopeful that the modified proposal will adequately address the public concerns and satisfy the requirements of the Town.

It is not appropriate to make a second presentation with a non-statutory public meeting, as indicated in the Town’s status report. These applications have been exposed to an extremely lengthy review process, with intense scrutiny from all affected parties. The proponent has made an extraordinary effort to appease the concerns. The modified proposal should be regarded as the finalization of the review process, not the beginning of a new round. There is no need for further delay in proceeding with approval decisions, whether acceptable or not.

If the Town intends to give the public an opportunity to see the modified proposal prior to the statutory public meeting, then we would suggest that an informal public open house may be considered for information purposes only, provided there is no intent to invite further delegations and submissions. The formal required statutory public meeting should be scheduled for one week following any open house meeting to ensure that there is no delay in proceeding. At that time, the public would be invited to comment on the modified proposal.

## 2.5 Public Comments

A residents group has been formed and presentations have been made to the Town to express their concerns. The residents have also submitted a number of letters, neighbourhood meeting minutes, and spreadsheets. The Town status letter identifies the major planning issues and concerns, including the majority of those relevant matters raised by the residents group. The redesign of the modified proposal has been carefully considered in order to adequately address all relevant matters raised by the Town and the public.

Although it is not necessary to further address each item in the public submissions individually, there are several additional themes raised by the residents which were not fully addressed in the Town status report:

### (a) Too Much Density

As noted above, the Official Plan allows substantially more development density for the subject lands. The proposed development is only about half of the maximum allowable density. Multiple storey townhouse and apartment style development could also be contemplated.

Notwithstanding the permitted density, the proponent is seeking a much more moderate form of low rise development. It is recognized that any proposed density for the subject lands must be properly designed to be compatible with the area. Similarly, it should be recognized that the density of development is not limited to single dwellings. Multiple dwelling development is permitted.

### (b) Road Improvements

The public comments expressed concern regarding the need for road improvements, including sidewalks. The traffic impact assessment has determined that traffic impacts will be minimal, as described in more detail elsewhere in this supplementary planning report. There is no perceived need for road improvements at this time.

The Town also has a development charges by-law that includes provisions for long term road improvement works related to the subject lands. Future road improvements may include sidewalks and will be provided as part of the Town's capital works program, as needed.

**(c) Interim Control By-law**

The residents petitioned the Town to impose a moratorium and/or interim control by-law to prohibit development on the subject lands until a new secondary planning process can be initiated for this entire portion of the municipality.

The use of an interim control by-law is only applicable in exceptional situations where a current planning study warrants. Interim development control is not intended to be used as a means to delay development, or to stop any new development application which poses concerns by neighbouring residents.

Interim development control is not an appropriate or necessary planning approach for these applications. The proponent has taken appropriate measures under the modified proposal in an attempt to address all planning related matters. The Town is able to address all relevant concerns as part of the normal planning approval process.

## Part 3 Conclusion

### 3.1 Summary

The modified proposal for Thornbury Meadows has responded favourably to all of the various concerns which have been identified, including the Town status report, the peer review, the draft design guidelines, and concerns expressed by the public.

The overall design has been reduced to a scale that is more compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. There is a transition of lower density units along the existing public streets, with the higher density directed away from the streetscape views. The number of units has been reduced from 97 to 86, open space and building distance separations have been increased, and the building lot coverage has been reduced from 40% to only 31.7%.

The proposed development presents a pleasing showcase design consisting of a complementary combination of gateway vistas, landmark architectural features, priority units, boulevard entrances, recreational amenities, and extensive passive landscaped open space areas.

There are no perceived adverse impacts. The existing traffic and servicing infrastructure can accommodate the development, without the need for any upgrades. The stormwater management facility is also incorporated into the overall open space amenities. Potential future public road and walkway linkages are provided for surrounding lands. There is ample resident and visitor parking. There is also suitable screening and buffering from adjacent existing residential development.

The proposed development is in conformity with the intent and direction of the Official Plan. The modified proposal has been designed to be compatible with the small town feel and character of the area.

These applications represent good planning for the subject lands.

### 3.2 Recommendation

Based on the foregoing, the following development approvals are recommended for the subject lands:

- a) That a Site Plan approval be given on the basis of the modified proposal described under this supplementary planning report.
- b) That a development agreement be entered into between the Town and the developer to address all relevant matters under the site plan approval, including the site plan, landscape plan, stormwater management, phasing, servicing allocation, financing, and land dedications.
- c) That a Zoning By-law Amendment be passed to rezone the subject lands from D to RM1.
- d) That the Zoning By-law Amendment include an exception to the RM1 Zone for setbacks, as needed. No exception is required if the Town accepts the dedication recommended under paragraph (f) below.
- e) That the Zoning By-law Amendment recognize the land lease tenure for the subject lands.
- f) That the Town accept the dedication of the proposed public parkette along Napier and Victoria Streets.
- g) That the Town include suitable provisions under the site plan agreement for the potential future dedication of the proposed public road and walkway along the southerly boundary, if needed.
- h) That a blanket consent approval be given for the purpose of land leasehold interests extending to unit owners for a period of more than 21 years. This approval may be deferred or otherwise addressed separately from the foregoing approvals.
- i) That the Town consider an amendment to the development charges by-law to provide for a more equitable charge in relation to residential unit types, and to separate or delete the deferred development lands from the Thornbury West service area. This approval may be deferred or otherwise addressed separately from the foregoing approvals.

- j) That a second statutory public meeting be held forthwith to present the modified proposal for Thornbury Meadows.

## **Appendix A**

### **Site Plan**

**Appendix B**  
**Landscape Plan**

## **Appendix C**

### **Architectural Renderings**

- **Gateway Vista – Napier and Victoria Streets**
- **Streetscape – Napier Street**
- **Recreation Centre – Close Up**
- **Parkette – Close Up**
- **Boulevard Entrance (Right) – Napier Street**
- **Boulevard Entrance (Left) – Napier Street**