

Memorandum to: Clerk, Lindsey Green, Township of Southgate  
Municipal Planner, Clint Stredwick

Subject: Bob Harris - Proposed Entrance (Sideroad 41)

“SENT VIA EMAIL”

---

**Background:**

On August 4, 2020, I sent a brief memo outlining a request by Mr. Harris to lift a portion of the 1 foot (ft) reserve along Sideroad 41 in order that he could obtain a convenient access to his rear yard at 100 Harris Crescent and construct an accessory building. Consideration of the request was deferred to permit Mr. Stredwick time to prepare a report to Council outlining staff concerns with this request.

**Comments:**

I have reviewed Mr. Stredwick’s report and would note the following:

**Zoning Provisions:**

The property is zoned R5 and any building and the use of any building must comply with the R5 zone provisions. Any speculation by neighbours or staff as to other uses, commercial or otherwise, should be discounted as the building and its use must comply to the R5 zone, which does not permit any type of commercial use outside the dwelling. There has been no history of commercial activity at this site. It is my opinion that there is adequate control through the zoning by-law for uses at this site.

**Strip Development:**

With regard to strip development, I would agree with Mr. Stredwick’s comment if the proposed access was for a new residential lot, which is not the case. The proposed access will not create any new traffic issues. I also question the opinion that a laneway to an accessory structure on the Harris lot would create a need for a reduction of the speed limit in this area. As mentioned before, this is not an entrance to a new residential property. If Mr. Harris was requesting a severance to create a new residential lot, there would be some validity in Mr. Stredwick’s concern with regard to strip development.

As noted in Mr. Stredwick’s “lot fabric” map, there has been a substantial amount of strip development approved in this area of the years. Strip development is defined as when a number of residential lots, with separate entrances, are created in a linear fashion along a municipal road. Access to an accessory structure does not meet that definition.

**On-site Access Option:**

The staff report suggests that if Mr. Harris used his exterior yard, which the by-law requires to be six (6) metres, and removed some trees, the six (6) metres is of sufficient width to gain access to where Mr. Harris wants to erect an accessory structure. I have reviewed this suggestion with Mr. Harris who

advised that twelve (12) trees would likely need to be removed, some being 30 years old. He also noted that this side yard is approximately three (3) metres in width, not six (6) metres. The 1 ft reserve alters the status of the exterior yard, making it a normal side yard. Creating a laneway in this narrow sideyard would have a significant negative effect on an attractively landscaped property.

Although this suggestion in the staff report seems reasonable, it is not appropriate upon further scrutiny.

**Summary:**

The staff report has expressed some legitimate concerns related to strip development, however, these concerns do not really apply to Mr. Harris' request.

The property along Sideroad 41 has a length of 141 metres (462 feet) which is ample room to safely locate an entrance without any need to review/reduce speeds at this location.

Based on the foregoing, it is requested that Council support the removal of a portion of the 1 ft reserve and permit access to the rear yard of the Harris property.

Mr. Harris and I would like to review this report with Council in order to respond to any questions or clarifications required by council. Please advise as to how we may participate at the October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2020 meeting.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'D. Scott', with several loops and flourishes.

Don Scott

Cc: Bob Harris