

August 14, 2020

UCC Proj. 19128

To: Barbara Weins, MCIP, RPP
Director of Community Planning and Development
20 Pelham Town Square
Fonthill, ON L0S 1E0

**Re: Application for Zoning By-law Amendment
1307 Haist Street – 2741546 Ontario Inc.
Response to Comments Received at August 10, 2020 Public Meeting**

On behalf of our client 2741546 Ontario Inc. I would like to thank the Town for the opportunity to respond to comments received on the Zoning By-law Amendment application for 1307 Haist Street at the August 10, 2020 Public Meeting. The purpose this letter is to provide additional information related to the concerns raised by the public and the inquiries of Council at that meeting. The following provides a summary of the issues raised at the Public meeting and our collective response:

Traffic, Parking and Safety: a number of members of the public cited concerns with the potential impact of the proposal on traffic in the area, with impacts to the neighbourhood related to parking and possible pedestrian and vehicular safety issues. The proposed zoning amendment would permit the addition of two dwelling units to the site. The traffic impact from the addition of two dwelling units on the transportation system, including the collector road on which the site is located, is negligible. Each unit is provided with four parking spaces for a total of twelve. This constitutes four times the required number of parking spaces required by the zoning by-law and it is not anticipated that the parking demand will exceed this requirement. The geometry and spacing of driveway accesses are not problematic from a safety perspective and no sight line issues will result. The Town's Engineering Department has reviewed the development proposal and has not identified any issues with traffic, parking or safety.

Housing Tenure: there were a number of comments regarding the use of the dwellings as rental units, both short and long term, as well as the "type of people" whom might live in the proposed dwellings. The proposed zoning amendment relates housing form, specifically to permit townhouses at this location. The application has nothing to do with the tenure of the dwelling or who might live in it. In fact, planning legislation prevents zoning for tenure and zoning for the type of people is considered discriminatory by the Human Rights Tribunal. Further, it is understood that the Town's recently approved short term rental by-law would not permit short term rentals at this location in any event.

Intensification and Compatibility: The most common public comment was that there was a preference to not have townhouses at this location and a sentiment that they do not fit in. While not the same, townhouses are compatible with single detached dwellings. The proposed townhouses have been designed to be effectively integrated with the surrounding land uses and minimize massing impacts on them. The proposed density of approximately 21 units per hectare is permitted by the Official Plan and the addition of 2 units to the site represents a 0.77% intensification to the neighbourhood within 300 m of the property, whereas 25% is permitted. The minor intensification and the addition of variety in the housing supply is supported by Provincial, Regional and Town Planning policies.

Zoning Regulations: one resident cited concerns with the impact of the proposal's deviation from the "as of right" zoning regulations for the RM1 Zone. The Town of Pelham's Zoning By-law was approved in 1987 at a time when housing form was very different than it is today. It is quite common for development proposals in the Town to include site-specific zoning regulations as a means to "fit" modern housing form into the antiquated zoning of the Town. The number or magnitude of deviations from this zoning are by no means representative of the quality of a development proposal and are not an appropriate basis upon which to make a decision on an application.

Second Dwelling Units: a number of residents cited concern with the inclusion of zoning permissions for second dwelling units and a member of Council asked the applicant to consider removing the request for this permission from the application. While the inclusion of second dwelling unit permissions in zoning is an appropriate means of incorporating housing choice and affordability into a community and represents good planning, my client and I are receptive to the neighbourhood's sensitivity on this issue. As a result, my client is willing to omit second dwelling units from the development proposal. Please accept this as my request to amend the Zoning By-law Amendment application for 1307 Haist Street by removing the zoning regulation to permit second dwelling units. We respectfully request that this not prejudice the site from being included in a Town-wide amendment to permit second dwelling units as of right in the future should the Town pursue this.

Thank you again for providing us the opportunity to respond to the public input on this application. If Town staff has any questions or requires additional information, please contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Matt Kernahan', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Matt Kernahan, MCIP, RPP, CNU-A
Senior Planner
Upper Canada Consultants

CC: 2741546 Ontario Inc.