



COUNTY OF WELLINGTON

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
GARY A. COUSINS, M.C.I.P., DIRECTOR
TEL: (519) 837-2600
FAX: (519) 823-1694
1-800-663-0750

ADMINISTRATION CENTRE
74 WOOLWICH STREET
GUELPH, ONTARIO
N1H 3T9

January 13, 2016

Bill White, CAO / Clerk
Town of Minto
5941 Highway 89
Harriston, Ontario N0G 1Z0

Dear Mr. White:

**Re: Christian Grotenhuis / Nathan Harper – 46 Robertson Street, Harriston
Rezone from R1B to R2 to Allow Duplex or 4-Plex
Zoning By-law Amendment**

PRELIMINARY PLANNING OPINION

The main purpose of the application is to permit a two unit duplex. Mr. Harper indicates that there is a small possibility of replacing the building with a new 4-plex in the longer term. There are two lots in the neighbourhood zoned R2, which would allow up to 4 units. Two other lots nearby, have semi-detached units on them. The rest of the neighbourhood is zoned R1B, which allows only a single detached dwelling. Council could chose to allow only the duplex and require a rezoning later for a 4-plex, or chose to allow both now in the present application. The public meeting may help to inform Council's preference. I will provide additional comments and a draft by-law after my site visit and the public meeting.

SUBJECT LAND

The property is legally described as Lot 9, Harriston, with a municipal address of 46 Robertson Street, Harriston. The property has a 66 ft. frontage and a depth of 149.5 ft., for an area of 9,867 sq. ft. The location is shown on the air photo at the end of my report.

PURPOSE

The purpose and effect of the proposed amendment is to rezone the subject lands from single family Residential (R1B) to Medium Density Residential R2 to permit a duplex in the near term and possibly, a 4-plex in the long term. The amendment may also address site specific regulations for the development to deal with any lot, setback or other deficiencies that might be present.

BACKGROUND

It's my understanding that the dwelling on the property was a legally established non-conforming duplex built around 1940. In recent years, a door was put in between the 2 units, and the house used as a single detached dwelling.

Mr. Nathan Harper is in the process of purchasing the property from Mr. Grotenhuis. I spoke with Mr. Harper on the phone; he indicated that the main purpose of the application was to make sure a duplex was permitted. He mentioned that there was a small possibility that he might replace the building with a new 4-plex in the longer term.

Purchase of the property is not conditional on approval of this zoning by-law.

A sketch was not supplied with the application and question # 13 was not filled in completely. Information on the existing dwelling location and yard setbacks are not provided.

PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT (PPS)

Section 1.1.3.3 of the 2014 PPS states that *"planning authorities shall identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for intensification"*. Section 1.4.3 encourages Planning Authorities to provide an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities to meet projected requirements of current and future residents.

WELLINGTON COUNTY OFFICIAL PLAN

The property is located within the Harriston Urban Centre and is designated Residential. The policies of Section 8.3.2 of the Official Plan set out a number of objectives for residential development including, *"g) to encourage intensification, development proposals provided they maintain the stability and character of existing neighbourhoods."*

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Neighbouring Properties

Most of the surrounding properties in the immediate neighbourhood are zoned Residential (R1B). Two lots, 68 and 76 Roberson Street are zoned Residential (R2). These are the fourth and fifth lot away from the subject property. While I have not made a site visit yet, these two properties appear to have single detached dwellings on them, based on Google Street View. There is also an older semi-detached home nearby at 116 and 116A Brock Street.

Duplex

A duplex contains 2 residential dwelling units. I do not have any concerns with rezoning to specifically permit a duplex dwelling on the property.

4-Plex in Future

For Council's information, if a 4-plex is developed in the future, it will be subject to site plan control and will have to meet the R2 zoning requirements for Section 12.2.5 (see below).

12.2.5 FOURPLEX RESIDENTIAL DWELLING

12.2.5.1	Lot Area, Minimum	650.0 m ² (6997.0 ft ²)
12.2.5.2	Lot Frontage, Minimum	18.0 m (59.0 ft)
12.2.5.3	Front Yard, Minimum	6 m (19.7 ft)
12.2.5.4	Interior Side Yard, Minimum	2.4 m (8.0 ft)
12.2.5.5	Exterior Side Yard, Minimum	6 m (19.7 ft)
12.2.5.6	Rear Yard, Minimum	7.6 m (24.9 ft)
12.2.5.7	Building Height, Maximum	10.5 m (34.5 ft)
12.2.5.8	Lot Coverage, Maximum	40 %
12.2.5.9	Floor Area, Minimum per Unit	70.0 m ² (753.5 ft ²)

At 9,867 sq. ft. and a frontage of 66 ft., a 4-plex could physically fit on the property.

Section 8.3.12 of the Official Plan contains criteria for evaluating intensification proposals.

- a) Compatibility of proposed in terms of built form

“... may not be the same as existing adjacent development but which can co-exist ... while not creating unacceptable adverse impacts”

- b) Building height and massing
- c) Maintenance of lotting pattern
- d) Ability of infrastructure to accommodate the proposal
- e) Impact on streetscape and protection of municipal trees
- f) Impact on adjacent properties

In relation to grading, drainage, access, parking, privacy, views, outdoor amenities and shadowing.

- g) Conservation of cultural heritage resources

Some of the above criteria can be considered at the time of site plan control and the issuance of the building permit. Some criteria are addressed by zoning by-law standards for the R2 zone.

However, there is no appeal mechanism for the public when Council deals with site plan control.

ZONING BY-LAW OPTIONS

There are two zoning by-law options for Council to consider:

1. Put the property into the R2 zone now, which would permit up to 4 units.
2. Put the property in a R2 Exception zone and only permit up to 2 units (i.e. single detached, semi-detached or a duplex). Then require an additional rezoning in the future if the owner wishes to go ahead with a 4-plex.

I would suggest that the public meeting will assist in determining the best direction. I discussed this with Mr. Harper and he thought this was a good approach. Once this is sorted out, I will prepare a draft amendment for review.

SITE PLAN CONTROL

As already noted, a 4-plex would be subject to site plan control.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark Van Patter". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Mark" being the most prominent.

Mark Van Patter, RPP, MCIP
Manager of Planning and Environment
519.837.2600 Ext. 2080

C: Nathan Harper, new owner
Terry Kuipers and Stacey Pennington, Building Officials

