



PARTNERS IN  
ENGINEERING, PLANNING &  
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

March 4, 2022

Township of Douro-Dummer  
894 South Street  
P.O. Box 92  
Warsaw, ON  
K0L 3A0

**Attention: Martina Chait, Clerk**

Dear Ms. Chait

**Re: 4034 Centre Road – Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan Approval, Part of Lot 10, Concession 9, Douro Ward, Township of Douro-Dummer, Planning Peer Review – 1<sup>st</sup> Submission Township File No. R-17-21 D.M. Wills Project No. 22-88002**

---

D.M. Wills Associates Limited (Wills) has been retained by the Township of Douro-Dummer (Township) to complete a Planning Peer Review of the proposed development located in Part Lot 10, Concession 9, Blocks 7 to 8, Douro Ward, municipally known as 4034 Centre Road. The applications were prepared by Ron Davidson Land Use Planning Consultant Inc. (Davidson) and MJ Davenport and Associates Limited (Davenport) on behalf of David Paterson and Kathryn Carrington.

The following information was received as part of this Peer Review:

- Application to Amend Zoning By-law 10-1996
- Application for Site Plan Approval
- Site Plan, prepared by M.J. Davenport and Associates Limited, dated April 2021
- Source Water Protection (SWP), Land Use Notice, dated December 14, 2021
- Planning Report, prepared by Ron Davidson Land Use Planning Consultant Inc., dated December 13, 2021
- Scoped Environmental Impact Study (scoped EIS), prepared by Oakridge Environmental Ltd., dated October 2021
- Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, prepared by York North Archaeological Services Inc., dated August 18, 2021
- First Nation Engagement, prepared by York North Archaeological Services Inc., dated August 18, 2021

The scoped EIS, Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and First Nation Engagement documents were reviewed as background information. However, a detailed peer review of the remaining information was conducted. A site visit was completed on March 1, 2022.

### **Proposed Development Description**

The subject property is located on the east side of Otonabee River, near the intersection of Douro Eighth Line and County Road 32. The property does not have direct frontage on a public road or shoreline; however is adjacent to an unopened Township road allowance which joins to Centre Road east of the property. Currently the property is vacant, and based on application information provides for a lot area of 2,795.85 m<sup>2</sup> (0.69 acres). Surrounding land uses are generally residential in nature.

An Official Plan Amendment (OPA #14) and Zoning By-law Amendment (2013-54) were previously approved for the subject lands to recognize the property as not providing frontage as defined in the Official Plan or Zoning By-law documents and otherwise recognizes access from the unopened road allowance to permit construction of a single detached dwelling.

The Zoning By-law Amendment also served to zone the lands to “Special District 190-Holding (S.D. 190-H) Zone” to apply several special provisions to the lands as follows:

- Minimum lot area - 2,700 square metres
- Minimum lot frontage - none
- Minimum front yard - 6 metres
- Defining the front lot line as the line which separates the lot from the abutting unopened road allowance

The Holding provision attached to lands is only to be removed subject to a site plan being approved and the property owners entering into both Site Plan and Level of Municipal Services and Access agreements to the satisfaction of the Township.

The property owner has proposed the following development on the subject lands:

- Single detached dwelling and attached deck
- Two accessory buildings (sheds)
- Swimming pool
- Septic system

In addition to requesting the holding symbol to be lifted, the submitted zoning by-law amendment application is also requesting to increase the maximum lot coverage from 15% to 17.1% to support the foregoing

development. It is noted that maximum lot coverage as defined in the Township's Zoning By-law is exclusive of accessory buildings and structures, which are permitted in addition to the maximum allowable lot coverage.

## Comments

Based on the information provided, we have the following comments regarding the proposed development.

### 1.0 Source Water Protection (SWP) Restricted Land Use Notice

The SWP Restricted Land Use Notice submitted states as follows:

*"This Notice has been issued in relation to an Application for a Site Plan..." and further states: "This Notice is not valid for any subsequent approvals the proposal may require under the Planning Act or for building permits under the Building Code Act".*

Although the zoning by-law amendment (ZBA) application is primarily intended to remove the holding provision, as additional relief from the Zoning By-law is being requested (i.e. lot coverage), it would be appropriate to obtain a revised/updated Notice which confirms applicability to a ZBA application in addition to the Site Plan application.

### 2.0 Zoning By-law Amendment Application

#### 2.1 Form Details & Information

Based on the site plan, it appears as though the proposed dwelling would meet or exceed all setback and development standards, save and except for the proposed increased maximum lot coverage. However, the setbacks provided in Section 10 of the application form do not appear to consistently reflect setbacks on the site plan drawing and also appear inconsistent with the definitions of the Township's Zoning By-law. As not all setbacks have been provided on the site plan, it is difficult to confirm/compare.

A lot line abutting an unopened road allowance is defined as an exterior lot line in the Township's Zoning By-law. However, By-law 2013-54 served to recognize the line abutting the unopened road allowance to be the front lot line. That being the case, identification of the remaining lot lines would likewise be adjusted; and setbacks from those yards measured accordingly.

Further, details inclusive of setbacks as well as size/area for the swimming pool have not been provided on the application form.

The application form and/or the site plan should be updated to ensure complete and consistent setbacks and development details are provided.

## 2.2 Accessory Buildings

The maximum height for accessory buildings is 4.5 metres (see Section 3.1.4 of the Zoning By-law). Based on the application information, the proposed height for both sheds appears to be 4.57 metres; slightly exceeding the maximum permitted. The proposed height of the buildings should be reduced or otherwise relief from this provision should be requested as part of the application.

All other development standards for accessory buildings or structures, inclusive of the septic system, appear to be met, subject to receiving updated information as requested in Section 2.1 and 2.3 of this letter.

## 2.3 Lot Coverage

Section 10 of the application form reported lot coverage for accessory structures is 3.0%, whereas the site plan indicates only 0.7%. Updated information should be provided on the application form and/or site plan accordingly to ensure consistent and complete information.

The application form indicates a total lot area, inclusive of accessory buildings/structures of 20.1%, whereas the Planning Report indicates a lot coverage of 20.4%. The correct total lot coverage should be confirmed and provided.

## 2.4 Parking & Driveway

The full extent of the driveway should be illustrated on the site plan drawing as it is considered to form part of the complete development plan; and also to ensure a minimum two (2) parking spaces are being provided for a residential dwelling unit (as per Section 3.31 of the Zoning By-law). It is assumed that parking within the unopened road allowance is not permitted.

## 2.5 Swimming Pool

The Township's Zoning By-law includes provisions specific to swimming pools (see Section 3.44) which have not been addressed through the Planning Report, nor have details been provided in the application form. Details such as size and setbacks as required by the By-law must be provided and the site plan updated as necessary.

It is noted that Section 3.44.1 c) of the Zoning By-law indicates that any building or structure accessory to the swimming pool shall be constructed in accordance with provisions applicable to accessory buildings. Section 3.12 d) requires a minimum distance of 1.2 metres between buildings or structures which does not appear to have been afforded between the pool and pool shed.

In the absence of this information, it cannot be confirmed at this time if the proposed swimming pool complies with the relevant provisions of the Zoning By-law.

## 2.6 Holding Symbol

On the basis of By-law 2013-54, Section 3.15 continues to apply to the subject property with respect to removing the holding symbol. As per 3.15 d), which indicates that any development constraints be addressed to the satisfaction of the Township, it would be our recommendation that the mitigation measures provided in the scoped EIS (Section 10) are included as a part of the site plan agreement.

It is noted that additional information may be required as part of the site plan submission to demonstrate how the development can still be supported when implementing the mitigation measures. However, it is anticipated any additional requirements will be addressed through comments received from the engineering peer review and/or review from Otonabee Region Conservation Authority.

## 3.0 Planning Report

The Planning Report provides a brief overview of the proposed development in the context of relevant planning policy. An extensive review of policy was not included. However, given that the land uses are permitted on the subject lands, this is considered appropriate and no further information, save and except as otherwise noted throughout this letter is considered necessary.

## 4.0 Site Plan Application

### 4.1 Site Plan Drawing

In addition to those items relevant to the site plan drawing as mentioned under Section 2.0 of this letter, information as required under 5 a) iii), iv) and xiv) of the Township's Site Plan Control Guidelines do not appear to have been fully incorporated on the submitted plan. It is recommended that the following information be added to the site plan, however note that the guidelines should be

D.M. Wills Associates Limited

150 Jameson Drive, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada K9J 0B9

P. 705.742.2297 F. 705.748.9944 E. wills@dmwills.com

reviewed by the applicant for any additional information relevant to the proposed development which may not be specifically listed below:

- All dimensions for the septic bed
- Dimensions and setbacks for the swimming pool
- A minimum of two (2) setbacks for each accessory building//structure. It is recommended that the two (2) nearest setbacks be illustrated
- Height of pool shed
- Separation distances between buildings
- Building entrances
- Revised and complete statistical summary as outlined in the site plan control guidelines and to otherwise be consistent with information submitted with the zoning by-law amendment application.

In addition to the foregoing, the floodline setback as illustrated in the scoped EIS prepared by ORE should be included on the site plan drawing.

It is noted that the 30-metre setback from the shoreline shown on the site plan does not appear to reflect the watercourse setback as illustrated in the scoped EIS. However, as the setback shown on the site plan appears to generally exceed that of the EIS, there are no concerns with the setback as shown on the site plan.

It is not evident where recommendations of Section 10 of the scoped EIS have been reflected on the site plan drawing or application. Engineering review with respect to drainage is being provided under separate cover, together with review of the scoped EIS. However, it is noted that pertinent information which relates to those suggested mitigations in the scoped EIS may still need to be addressed through supplementary information.

#### 4.2 Landscaping Plan

Section 5 c) of the Township's Site Plan Control Guidelines requires applications to be accompanied by a landscaping plan. Although residential site plan applications may not always require a specific landscaping plan, given the recommendations of the scoped EIS it would be considered appropriate for the proposed development.

Given the level of detail on the existing site plan, it is recommended that a separate landscaping plan, prepared by a qualified



professional, be submitted; and which take into consideration recommendations of the scoped EIS.

It is noted that the Planning Report refers to a pending landscaping / planting plan.

#### 4.3 Elevation Drawings

Elevation drawings are required under Section 5 d) of the Township's Site Plan Control Guidelines. To our knowledge, these plans have not been provided. It is recommended that elevation drawings be submitted to the Township as part of this application.

We trust that this information is suitable for your purposes at this time. Please contact our office if you have any questions or require clarification.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'A. Dougherty'.

Amanda Dougherty, B.A. (Hons.)  
Senior Land Use Planner

AD/DT/hd