PASCUZZO PLANNING INC.

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 –

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 concerns 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