A. Recommendations

THAT Council receive Staff Report PDS.20.34, entitled “Follow up Staff Report Solcorp Developments (Peaks Ridge) Inc. Applications for Draft Plan of Subdivision Condominium and Zoning By-law Amendment” for additional information purposes;

AND THAT Council support the recommendations presented in Planning Staff Report PDS.20.12.

B. Overview

The purpose of this staff report is to provide Council with additional information regarding questions that were directed to staff at the March 16, 2020 Committee of the Whole meeting.

C. Background

On March 16th, 2020 Committee of the Whole received Planning Staff Report PDS.20.12 that provided recommendations for approvals (subject to conditions) on Applications for Plan of Subdivision, Plan of Condominium and Zoning By-law Amendment.

In addition to receiving the report, the following resolution was made:

AND THAT Council direct staff to provide a further report directly to the March 30, 2020 Special Meeting of Council for Council consideration, with permission being granted to the developer’s consultant to attend the March 30, 2020 Special Meeting of Council regarding this matter, Carried.

D. Analysis

At the March 16th, 2020 meeting, Council members asked Planning staff questions related to the Solcorp Block 38 proposal.
The following chart provides a summary of the Staff responses for the questions raised during the meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Was Block 38 created as part of the overall Ridge Estates Plan of Subdivision?</td>
<td>Yes. Block 38 was legally created with the registration of the Ridge Estates Plan of Subdivision Plan 16M-24. This plan was registered on December 18th, 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Are there any financial obligations on behalf of the current Block 38 owner to share in the responsibility or costs of repairing George McRae Road or other Phase 1 deficiencies?</td>
<td>Planning staff have consulted with Town’s legal counsel about this question. It is the opinion of Town’s legal counsel that the current owner of Block 38 does not have a legal obligation to remedy the defects in construction of the works already constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does a proposal to develop Block 38 as 31 single detached dwelling units as opposed to 42 townhouse dwelling units is consistent with; a) the Provincial Policy Statement, and conforms with b) the County of Grey Official Plan, and c) the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan?</td>
<td>Yes. Staff Report PDS.20.12 provided an analysis how the proposal is consistent with the PPS and conforms to the County of Grey Official Plan and the Town’s Official Plan. A summary regarding Official Plan conformity is provided below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Official Plan**
- The land is designated Recreational Resort Area (RRA),
- Single detached dwelling units are permitted in the RRA designation, and
- County Planning staff have not identified any County O.P. conformity issues regarding this proposal included that of “density”.

**Town Official Plan**
- The land is designated Recreational Resort Area (RRA),
- Single detached dwelling units are permitted in the RRA designation,
- There is no required minimum density in the RRA designation, and
- The maximum density in the RRA designation is 10 uph. If Block 38 is developed at 31 units the resultant density for the Ridge Estates Subdivision will be *6.5 uph.*

*uph = units per hectare

The original Ridge Estates Subdivision envisioned a total of 112 dwellings representing an overall density of 7.3 units per hectare. If Block 38 is developed at 31 units the resultant total unit count for Ridge Estates Subdivision will be 99 units representing an overall density of 6.5 units per hectare. The opinion of Planning staff is that a reduction of the original Ridge Estates...
Subdivision planned density of 7.3 unit per hectare to a resultant density of 6.5 unit per hectare is negligible. Block 38 was originally intended to be a significant concentration of the overall density for the Ridge Estates Subdivision density (42 units at 17.7 unit per hectare for this block) and it will continue to be so (31 units at 13.1 unit per hectare for this block).

Additional questioning was looking for clarification that if a re-consideration of Block 38 development is appropriate until such time as the repair of George McRae Road and other Phase 1 deficiencies is complete?

Previous reports to Council from the Town’s Development Engineering Department have been provided that identify the Town’s role to ensure that Phase 1 deficiencies are completed. This process is underway, and the Town is expecting a technical response from its retained Engineer by the end of April 2020. Part of the technical response is to determine whether efficiencies can be gained with the advancement of the Block 38 development?

In the interim, Planning staff have crafted Draft Plan Condition #15 that will require a final resolution to the Phase 1 remedial works prior to the registration of the Block 38 Plan of Subdivision and its “lots” being legally created. This is an additional safe-guard to the existing 0.3m wide Town road reserve (Block 47, Plan 16M-24) that also precludes legal access to Block 38 until such time as the Town is satisfied.

Furthermore, by way of this report, Council is advised that George McRae Road is not identified as a “Development Charge” road, and as a result, no development charge collected resulting from the development of Block 38 can be directly used to repair George McRae Road or Phase 1 deficiencies.

Lastly, Mr. Pascuzzo principal of Pascuzzo Planning Inc., has advised Planning staff that his client is not desirous of revisions to the “as proposed” Draft Conditions. Mr. Pascuzzo has submitted additional information on behalf of his client for Council’s consideration (see Attachment #1). Mr. Pascuzzo has been granted permission to attend the March 30th Council meeting despite Town Hall being closed to the public.

E. The Blue Mountains Strategic Plan

Goal #3: Support Healthy Lifestyles
Objective #3 Manage Growth and Promote Smart Growth

F. Environmental Impacts

This development proposal and its associated Planning Act applications have been reviewed by the appropriate agencies and authorities with regard to several matters, including natural heritage. The Grey Sauble Conservation Authority has reviewed the Environmental Impact Study submitted for this development and the appropriate conditions have been included to avoid negative impacts on the environment.
G. **Financial Impact**

The Town will receive development charges and future tax assessment associated with the build-out of this development.

H. **In consultation with**

Trevor Houghton, Manager of Community Services  
Nathan Westendorp, Director of Planning and Development Services  
Will Thomson, Director of Legal Services

I. **Public Engagement**

The development applications that are the subject to this report proceeded through the appropriate public process required by the Planning Act and are captured in Staff Report PDS.20.12.

J. **Attached**

1. Pascuzzo Planning Inc. letter (dated March 20\(^{th}\), 2020)

Respectfully submitted,

_____________________________  
Shawn Postma, RPP, MCIP  
Senior Policy Planner

_____________________________  
Nathan Westendorp, RPP, MCIP  
Director of Planning and Development Services

For more information, please contact:  
Shawn Postma  
planning@thebluemountains.ca  
519-599-3131 extension 248
March 21, 2020

The Town of The Blue Mountains
Corrina Giles, Clerk
32 Mill Street
PO Box 310
Thornbury, ON
N0H 2P0

RE: Block 38 Draft Plan of Subdivision, Zoning Bylaw Amendment
Solcorp Developments
The Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey

Dear Corrina:

On behalf of Solcorp Developments, Pascuzzo Planning Inc. submits this letter requesting that Council proceed with the recommendation of Staff to approve the Draft Plan of Subdivision (DPS) and Zoning Bylaw Amendment (ZBLA) related to Block 38 on March 30, 2020 for the following reasons:

1. In The Town of Blue Mountains Zoning Bylaw 2018-65 the subject lands are zoned R2-42. Exception reads –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42</th>
<th>R2-42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These lands shall only be used for a maximum of forty-two (42) dwelling units and uses, buildings and structures accessory thereto.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   It is worth noting that the exception does not require a minimum of 42 units be built out on the property. Further, there is no site-specific policy in the Official Plan that requires a minimum of 42 units to be developed on the subject lands. Based on the size of the property being 2.37 ha technically the Official Plan would only permit 23 units as the Recreational Residential designation only permits 10 units/ha. A site specific Official Plan Amendment is not required, nor has one been submitted.

2. It is important to note that it is the Town’s responsibility to repair any deficiencies to George McRae Road or any of the other right-of-ways within the “Parent” Plan of Subdivision (Ridge Estates). Block 38 should not be responsible for any of these upgrades. It is unfair and unacceptable for Council to suggest that the new owner of Block 38 should be responsible for any potential repairs to George McRae that come to light as part of the independent engineering review that is ongoing. Further, it is inappropriate for Council to suggest that the new owner of Block 38 should be required to pay monies associated with the potential repairs prior to the Final Approval of the Block 38 Draft Plan of Subdivision. For further clarity, the owner of Block 38 is not a party to the Town’s Subdivision Agreement with Ridge Estates. Similarly, neither are any of the other lots within the Subdivision.
3. With regard to applicable Development Charges (DC), Council should be aware that the Town would actually receive less money (almost $50,000) through DC’s if this development proceeded as an apartment building.

31 single family homes @ $36,884/ unit = $1,143,404

42 apartments @ $26,057/unit = $1,094,394

Further, Solcorp has expressed willingness to pay both the hard and soft cost portions of DC’s at the Subdivision Agreement stage, if that assists the Town with the upgrades to George McRae.

4. Based on my interactions and previous experience with adjacent land owners I expect that they will strongly object to a redesign of the proposed development from single detached homes to an apartment building occupied by attainable/affordable units. I would also suggest to Council that the neighbours may have some rationale for this not being an appropriate location for affordable housing versus a more suitable location within Thornbury. I understand that Council is very concerned about the affordable/attainable housing crisis in the Town of Blue Mountains. I would recommend that Council consider pre-zoning some of the Development (D) zoned lands within Thornbury. I would suggest that one potential location for this type of pre-zoning is the west side of Thornbury.

5. The proposed single detached housing product within Block 38 will be approximately 1600-2100 square feet in size, which is smaller than the existing single detached dwellings along George McRae. Therefore, the proposed units represent a different housing type compared to what currently exists. In my opinion, Solcorp is adding to the variety of housing types in the neighborhood, while at the same time providing a more attainable housing product.

6. See below for a comparison between the existing single detached residential lots within the existing Subdivision and the proposed lots with Block 38. The proposed lot fabric is more than 3 times denser than the existing Subdivision.
7. There are currently no objections to the ZBLA or the Draft Plan from any of the agencies or the public.

8. If the application(s) are refused then my client will have no choice but to appeal that decision to LPAT and Council will need to seek out a private planner to assist with the appeal. Staff at the Town will not be able to represent Council in this matter.

Based on the above, I am of the opinion that there is no reason to modify the proposed Draft Plan Conditions.

Therefore, on behalf of Solcorp I would ask that on March 30, Council proceed with the approval of the Zoning Bylaw Amendment as well as the recommendation to the County to proceed with the Approval of the Draft Plan of Subdivision.

Kind Regards

PASCUZZO PLANNING INC.

Andrew Pascuzzo, MCIP, RPP