

September 16, 2020

Village of Merrickville-Wolford
317 Brock Street West
P.O. Box 340
Merrickville, ON K0G 1N0

Attention: Doug Robertson, CAO/Clerk

Dear Mr. Robertson:

**Re: Planning Comments on Application for Approval of Draft Plan of Subdivision (07-T-20202)
Part of Lots 1 and 9, Block 16, Lots 190 to 192, Part of Lots 193 to 196, Plan 6
Village of Merrickville-Wolford, Our File No. 19-7059G – McLean Landing Phase II**

We have prepared this letter to provide planning comments on our initial review of applications for approval of draft plan of subdivision filed by NOVATECH Engineers, Planners and Landscape Architects on behalf of 2287171 Ontario Inc.

The subject lands are located in the Merrickville urban area at the southwest extent of the Village on lands described as Part of Lots 1 and 9, Block 16, Lots 190 to 192, Part of Lots 193 to 196, Plan 6 Village of Merrickville-Wolford. The subject land is approximately 3.54 hectares in size with frontage on Country Road 16, as well as frontage on Sophie Lane and Irene Street. The proposed development includes the creation of 43 lots, 1 block which is to permit connection of Sophie Lane and the unopened road allowance of St. John Street. There are two streets also identified on the Draft Plan. The development consists of 38 single detached units and 10 semi-detached units for a total residential unit count of 48. The proposal is designed to direct stormwater into the existing stormwater pond constructed as part of McLean Landing Phase I. The proposal anticipates cash in-lieu-of-parkland and does not include the identification of parkland.

The lands are currently designated as Residential (R) in the current Village of Merrickville-Wolford Official Plan, as well as in the new Official Plan currently awaiting approval by the United Counties. The lands are zoned “D – Development in the Village’s Zoning By-law. The Planning Rational Report identified that there are a number of lots proposed which do not meet the minimum lot frontage of 18 m for single detached development. The report also identified that there are currently five proposed lots which will have the area and frontage required to meet the requirements of the R2 zone for semi-detached development. An application for a zoning by-law amendment to address the reduced minimum lot frontage and place the lands in a site specific R2 zone will be required as part of this development proposal.

The proposed development does well to represent and meet the objectives of the Official Plan. The subdivision will fill out the remaining vacant residential lands at the southwest end of the Village, providing a modest mix of low density development on a variety of lot sizes. With the Village’s population projected to increase to approximately 4,000 people by the year 2023, the proposed development will provide a portion of the additional housing that will be needed to accommodate the population growth.

Planning Comments: Application for Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval

Based on our initial review of the subdivision application, we offer the following planning comments:

1. Parts of the proposed development are located on lands that are former unopen road allowances. Confirmation that the unopened road allowances are in the ownership of the applicant is required.
2. The mix of single detached dwellings (38 units) and semi-detached dwellings (10 units) being proposed result in a net density of approximately 28 units per net hectare of development lands (i.e 1.7 ha of net residential lands



excluding roads). The Official Plan sets a maximum low-density requirement of 22.7 units/net ha. The Official Plan does allow for an increase in this density requirement for proposals that include semi-detached and duplex development. It should be noted that if all 43 proposed lots were developed by single detached houses, the density would still be 25 units/net ha, exceeding the requirements of the Official Plan. The information contained in the draft plan of subdivision application under Chart 4.8 appears not to be complete and somewhat misleading. Clarification of Chart 4.8 and conformity with density targets should be provided by the applicant.

3. The issue of density is also reflected in the request to reduce the minimum lot frontage of the R2 zone from 18 m (60 feet) to 12 m (40 feet). If the density of development was closer to the requirements of the Official Plan, it is possible that there would be fewer lots not meeting the minimum lot frontage of 18 metres. It is also worth noting that the request is to reduce the minimum frontage to 12 m. Most of the proposed lots appear to have frontages closer to 15 m, with relatively few lots in the 12 m range. It may be more appropriate to consider reducing the minimum frontage from 18 m to 15 metres. It may be necessary to spot zone the few lots that would not meet this standard. It is typical for zoning compliance to be a condition of draft approval. It is recommended that any consideration of changing the zoning be deferred until after the approval of the application for draft plan of subdivision.
4. It is important to understand the anticipated traffic flow generated from this proposed subdivision. The direct connection to County Road 16 via Street 1 is proposed to be a right-in/right-out intersection. This is recommended in the Traffic Brief due to limited sight lines for left-bound traffic. The implication of this design is that the vast majority of traffic bound for downtown Merrickville will access St. Lawrence Street via Sophie Lane. This, plus the additional load anticipated from the Merrickville Grove Draft Plan of Subdivision may result in a combined load that should be assessed in terms of the capacity of Sophie Lane and intersection control at Sophie Lane and St. Lawrence Street.
5. The Environmental Impact Statement submitted in support of the application identified that a small portion of the southern extent of the subdivision is impacted by Whippoorwill Habitat. It also indicates that additional consultation and direction on an acceptable mitigation is pending. Clarification of this matter by the applicant is required as it could have an impact on the development of Lots 21 to 27 of the draft plan.
6. Table C on the draft plan of subdivision application is intended to capture information related to housing affordability. The application submitted does not include any of the requested information. This information is required for the Council to be aware of the housing affordability of the proposed development.
7. There is no information contained in the Planning Justification Report or draft plan that would address pedestrian travel via sidewalks or pathways. Additional information related to active transportation should be provided by the applicant.
8. The subject lands are impacted by the 500 m Waste Disposal Influence Area, as identified on Schedule B-3 of the Official Plan. The Planning Justification report is silent on this matter. Section 4.4.2 of the Official Plan states that:

“In the case of an existing or former Waste Disposal Site use, development may be permitted within the 500 m Influence Area in accordance with the land use designation shown on Schedules A-1 and B-1; however, residential uses are generally not permitted within the Influence Areas of existing uses. Prior to the approval of any development proposal, the applicant shall undertake such studies, as required by the Village in consultation with the Ministry of the Environment pursuant to the policies of Section 3.6 and 3.19, to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be adversely impacted. Typically, such studies consider factors such as landfill-generated gases, ground and surface water contamination by leachate,



odour, litter, contaminant discharges from associated vehicular traffic, visual impact, noise, dust, fire, vectors and vermin.”

This matter should be addressed by the applicant to provide Council with the assurances that the future subdivision will not be negatively impacted by the existing landfill.

Summary

The above planning comments are preliminary and a final copy will be prepared following the public meeting. The purpose of this is to allow for us to review the public and agency comments and address any additional concerns that may be brought to our attention. A review of the engineering aspects of the application have also been conducted by Jp2g Consultants Inc. The engineering comments will be addressed in a separate letter.

Should you have any questions regarding the comments please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Jp2g Consultants Inc.
ENGINEERS • PLANNERS • PROJECT MANAGERS

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'F. Symon', is written over a light blue rectangular background.

Forbes Symon, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner | Planning Services

Cc Brian Whitehead, Principle | Planning Services