

Schedule Three to PLS-2019-0028:
Comments Matrix

	Comment	Response
Wayne Scott, 15 Credit Street	<p>Background</p> <p>Unfortunately I was not able to participate in the neighbourhood walking tour. I did participate in all the other elements of the Study asking questions of clarification and offering comments which I presume that Town staff and its Consultant considered along with all other input. I attempted to not repeat what I offered earlier.</p> <p>The extemporaneous comments shared with Council were based solely on the documents posted on the Town website.</p> <p>The terrain and history of construction throughout the Glen created situations that make it unreasonable to apply "flat land" zoning provisions to direct changes to all existing buildings. For example, minimum front yard provisions prevent owners of buildings adjacent the road allowance from making any changes (unless they invest money and time to go through the Committee of Adjustment and are successful).</p> <p>Bottom Line</p> <p>If Council implements the proposed changes to the Glen Williams Official Plan and the Zoning Bylaw it will effectively discourage the construction of huge homes on existing lots within the defined areas of Glen Williams.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Town did not examine, nor is proposing any changes to, the minimum front yard provisions of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law, through this study.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is the purpose of the proposed changes to setback, height and lot coverage in the mature neighbourhood areas to appropriately restrict large home rebuilds.</p>
	Currently there is no trigger to more restrictive requirements based on the amount of any proposed increase of floor space (e.g. increase of more than 20%);	Comment noted. Agreed.

Schedule Three to PLS-2019-0028:
Comments Matrix

	<p>hence, for large properties if the new setback, height and coverage provisions are met then only the building code provisions apply.</p>	
	<p>But the new provisions also create problems for current Glen home owners who wish to make small changes to their home when current structure are legal non-conforming from the zoning setbacks (except where relief is provided in proposed special provision 2 set out in the draft bylaw addressing lot frontages less than 18 meters which have relief from side yard setback).</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Town analysis was based on the principle of not creating significant non-complying situations through the new zoning regulations, and in achieving a balance between flexibility and an appropriate level of control over large home rebuilds. As noted, for lots with less than 18 m of frontage, the new side yard setback would not apply. For other unique situations, relief can be sought through the minor variance process at the Committee of Adjustment.</p>
	<p>In my situation, for 15 Credit Street, a corner lot, the Front Yard is defined as Erin Street, but Erin Street is many feet below the property boundary and thus while it is practical to build a garage <i>in front of the home</i>, with the current access from Credit Street, it will not permitted.</p>	<p>Comment noted. A revision has been made to the special provisions in the zoning by-law amendment to clarify the intent of requiring attached garages <u>facing the lot line which the driveway crosses</u> to be recessed at least 1 metre from the front wall of the house, in order to preserve the prominence of the front door vista characteristic of the hamlet. However, this does not prevent the location of a garage in front of the house if it is not facing the lot line in which the driveway crosses (i.e. the view from the street is of the side wall of the garage).</p>

Schedule Three to PLS-2019-0028:
Comments Matrix

	<p>Recommended Actions</p> <p>The Town should notify Glen home owners when the rough evaluation carried out in support of the new standards shows that the Monster Home provisions change their property status to non-conforming (legal).</p> <p>There should be further assessment of the impact of application of the new provisions to existing corner lot properties, particularly for properties with significant elevations over the lot.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The study did not conduct an analysis of every lot in Glen Williams. Certain areas were examined and certain types of lots were modeled to assess the impact of the proposed new provisions.</p> <p>The consultant team has examined, in consultation with Town staff, the impact of the new zoning provisions on corner lots in Glen Williams, and in general, while there may be specific situations in which replacement housing on corner lots may require a minor variance to the zoning by-law, these situations generally already existed, and have not been exacerbated by the proposed new zoning provisions.</p>
	<p>As I was informed at the Public Meeting, the Provincial Planning Act ensures that owners are able to rebuild their homes. It seems counterproductive for the Town to not recognize this reality within the Secondary Plan and Glen Zoning provisions, particularly for the owner suffering a catastrophic loss who wants to construct a duplicate of the lost structure.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Planning Act contains language that permits the replacement of a dwelling unit on the same building footprint (regardless of non-compliance with the in force zoning by-law) in the case of catastrophic loss/fire.</p> <p>The Town's Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2010-0050 contains similar language in Section 4.18, which applies to all zones within Glen Williams, and would permit replacement of a dwelling unit provided non-compliance with the zoning by-law is not increased (i.e. building occurs on the same building footprint).</p>

Schedule Three to PLS-2019-0028:
Comments Matrix

<p>Richard Domes, 1 Thomas Court</p>	<p>I am writing today as the resident of 1 Thomas Court in Glen Williams. As a resident I have a direct interest in the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhoods Study and associated draft Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments being presented at tonight’s public meeting.</p> <p>By way of background my wife and I purchased the property in 2017 with the intent of improving the property with modest building additions to “round out” and regularize the dwelling’s north and south side yards. Currently, my dwelling is one of the smallest in the immediate neighbourhood consisting of Oak Ridge, McMaster, Meagan and Thomas. As you can appreciate our aspirations for our home will take some time to realize. Given our vision for our home I have a particular interest in the proposed lot standards proposed to be advanced in the Town’s proposed amendments, particularly those of lot coverage and yard setbacks.</p> <p>According to the draft implementing documents, as currently advanced, my property is proposed to be Zoned HR1 (MN2), which would revise the lot coverage requirement from ‘N/A’ as currently advanced in the present Zoning By-law to a maximum coverage of 15%, as proposed. Given my particular situation this conflicts with my ultimate vision for the property which would add building coverage to the north and south side yards while maintaining all existing minimum side yard setbacks. My preliminary estimate is a (lot) coverage of between 15 – 17% would be required; slightly above what is currently being recommended and in my opinion would not represent a “monster home” that the Town is seeking to avoid.</p>	<p>Comment noted. When selecting 15% as the appropriate maximum lot coverage to be applied to the MN2 overlay (i.e. larger lots zoned HR1 and most lots zoned HR2), a lot coverage analysis was done, and in the Oak Ridge/McMaster/Meagan/Thomas neighbourhood over 90 percent of the lots had an existing lot coverage below 13%, with more than half having a lot coverage below 10%. Therefore a maximum lot coverage of 15 percent was considered to be an appropriate standard, which in the case of most lots would allow for some increase in the lot coverage (i.e. building footprint), while introducing a reasonable</p>
---	---	---

Schedule Three to PLS-2019-0028:
Comments Matrix

		level of control. Minor increases beyond this maximum threshold could be evaluated through the minor variance process (i.e. Committee of Adjustment).
	<p>I would ask that prior to bringing the draft implementing documents to Council for final ratification that the following concern be addressed by Town Staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What planning rationale has been advanced that determined that lots proposed to be Zoned HR1 (MN2) be limited to a coverage of 15% rather than a slightly larger number of 20%? 	See response above.
	<p>It seemed that residents consulted during the public process had suggested a lot coverage of 20-30% as being appropriate, which does not correspond with what the Town is currently advancing, and is quite different to the lot coverages of up to 30% and 35% for lots proposed to be Zoned HR1 (MN1).</p>	<p>The lot coverage range of 20 to 30% was for the original study area comprising the smaller lots in the core of Glen Williams. This higher lot coverage is not considered appropriate for much larger hamlet residential lots.</p>
	<p>On separate but related matters I also seek further clarification as to why the Town has chosen to exclude the proposed Eden Oak development lands at the west terminus of McMaster Court/Meagan Drive from the limits of the proposed implementing documents.</p>	<p>The Eden Oak development lands, and all properties zoned D (Development) in Glen Williams are generally vacant properties with development potential, rather than mature neighbourhood areas. D Zoned properties permit only existing uses and require a re-zoning process in which appropriate zoning regulations supported by technical studies, and subject to public input, can be determined.</p>

Schedule Three to PLS-2019-0028:
Comments Matrix

<p>Drew Leverette, GWCA</p>	<p>Wildwood Rail Trail - concern: Incorrect Zoning The trail from Wildwood Road to the Glen Boundary near Gamble St. has been zoned in 3 different ways - why? I believe that the rail trail is considered Open Space (OS) and should be shown as such. Most problematic is the assignment of the colour purple for Development (D) on the portion of the trail from Ann St. to Gamble St. I believe this identified purple stretch should be re-coloured and assigned some form of Open Space (OS) zoning, or at least Hamlet Residential 1 (HR1)</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Wildwood Rail Trail in this location is in public ownership and could therefore be placed in an Open Space, or Hamlet Residential 1 zone. This matter will be addressed through a future housekeeping amendment to the Comprehensive Zoning By-law.</p>
	<p>3 Wildwood Road (Taylor) & 60 Confederation St (Preston's Food Mart) - concern: Mature Neighbourhood 1 overlay Zoning missing This rectangle of the Hamlet Commercial Corridor (HCC) found west of Confederation St. and bisected by Wildwood Road should also be identified with the cross hatching of Mature Neighbourhood (MN1). The 3 Wildwood Road (Taylor) property is north of Wildwood and contains a private residence, while the 60 Confederation St (Preston's Food Mart) property is south of Wildwood and contains a commercial store. These properties need the MN1 zoning overlay.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The final schedule to the Zoning By-law amendment has been revised to show the MN1 overlay on the HCC Zoned properties at 3 Wildwood Road and 60 Confederation Street.</p>
	<p>17 Wildwood Road - concern: Incorrect Zoning Should not the portion of this 17 Wildwood Road lot that has been developed and shown as yellow Hamlet Residential, be zoned HR2/MN2? The size of the yellow portion on this lot would suggest that it is large enough to be considered Hamlet Residential 2, not Hamlet Residential 1.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This study does not propose changes to the boundaries of the HR1 and HR2 Zones in Glen Williams. As noted, the MN2 overlay has been applied to the subject property, thereby extending mature neighbourhood zoning provisions to the property.</p>

	<p>7 Wildwood Road (residential) & 9 Wildwood Road (light industrial/commercial) - concern: Incorrect Zoning, showing purple Development (D)</p> <p>Although sometimes referred to by two postal addresses, I believe that this land is one lot of approx. 11.3 acres with a mixed use designation. The lower level (#9) abutting Wildwood Road was industrial, and more recently rezoned Environmental Protection One (EP1, with existing uses grandfathered. The upper level (#7) has contained a home for 40+ years, with a rebuild house placed there in the last 4 years.</p> <p>- I believe that the 7 Wildwood Road home is sitting in the purple Development (D) portion of the property, not the green Environmental Protection One (EP1) zone. Can you please confirm the zone location of this home?</p> <p>- Similar to the example of 17 Wildwood Road (Pilutti), the 7 Wildwood Road acreage contains one erected home already and the land is therefore developed. Like 17 Wildwood Road, should not this portion of 7 Wildwood be zoned yellow HR2/MN2 and not purple Development (D)? Why is a purple Development (D) section shown on this property?</p>	<p>The upper portion of the 7 Wildwood Road property is located within the D Zone, while the lower portion is zoned Environmental Protection 1 (EP1).</p> <p>At the time of the previous Glen Williams Secondary Plan Review, this property was considered to have development potential and was therefore placed in the D Zone. The Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study was focused on large home rebuilds. The appropriateness of the land use designation (and implementing zoning) for this property can be examined through the review of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan to be commenced in 2019.</p>
--	---	---