



Staff Report PL2021-080

Title of Report: PL2021-080 -B8-21, B9-21, and B10-21 - Sharon Roberts
Department: Clerks
Branch: Planning Services
Committee Date: September 22, 2021

Recommendation:

Be it resolved that the Committee of Adjustment receive Staff Report PL2021-080 for information; and

That the severance be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. That** a 3m road widening be provided to the Township.
- 2. That** a survey be provided; and
- 3. That** an Engineered Grading and Drainage plan be provided to address stormwater management and ingress and egress concerns that is satisfactory to the Township public works department and the Chief Building Official.
- 4. That** all outstanding taxes, fees, and charges are paid, if any.

Property Location: 263071 Wilder Lake Road



The property is legally described as Con 1 EPT DIV 3 Lot 3, Geographic Township of Egremont. The lands are further described as 263071 Wilder Lake Road. It is

approximately 9.3ha (23 acres) with approximately 480m of Frontage on Wilder Lake Road.

The Proposal:

The proposal is to sever three 0.4ha (1 acre) lots from the 9.3ha (23 acre) parcel. The lots will have 44.19m (145ft) of frontage on Wilder Lake Road and have a depth of 91.7m (301ft).

Background:

The consent files B8-21, B9-21 and B10-216-21 can be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.southgate.ca/en/municipal-services/planning-applications-public-notice.aspx#B8-21-B9-21-B10-21-Sharon-and-Timothy-Roberts-Associated-with-C22-21>

The Comments received to date on the consent applications are as follows:

Bell Canada has no concerns

Enbridge has service lines running within the area which may or may not be affected by the proposed severance. Should the proposed severance impact these services it may be necessary to relocate the line according to the new property boundaries at the owner's expense.

Public Works Department indicates that the lots are on a rural asphalt road. The lot entrances will have to cut into the hill and may require more sloping or retainment of banks. Wilder Lake Road is a 50km/hr road at this section.

SVCA finds the consents acceptable to SVCA staff.

Hydro one has no concerns

The County recommends that detailed comments be received from the SVCA and that a decision be deferred until such time that an Environmental Impact Study could be completed.

The County requests notice of any decision rendered with respect to this application.

Comments have been received from members of the public.

Aly Livingston has the following questions/ concerns. The properties are located up hill - how will excavation of new lots affect the erosion and run off onto our property?

What will be the effects to the water table? We are on a private well and have concerns in that regard.

We have noticed some markings on the road and flagging inside the forest that we both share. We have concerns that some of the red tags are on trees that grow on our property. Can you provide an image of your proposed lots that includes our lots as well?

James Martin also has concerns regarding drainage and runoff as well as the safety of the road access onto Wilder Lake Road. There is also concern that additional consents will be applied for in the future to avoid the comprehensive plan of subdivision approach.

Staff comments:

Staff agree with the concerns regarding safe ingress and egress as well as stormwater management and drainage concerns expressed by neighbours. As a result, a condition has been included to require a detailed grading and drainage plan that addresses these issues. Further severances will not be supported without a plan of subdivision process being undertaken.

Policy Review:

All applications must be reviewed against Provincial, County and Township policy and all applications must be consistent with those policies. The lands are considered to be within a rural settlement area within the PPS and the Official Plan.

Note that while all policies in the PPS and Official Plans were reviewed only the most relevant, being the consent policy, is discussed below.

Section 1.1.3 addresses policies toward settlement area, both urban and rural. The first policy indicates that *Settlement areas* shall be the focus of growth and development. This policy clearly directs growth of this nature away from the rural areas toward settlement areas such as Varney.

The PPS also encourages growth that is appropriate for the servicing level and that is adjacent to existing development. The proposal would meet this test as it is directly across from existing strip development that is within the settlement area. The one acre lot sizes also help support the long term provision of private waste water and well water for the three lots.

An EIS was prepared for the proposal and has been reviewed by the Conservation Authority and has been found to be acceptable.

The proposed consents conform to the Provincial Policy Statements.

The County of Grey has already commented on conformity with the County official Plan and with the provision of a satisfactory EIS, it would appear that the proposal conforms to the County Official Plan.

The Township Official Plan designates the subject lands as Village Community within the Township Official Plan. The Township anticipates limited growth in these areas during the life of the Official Plan.

The proposed residential lots are a permitted use. Section 5.3.2 requires that the maximum density within the settlement area shall be 1 unit per acre. The proposed consents are each one acre in size and would meet this policy.

An EIS has been prepared and reviewed by the SVCA. The EIS has determined that the proposal can be accommodated in the location proposed.

The proposal is consistent with the Township Official Plan

Zoning

The subject lands are currently zoned Restricted Agricultural (A2) and Environmental Protection (EP). The lands to be severed will be rezoned to a Residential type 5 (R5) which is our rural community zone. The Environmental Protection Lands will remain the same unless altered by the Conservation Authority. There is a zoning application (C22-21) currently submitted for these lots to implement the consents. The zoning application has not been approved yet and is scheduled for a public meeting Sept 22 at 1pm.

The Township has no issues with the requested zoning amendments to implement the consents. The lots sizes meet the intent of the zoning by-law provisions and the retained lot is sufficiently sized continue.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications to this proposal.

Concluding Comments:

Based on the above, comments received it is recommended that the consents be approved with conditions provided no negative comments are received at the hearing.

Respectfully Submitted,

Municipal Planner: Original Signed By
Clinton Stredwick, BES, MCIP, RPP



CAO Approval: Original Signed By
Dave Milliner, CAO

Attachments:

- 1. Consent Sketch showing proposed lots.