

## PLANNING, PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Meeting #: PPT-07-2018

**Date:** Tuesday, May 29, 2018, 3:00 p.m.

**Location:** Halton Hills Town Hall, Council Chambers

1 Halton Hills Drive

Members: Mayor R. Bonnette, Councillor C. Somerville, Councillor J. Fogal, Councillor M. Albano, Councillor B. Lewis, Councillor M. Johnson, Councillor B. Inglis

- 1. CALL TO ORDER
- 2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST
- 3. COMMITTEE DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS
- 4. REPORTS & MEMORANDUMS FROM OFFICIALS

Vet Reports to be considered by the Community and Corporate Affairs Committee

Reports will be automatically held when there is a presentation or delegation on the matter.

### a. REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0030

PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0030 dated May 9, 2018 regarding Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study – Status Update and extension of Interim Control By-law 2017-0070.

### b. REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0035

PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0035 dated April 30, 2018 regarding Dedication of Reserve Block 26, Plan 20M-1029 Location: 14329 Highway 25 at Davidson Drive, Halton Hills.

### c. REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0036

PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0036 dated April 27, 2018 regarding Intent to Designate the Glen Williams Schoolhouse at 15 Prince Street, Glen Williams. 81

3

86

d.	REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0039	106
	PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0039 dated May 17, 2018 regarding Proposed CTC Source Protection Plan Policy Amendments under Section 34 of the Clean Water Act, 2006.	
e.	REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0041	131
	PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0041 dated May 8, 2018 regarding Authorization to allow Encroachment onto Victoria Street Address: 24 John Street, Halton Hills.	
f.	REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0044	136
	PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0044 dated May 16, 2018 regarding Recommended changes to the Planning and Sustainability development application fee structure.	
g.	REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0047	183
	PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY REPORT NO. PLS-2018-0047 dated May 16, 2018 regarding Conditional water allocation for 167-171 Mountainview Road North (8 SDE from the Georgetown residential infill pool).	
h.	REPORT NO. TPW-2018-0010	187
	TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS REPORT NO. TPW-2018- 0010 dated May 14, 2018 regarding Award of Tender T-015-18 for 22 Side Road Reconstruction, Limehouse.	
i.	REPORT NO. TPW-2018-0020	209
	TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS REPORT NO. TPW-2018- 0020 dated April 18, 2018 regarding Award of Engineering Services for the Design of Armstrong Avenue Phase 2.	
j.	REPORT NO. TPW-2018-0023	214
	TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS REPORT NO. TPW-2018- 0023 dated May 11, 2018 regarding Award of the Proposal P-014-18 for Engineering Services for Turn Lane Modifications.	
k.	MEMORANDUM NO. MEM-TPW-2018-0006	218
	TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS MEMORANDUM NO. MEM- TPW-2018-0006 dated May 15, 2018 regarding Transportation Update.	
CLOS	SED SESSION	
Com	nittee to Convene into Closed Session if necessary.	
REC	ONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION	

Motion to approve items pertaining to Closed Session.

## 7. ADJOURNMENT

5.

6.



REPORT TO:	Chair and Members of the Planning, Public Works and Transportation Committee
<b>REPORT FROM</b> :	Anne Fisher, Heritage Planner
DATE:	May 9, 2018
REPORT NO.:	PLS-2018-0030
RE:	Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study – Status Update and extension of Interim Control By-law 2017-0070.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Report No. PLS-2018-0030 dated May 9, 2018 regarding the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Interim Control By-law 2017-0070, attached as Schedule Two to this report, be extended for a further six months;

AND FURTHER THAT the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to sign the By-law attached as Schedule Two to this report, which extends the period during which Interim Control By-law 2017-0070 will be in effect by an additional six months, from November 26, 2018 to May 27, 2019;

AND FURTHER THAT the process for considering exemptions/site-specific exceptions to the Interim Control By-law as outlined in Staff Report PLS-2017-0027 be continued until the expiration or repeal of the By-law attached as Schedule Two to this report.

## BACKGROUND:

The purpose of this report is to:

- Provide an update on the progress of the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study;
- Provide a synopsis of the findings of the consultant's Background Report with respect to this study; and
- Seek approval to extend Interim Control By-law 2017-0070 for a further six months to allow sufficient time to complete the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study.

On November 27, 2017 the Town Council approved the Terms of Reference for a Mature Neighbourhood Study of the Hamlet of Glen Williams. The Study is looking at the impact that large home rebuilds are having on the mature neighbourhoods of Glen Williams. It is considering whether these forms of development are harming these neighbourhoods and whether the Zoning By-law and Official Plan should be amended to prevent such harm.

The Study is being undertaken in three phases. These are illustrated in Table 1 below.



## Table 1: Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study Phases

## Phase 1: Background Review

This phase involved a thorough background review and included:

- A Neighbourhood Walking Tour Completed March 24, 2018
- Stake Holder Interviews Completed April 2018
- Background Report (see Schedule One of this report) Completed April 2018
- Public Workshop Completed May 3, 2018

## Phase 2: Draft Zoning By-law Amendment

This phase is currently underway. It includes an analysis of the public feedback and the production of draft directions and recommendations for changes to the Zoning By-law (and potential minor associated changed to the Official Plan). This phase includes:

- A Draft Options Report **Due May 18, 2018** (not available at the time of writing this report)
- A Public Open House Scheduled for June 14, 2018

Having the Public Open House before the summer provides considerable time for the public to review and comment on the proposed options and for their input to be considered in the final report.

## Phase 3: Final Zoning By-law Amendment

This phase includes a thorough review of the public engagement to date and proposed directions and amendments to the Town's Comprehensive Zoning By-law. The municipal election period has meant that this phase of the study cannot be completed until Winter 2018/2019 when the new Council is in office. This phase of the Study will include:

- A Final Recommendations Report from the Town's consultants;
- A Statutory Public Meeting; and
- A final Council Report with recommendations for changes to the Zoning By-law and potential minor associated changes to the Official Plan.

## Interim Control By-law 2017-0070

Interim Control By-law 2017-0070 (ICBL) came into effect on November 27, 2017 and is in effect for one year, until November 26, 2018. It restricts the size/scale of large home rebuilds in the mature neighbourhoods of Glen Williams while the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study is being undertaken. It is recommended that the ICBL be extended for a further six months to May 27, 2019 as the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study will not be complete by November 2018. This six month extension will ensure that no large home rebuilds take place prior to the adoption of any changes to the comprehensive Zoning By-law that result from this study. In the event that the study is completed and Council has adopted final Zoning By-law changes prior to May 27, 2019, the ICBL could be repealed.

The Exemption Process established by Council in November 2017 would also continue to apply for the duration of the six month extension period. This allows new residential development that does not comply with the restrictions outlined in the by-law to be considered, on a case-by-case basis, to determine their compatibility with the existing neighbourhood character. Council approval would still be required to grant a sitespecific exception to the ICBL.

## COMMENTS:

Phase 1 of the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study has been completed. The key findings of this Background Review Phase (as contained in the Background Report attached as Schedule One of this report) are as follows:

• Understanding the unique history of Glen Williams is a vital element in understanding the character of the community.

- The character of a neighbourhood is defined by both broad elements such as the lot pattern, natural heritage system and street network as well as the features of individual lots such as the heights, setbacks and designs of the buildings.
- Changes in demographics and the housing market during the last fifty years have meant that people today now own more cars and want larger houses than they did before. This has led to changes to some of the Glen's older housing stock through both demolition and rebuilding new larger replacement houses and major renovations to existing houses.
- A study of the way other municipalities are seeking to control development within their mature neighbourhoods has been included. The different methods used by other municipalities have been analyzed and a summary of their advantages and disadvantages of each approach is included.
- The Background Report notes that a review of the following zoning provisions should be considered as part of this Mature Neighbourhood Study:
  - o Height
  - Massing
  - Scale and proportion to lot frontage and area;
  - o Setbacks
  - Landscaping
  - o Garages

## **RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

## 2014-2018 Strategic Action Plan:

The Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study relates to the following 'Top 8' priority of Council's 2014-2018 Strategic Action Plan:

## 3. Planning for Growth

**C.** Preserve the established character of stable neighbourhoods by focusing development in identified intensification areas, and utilizing 'best practices' in urban design for infill development.

## Town Strategic Plan:

The Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study relates to the following Strategic Directions outlined in the Town of Halton Hills Strategic Plan:

- Strategic Direction G: Achieve Sustainable Growth which "seeks to ensure that growth is managed so as to ensure a balanced, sustainable, well planned community that meets the needs of its residents and businesses" and in particular the following Strategic Objective:
  - **G.7** To ensure that the character and stability of existing residential neighbourhoods is maintained when accommodating growth.

- Strategic Direction I: Provide Responsive, Effective Municipal Government – which aims to "provide strong leadership in the effective and efficient delivery of municipal services" and in particular the following Strategic Objective:
  - **I.4** To encourage and support community participation in municipal decisionmaking.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT:

None as a consequence of this report.

## **CONSULTATION:**

The consultants and Town staff have worked closely with the Steering Committee established for this project. The Steering Committee comprises of Town Councillors and residents of Glen Williams as well as a representative of Heritage Halton Hills and a representative of the Glen Williams Community Association.

## PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:

A Neighbourhood Walk took place on March 24, 2018 and the Public Workshop took place on May 3, 2018. Both were advertised in the newspaper and on the Town's web site. The Glen Williams Community Association also drew attention to these events and advertised them on their web site. Approximately forty (40) people attended the Walking Tour and approximately thirty (30) participated in the Public Workshop. Valuable input was received at both events. This is currently being reviewed and will be carefully considered in the development of options.

Details of the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study have been included on the Town's web site and on its community engagement platform "Let's Talk Halton Hills".

### SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

The Town is committed to implementing our Community Sustainability Strategy, Imagine Haltom Hills. Doing so will lead to a higher quality of life.

The recommendation outlined in this report advances the Strategy's implementation.

This report supports the Economic Prosperity and Social Well-being pillar of Sustainability and in summary the alignment of this report with the Community Sustainability Strategy is good.

#### COMMUNICATIONS:

Community Engagement will be ongoing throughout the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study as outlined in the study Terms of Reference that were approved by Council in November 2017 (Staff Report: PLS-2017-0027).

Study updates and information are posted regularly on the Town's website and on its community engagement platform "Let's Talk Haltom Hills". Events are also communicated on the Town's monthly e-newsletter "The Current". In addition to this the Glen Williams Community Association has worked with Town Staff to publicize information and upcoming events relating to this study.

### CONCLUSION:

This report provides an update on the progress of the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study. The proposed extension of Interim Control By-law 2017-0070 for a further year would prevent any new large home development taking place on existing lots of record in Glen Williams while the study is underway.

Reviewed and Approved by,

Steve Burke, Manager of Planning Policy

John Linhardt, Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability

Brent Marshall, CAO



## GLEN WILLIAMS MATURE NEIGHBOURHOOD Study

## BACKGROUND REPORT

Date: April, 2018

Prepared for: Town of Halton Hills

Prepared by: MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC)

> **ТТ** МНВС

File #: 071351

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.0 INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 STUDY PURPOSE	5
1.2 STUDY PROCESS	6
2.0 NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER	7
2.1 HOW IS NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER DEFINED?	8
2.2 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT IN GLEN WILLIAMS	11
2.3 NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER OF GLEN WILLIAMS	14
3.0 WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM THE COMMUNITY?	17
3.1 STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS	18
3.2 WALKING TOURS AND SURVEYS	20
4.0 TRENDS, FACTORS, INFLUENCES	23
4.1 HISTORIC TRENDS	24
4.2 LOCAL BUILDING ACTIVITY	25
4.3 LOCAL REAL ESTATE TRENDS	27
5.0 PLANNING POLICY AND PROCESS	28
5.1 PLANNING POLICIES AND REGULATIONS	29
5.2 POLICY FRAMEWORK	30
5.3 BEST PRACTICE REVIEW	49
6.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	58
6.1 KEY ISSUES TO CONSIDER	59
6.2 NEXT STEPS	61

**APPENDIX A** STAKEHOLDER RESPONSE SUMMARY **APPENDIX B** WALKING TOUR HANDOUT **APPENDIX C** HERITAGE PROPERTIES

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the Town of Halton Hills has experienced an increase in the redevelopment of properties within its older, mature Neighbourhoods. Concerns have been raised by members of the community with respect to the type of replacement housing being built and the incompatibility of some homes with the character of the mature neighbourhoods. In response to this, the Town of Halton Hills has recently completed a Mature Neighbourhoods Character Study (MNCS) for the mature residential neighbourhoods of Acton and Georgetown. This study was undertaken following public concerns about the potential impact that new large houses (known as "monster homes") were having on mature neighbourhoods. This study resulted in the adoption of Official Plan and Zoning-By-law amendments in May 2017 to address neighbourhood character. The MNCS did not cover the hamlet of Glen Williams and during the study process some of the residents of Glen Williams raised similar concerns regarding the potential for large home rebuilds affecting the character and appearance of Glen Williams.

In June 2017, the Halton Hills Council approved a work plan for a similar study for the Glen Williams area to focus on the impact of new replacement housing and additions and alterations to houses in Glen Williams. The study will recommend changes to the Zoning By-law to address the construction of new large homes in relation to the character of the mature neighbourhoods of Glen Williams. Changes recommended by the study are intended to work with the existing Official Plan and Secondary Plan policies to manage future change in the mature neighbourhoods of Glen Williams.



In November 2017, Council enacted an Interim Control By-law to restrict the size/scale of large home rebuilds within defined areas of Glen Williams, while the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study is being undertaken. The Interim Control By-law will be in effect for one year.

In November 2017, the Town of Halton Hills retained MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson (MHBC) Planning Limited (MHBC) as the planning consultant team to undertake this Study, under the direction of Town staff. The goal of the study is to provide recommendations on how to manage changes in the existing neighbourhoods of Glen Williams. The study will focus on the older residential areas at the centre of the hamlet as this is where the older homes and smaller lots are concentrated. Outside of these areas are larger lots or new developed areas where large new homes are either unlikely to be developed or are unlikely to have a significant impact. Specifically, the study will examine whether the Town's Zoning By-law is effective in maintaining the character of the mature neighbourhood of Glen Williams.



Figure 1.1.1 Study Area based on the boundaries of the Interim Control Bv-law 2017-0070

## 1.1 STUDY PURPOSE

Managing growth is a key objective for the Town of Halton Hills. While there are policies that direct growth through intensification to particular areas, there is also a need for policies to manage change in the older established neighbourhoods. Protecting and enhancing the character of older established areas is important to ensure these areas retain their character and remain stable through change.

The Terms of Reference for the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study identified the following objectives:

- to define and establish boundaries for the mature neighbourhoods of Glen Williams;
- to identify and evaluate the unique qualities and characteristics of the defined mature neighbourhoods and key issues regarding large-scale residential rebuilds that are of concern to the residents of Glen Williams;
- to develop options to maintain and enhance the distinct character of the mature neighbourhoods of Glen Williams;
- to identify existing and potential threats to the heritage resources within the hamlet of Glen Williams from large-scale residential rebuilds and assess the impact this would have on the character and appearance of the hamlet; and
- to develop and propose amendments to the Town's comprehensive Zoning Bylaw, as necessary, that define and manage large scale residential rebuilds in hamlet's mature neighbourhoods.

The boundary for the study area was based on the boundaries of the Interim Control Bylaw 2017-0070 (shown in figure 1), which was enacted to restrict the size/scale of large home rebuilds within defined areas of Glen Williams during the course of this study. As noted earlier, the ICBL applies to properties within the older residential areas at the centre of the hamlet. While the ICBL identifies a study area, the broader area will be examined to consider a broader context for the study.

## **1.2 STUDY PROCESS**

The Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study has three phases. Each phase includes engagement with the community and a steering committee meeting. The Steering Committee is made up of members of Council, Staff and representatives from the community. The Steering Committee will provide input at each stage of the process.



Figure 1.2.1 Study process chart

The first phase of the study is focused on background research and initial community consultation. This background report is intended to inform the study process by providing the following:

- an identification of the historical and physical neighbourhood context within the Glen;
- input from the community and stakeholders, identifying the issues and concerns within the hamlet;
- an identification of the changes occurring within the area and an understanding of the factors influencing such change;
- a summary of the planning process and the tools that can be used to manage change; and
- preliminary options to amend the Comprehensive Zoning By-law.

# 2.0 NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER



## 2.1 HOW IS NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER DEFINED?

The character of a place is often defined to mean the collective qualities and characteristics that distinguish a particular area of neighbourhood. It is the combination of traits, features, styles and other common design elements that work together to create a feeling and presence of a distinct place or neighbourhood.

The characteristics of a place can be land related (i.e. the size of a lot and its frontage along a street), building related (i.e. built form, massing, height, building materials), neighbourhood related (i.e. connections such as sidewalks, trails, street networks) and include special features (i.e. focal points such as parks, community facilities, natural features). These features blend together to create a unique place and character.

It is also important to note that the character of a neighbourhood is perceived differently by people, and is shaped by individual values and experiences. Because these highly qualitative, experiential and subjective interpretations of neighbourhood character area are difficult to define, this study involves significant public engagement, as detailed in Section 3.0 of this report to collect a broad range of input and perspectives.













**Neighbourhood** features include elements that define the broader neighbourhood and include public areas such as the streets including the streetscape and street design, sidewalks, street lighting, street trees, natural features, and general lotting patterns (grid curvilinear, cul-de-sacs).

**Housing** or built form features are elements which define the type of buildings on the lots within the neighbourhood. These features include the architectural style of the homes, building materials, colours and textures, the massing and height of buildings, façade details and building orientation, lot coverage, rooflines, housing features including porches, driveways, garages and other features.

Lot features include elements that define the lots in a neighbourhood. These are both physical characteristics and visual characteristics which describe the look and feel of the area. Lot features include the size and frontage of the lots, the orientation of the lots and the natural features common on the lots.



Figure 2.1.1 Neighbourhood character elements

## 2.2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT IN GLEN WILLIAMS

The varied topography and natural heritage in and around the hamlet of Glen Williams are some of its most noticeable and valued characteristics. A flood plain runs through the heart of the hamlet following the line of the Credit River. The Greenbelt surrounds the hamlet apart from a small area to the south west which borders Georgetown.

Glen Williams began as a community that grew up around a number of mills that were established and thrived by utilizing the power of the Credit River as well as benefitting from the close proximity to the York (Toronto) to Guelph Road (Highway 7). The hamlet was founded in 1826 by Benajah Williams, a mill operator from Gainsborough Township. He built a sawmill to cut and dress timber from the surrounding countryside which was being cleared for agricultural usage. This was followed shortly by a gristmill, also run by water, and operated by the Williams family; and later a woollen mill.

The mills provided a focal point in the area and attracted workers and new businesses, including, general stores, furniture manufactures, a hotel, and two separate parishes. The growth and prosperity of Glen Williams continued, supported mainly by the knitting mill industry, which began in 1839 and continued until 1980.

The centre of Glen Williams still contains many buildings from the early days in the hamlet's development. These include former mill buildings, workers housing, stores and the houses of the more wealthy members of the community. Six of these properties are now designated under the provisions of Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Of these, the Williams Mill and the Georgetown Electric Generating Building, have formed the nucleus of a vital artist's community, and have added a new dimension to the community as a tourist destination. A Heritage Conservation District Plan Study for the hamlet was undertaken in 2001. Although this did not result in the designation of a Heritage Conservation District the study noted the rural character of the road network in Glen Williams and the fact that this has remained relatively unchanged in scale and character for over 150 years. It concludes that:

"Glen Williams is located in a scenic area of the Credit Valley where both geography and terrain as well as nineteenth century settlers played a major role in the original laying out and later development of the community. The village grew as an autonomous community, thriving on industrial milling enterprises from its founding in 1826 to as late as 1980. This independence allowed the village to develop a strong business and community spirit, despite the close proximity to the much larger nearby centre of Georgetown."



Figure 2.2.1 Historic photo of Glen Williams Wheelers General Store (left), Glen Woollen Mills (directly below) and aerial view of the hamlet, dates unknown, from the Esquesing Historical Society





### PRE WORLD WAR II DEVELOPMENT

The older established homes of the Glen date back to the early 1800's and 1900's before World War II. Houses built during this era were situated along Main Street, Tweedle St, Confederation St, Beaver St and Credit St with a few lots sporadically developed on Mountain St, Erin St and Alexander St. In general, these streets feature small 1 to 2 storey homes on larger sized rectangular lots. These homes are generally constructed of wood in various colours and feature gable roofs and windows with exterior shutters. Many of the original wood-sided houses in the area remain; however over time, few of the houses were constructed with brick and stone.

## POST WORLD WAR II DEVELOPMENT

Immediately following the Second World War, Canada experienced a housing shortage for its returning Veterans. Following the late 1940's, Glen Williams experienced a period of steady growth up until the 1990s, with a huge chunk of development occurring in 1989. Post 1990, development occurred at a slower pace through lot division, with the exception of subdivision developments on Bishop Court and Barraclough Boulevard.



## 2.3 NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER OF GLEN WILLIAMS

The character of Glen Williams can be described by the following neighbourhood, housing and lot features which have been taken into consideration by the Town through the development of the Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines for Glen Williams.

### **NEIGHBOURHOOD FEATURES**



## **Street Type and Pattern**

Older streets in the hamlet have street sections as narrow as 12 and 15m. Narrower streets allow for houses to have "eyes on the street", which contributes to a safe and intimate pedestrian environment. There is a strong sense of this "community supervision" in the hamlet.

## HOUSING FEATURES

## **Windows and Projecting Elements**

Location and detailing of windows are similar within the hamlet. Projections such as bay windows and balconies, chimney elements, projecting cornices and roof eaves are prominent.

### **Construction Materials**

A variety of building materials are used throughout Glen Williams. Materials found in heritage buildings include brick, stone and wood. Wood-siding houses and porches in the hamlet are painted in various bright colours which creates an attractive and lively streetscape. Materials used for garages and outbuildings are generally similar to those used for the main house





## Roofs

No single roof type or pitch is prevalent due to various ages of houses in Glen Williams. Heritage homes typically have steeply-pitched roofs with a variety of roof forms such as dormers and gables. Bungalows have shallower hip roofs.



## **Garages and Auxiliary Buildings**

Many garages in the hamlet are detached and to the rear and/or side of the lot.

### Front Entrance Architecture

Porches and stairs and contribute to streetscape character as well as foster social activity and neighbourhood feel. Terraces and balconies convey the sense of houses "looking out onto the street". Walkways from the entrance to the street provide linkage at a pedestrian scale

### LOT FEATURES

#### Setbacks

There are a variety of front yard setbacks found on the Glen streetscapes. Side yard setbacks in the hamlet vary from as low as 2m up to 35m. Rear yard setbacks in the hamlet are currently at 7.6m

#### Landscaping

Landscaped elements to delineate between properties are very common in the hamlet. Woodlots or single trees are integrated into the landscaping design. Many paths to houses in the hamlet are identified with planted features.



## Lot Configuration

The Glen has a random lot pattern with varying sizes, lot frontages and depths within each streetscape. The average lot size in the glen is 0.25 to 0.1 acres.

Figure 2.2.3 Mapping of lot sizes in Glen Williams



## 3.0 WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED FROM THE COMMUNITY

## **3.1 STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS**

In Phase 1, a series of stakeholder interviews were conducted and comments were also received through input from the community. The stakeholder interviews were held with a number of local residents, architects, designers, builders and real estate agents with knowledge and experience in the local area. The following are some of the questions asked:

- How would you describe the character of the Town's mature neighbourhoods? What, if anything, makes the mature neighbourhoods of Georgetown and/or Acton unique?
- Can you describe the changes that you are noticing in the Town's mature neighbourhoods?
- Do you have any concerns with these changes?
- In your opinion, what factors are driving these changes?
- In your opinion, what measures or tools should be implemented by the Town to protect the character of neighbourhoods?

**Appendix A** provides the detail comments gathered from the stakeholder interviews.

The responses to the interview questions varied and represent the diverse perspectives:

## Character

- 3. The character of the Glen is varied and diverse, making it a very eclectic and sought after place to live. Within the Glen, there is a variety of architectural styles, lots sizes, accessory buildings and garages.
- 4. Rural hamlet with a historically focused community. The heritage features and maturity of the neighbourhood are valuable for the community.
- 5. Large and mature trees enhance the streetscape and should be protected.
- 6. Situated along the Credit River, The Glen is comprised of unique natural environmental features, trees, wild vegetation, and a valley with hills and plateaus.

## Changes

- Some houses have maintained original characteristics and historic charm while others are being built to contemporary standards.
- 2. There is a trend to construct new larger homes in existing neighbourhoods by tearing down current homes or by subdividing larger lots. These single replacement homes are being constructed with complex designs and greater mass compared to existing surrounding development. Additions on some homes are twice the size of the existing homes and are not well integrated architecturally (roofline, windows).

## Controls

- 1. Change must respect the existing character of the neighbourhood and its elements. Regulations should better address elements that define character including setbacks, massing, height and scale in accordance with adjacent properties.
- 2. Heritage attributes need to be preserved over time. Natural heritage protection on Private and Public property should be considered.
- 3. Database of building information should be used to inform local residents of upcoming construction activities
- 4. Monster homes should be regulated and defined through changes to the Town's Zoning By-law.
- 5. Consideration should be given to the size of the lot (or the constructible envelope of a lot) and the footprint/size of the home.
- 6. Not to over-control building design as individual lots and homeowners have different needs. Random styles should be encouraged for the Town to maintain an eclectic feel.
- 7. Ability to maintain tree canopy through replacement or protection of existing trees and other landscaped open areas.
- 8. Consideration should be given to whether rebuilds should be treated differently than a building on a vacant lot.
- 9. Focus should be put on the quality of new constriction that will ultimately become historic rather than creating exceptional rules and regulations for maintaining properties that are degraded.
- 10. Restrict the massing of new builds or additions to use the existing homes footprint plus a small addition by formula, e.g.: 25%.
- 11. Minimize the impact of shadowing between neighbours.
- 12. Low impact development (LID), grading sensitivity and drainage impacts should be considered.
- 13. Restrict encroachment on the existing home's side yard and front yard setbacks and separation from neighbours to prevent homes from pushing out to the edges of the property.
- 14. Architectural design oversight should include materials used for both additions and new builds to keep in line with existing property. Planning staff should look at design of the home on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the home fits within the neighbourhood
- 15. All new planned infrastructure improvements on Public property should be of the same architectural style and maintain the rural look of the Glen.
- 16. All recent applications and decisions of the Committee of Adjustment should be reviewed in order to summarize any trends and make recommendations for improvement.
- 17. All recent Building Permit applications should be reviewed in order to summarize any trends and make recommendations for improvement.

## **3.2 WALKING TOURS**

At the outset of the project, MHBC Planning and the Town of Halton Hills carried out walking tours in Glen Williams. The purpose of these walks was to document the conditions in the Glen and develop a better understanding of the physical and historical context of these neighbourhoods.

The walking tour provided an opportunity for the project team and Town staff to discuss the study with residents and collect further information about the area. Two walking tours were carried out and residents had a chance to identify features and elements that define the neighbourhood as well as other information about recent developments and the history of the area. At the engagement stations associated with each walking tour, there was also an opportunity to provide input on features that define neighbourhood character and to identify the most important elements to be protected to maintain the character of the neighbourhood. A copy of the Walking Tour maps and handout are attached as **Appendix B**.



The following is a summary of what we heard from each of the walking tours.

1. A number of surveys were filled out by walking tour participants to collect their opinions on which features best define neighbourhood character. The following are the survey results:



NEIGHBOURHOOD FEATURES

HOUSING AND LOT FEATURES

Figure 3.2.3 Survey result of housing and lot features deemed to define neighbourhoods.



2. Residents were also asked to list the top three features they believe have the strongest impacts on neighbourhood character. The following are the survey results:

Architectural Style				
Setbacks			3	
Lot Coverage			3	
Building Height and Scale		2		
Neighbourhood/ Community		2		
Facade Details	1			
Heritage	1			

Figure 3.2.4 Survey result of features deemed to be important to the community.

# 4.0 TRENDS, FACTORS & INFLUENCES

## **4.1 HISTORICAL TRENDS**

Over the last century, the housing needs of families in North America have been evolving. As family sizes changed, the built forms of homes have adjusted to meet their needs. Since the post-war era, the sizes of homes increased while the number of family members decreased. At same time, families own a larger number of cars.



Figure 4.1.2 Average number of persons and vehicles in homes in 1969 and 2001.



## **4.2 LOCAL BUILDING ACTIVITY**

Building activity has been increasing in recent years in the Glen. Between 2000 and 2017, there were 11 instances of demolition of the existing house and replacement with a new house in the Glen, including 7 rebuilds in the study area. During 2011 to 2017 there have been 12 new single family dwellings permitted in the study area and 15 additions to existing houses in the study area. The total number of building permits in the study area is 27 (see figure 4.2.1 below).

A total of 29 minor variances have occurred in the Glen Williams area from 2015-2017. 16 of these variances have been on homes located within the study area. See figure below for details on minor variance applications.

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
New houses in study area	2	2	2	2	0	1	3	12
New houses outside study area	19	17	22	1	0	0	1	60
Additions to existing houses in study area	0	3	1	2	3	3	3	15
Additions to houses outside study area	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	6

Figure 4.2.1 Building permits granted in Glen Williams between 2011-2017



Figure 4.2.3 Minor Variance Applications from 2015-2017



## 4.3 LOCAL REAL ESTATE TRENDS

New home development in the Town of Halton Hills has been trending down in recent years. Between 2012 and 2016, there were 16,359 units of housing completions in Halton Region and 1,055 in Halton Hills. The Town of Halton Hills provides 6.5 percent of new housing completions in Halton Region (1,055 completions). Oakville and Burlington accounted for the largest share of housing completions in Halton. Halton Hills provides a smaller portion of new home construction within the Region given the limitation related to servicing and market conditions.

Information provided by local realtors suggest that those who move to the Glen are attracted to the small scale of the hamlet and the charming geographic features such as the river, hills, valleys and fields. Local relators also mentioned many families wish to escape the traditional suburb development and are attracted to the larger yard space and privacy that homes in the Glen offer. In addition, larger lots provide opportunities for custom builds and accessory structures.





Figure 4.3.2 2015 home resale data in Town of Halton Hills. Source: TREB, Community Housing Market Report Halton Region: Halton Hills, 2015

Resale Activities in 2015	# of Resales	Average Price (,000's)
Town of Halton Hills	1038	\$ 556.3
Georgetown	705	\$ 545.5
Acton	193	\$ 417.0
Glen Williams	25	\$ 726.3
Limehouse	11	\$ 632.8
Stewarttown	2	no data
Rural Halton Hills	102	\$ 844.8

# 5.0 PLANNING POLICY AND PROCESS
# **5.1 PLANNING POLICIES AND REGULATIONS**

The planning and development process is guided in Ontario by the Planning Act which sets out requirements for plans and by-laws to manage growth and change and regulate development. The graphic below illustrates the policy and regulatory framework which generally establishes the policies and controls that manage development and change in the community.

Under the Planning Act, each municipality is required to approve an Official Plan that outlines the guiding policies for managing growth and change in the community.

The Official Plan is implemented by a Zoning By-law that regulates uses and the size of development permitted in each zone. If the proposed development does not conform to the policies of the Official Plan, a site-specific Official Plan Amendment is required. If the proposal does not conform to zoning requirements, a minor variance or a site-specific amendment to the Zoning By-law is required.

Secondary Plans may be prepared to allow for more detailed area or block planning in newly developing areas or other areas where specific issues and concerns are identified.



Figure 5.1.1 Planning process and tools related to redeveloping existing lots of building and an addition to a new home.

# **5.2 POLICY FRAMEWORK**

## 5.2.1 Official Plan

The Town of Halton Hills Official Plan provides a vision for the community, which is the following:

The primary purpose of the Official Plan is to provide the basis for managing growth that will support and emphasize the Town's unique character, diversity, civic identity, rural lifestyle, natural heritage and cultural heritage and to do so in a way that has the greatest positive impact on the quality of life in Halton Hills.

[Community] is a place where residents enjoy safe family living, scenic beauty and active community life. The community recognizes the unique attributes that set it apart from other places and is passionate about preserving the small town character and rural feeling.

The Town and its citizens view its long-term future to be more self-reliant and supports managed growth that preserves the unique features of the community, uses land wisely, elevates the quality of the built environment and provides diverse economic opportunities. The aim is to provide choices for employment, housing, shopping and services.

The Town of Halton Hills recently adopted Amendment 22 to the Official Plan, which implements the final recommendations of the Mature Neighbourhoods Character Study undertaken for Georgetown and Acton. This amendment addresses policies and definitions related to new housing, replacement housing, additions, and alterations in the mature neighbourhoods of Georgetown and Acton in sections A2.3.2, D1.1, D1.4 and G13.7 of the Official Plan.

As shown in the land use policy map below, Glen Williams is designated as a Hamlet. Strategic objectives for Hamlets are outlined in the Official Plan and the Glen Williams Secondary Plan. One of the strategic objectives of the Official Plan is to permit development within the Hamlets that **maintains and enhances hamlet character and scale** in accordance with specific policies. In addition, one of the eleven goals of the Town's Official Plan aims to identify, **conserve and enhance the Town's cultural heritage resources and promote their value and benefit to the community.** 

The objectives of the Hamlet Area designation are to recognize these areas as unique and historic communities that provide a transition between the Georgetown Urban Area and the surrounding agricultural and rural landscape. In addition, the Town's intention to carefully control new residential development in the Hamlets in order to maintain the character and scale of Glen Williams and provide opportunities for small-scale commercial

and tourism related uses that are compatible with the character and scale of the Hamlet. All development within Hamlet Areas is subject to the policies included within the Glen Williams Secondary Plan discussed in Section 5.2.2

Figure 5.2.1.1 Official Plan Land Use Map for Glen Williams with study area boundary in red



The Official Plan also contains definitions relevant to the Glen Williams study area. They are as follows:

#### Character

Means the aggregate of the distinct features that work together to identify a particular area or neighbourhood. The distinct features may include the built and natural elements of an area.

#### Compatible

Means the development or redevelopment of uses which may not necessarily be the same as or similar to the existing development, but can coexist with the surrounding area without negative impact.

#### Cultural Heritage Resources

Means those things left by a people of a given geographic area, and includes:

*a*) built heritage, such as buildings, structures, monuments or remains of historical, cultural or architectural value, and including protected heritage property;

b) cultural heritage landscapes, such as rural, hamlet or urban uses of historical or scenic interest; and,

c) archaeological resources.

#### Development

Means the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of buildings and structures, requiring approval under the Planning Act, but does not include:

a) activities that create or maintain infrastructure authorized under an environmental assessment process; and,
b) works subject to the Drainage Act.

#### Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs)

Means land or water areas or a combination of both containing natural features or ecological functions of such significance as to warrant their protection.

#### Floodplain

Means the area, usually lowlands, adjoining the channel of a river, stream, or watercourse, which has been or may be covered by floodwater during a regional flood or a one-in-one hundred year flood, whichever is greater. See also Regulatory Floodplain.

#### Heritage Attributes

Means the principal features, characteristics, context and appearance that contribute to the cultural heritage significance of a protected heritage property.

#### Heritage Conservation District

Means an area defined by the Town to be of unique character to be conserved through a designation By-law pursuant to Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

#### Negative Impact

b) In respect to cultural heritage resources, means but is not limited to:

*i)* destruction of any, or part of any, heritage attributes or features;

*ii) alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;* 

iii) shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;

*iv)* isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;

v) direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features; and, vi) land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.

d) In all other respects, means a deleterious effect or result on an adjacent use, the enjoyment of a neighbouring property or on the public realm that cannot be reasonably mitigated through the use of planning controls such as setbacks, buffering, fencing, and landscaping.

#### Net Residential Hectare

Means for detached, semi-detached, duplex, street townhouses and other dwelling types with individual frontages on a public street, the area of land measured in hectares for residential dwelling units and consists of only the residential lots and blocks and local roads on which

#### Protected Heritage Property

Means designated real property and heritage conservation easement property under the Ontario Heritage Act and property that is subject to a covenant or

#### **Regulatory Floodplain**

Means the limit of the floodplain for regulatory purposes, defined by the application of the approved standards, a regional flood or a one-in-one hundred-year flood, used in a particular watershed.

#### Valley or Valleylands

Means a natural area that occurs in a landform depression that has water flowing through or standing for some period of the year and is defined by the primary top of bank. See also Major Valley/Watercourse and Minor Valley/Watercourse For this study, the Hamlet Residential Area and Hamlet Community Core Area designation is of relevance to Glen Williams. The following table provides an overview of the permitted uses in Glen Williams.

Hamlet Residential Area	Hamlet Community Core Area	
a) single detached dwellings; b) bed and breakfasts subject to conditions; c) home occupations and cottage industries subject to conditions; d) residential care facilities (Group Home Type 1) subject to conditions;	<ul> <li>a) retail and service commercial uses; b) restaurants;</li> <li>c) institutional uses;</li> <li>d) open space uses;</li> <li>e) public parking uses;</li> <li>f) single detached dwellings;</li> <li>g) bed and breakfasts subject to conditions;</li> <li>h) home occupations and cottage industries subject to conditions;</li> <li>i) residential care facilities (Group Home Type 1) subject to conditions;</li> </ul>	

It is noted that the Glen Williams has a set of Secondary Plan policies to guide its development in greater detail than the general provisions of the Official Plan, discussed in Section 5.2.2 below. The Official Plan also provides a set of Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines for Glen Williams discussed in Section 5.2.3 below.

## 5.2.2 Glen Williams Secondary Plan

The Glen Williams Secondary Plan was adopted by Council in 2008 by way of amendment to the Official Plan. The overall goal of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan is to **ensure the retention and enhancement of the natural, cultural and heritage resources of the Hamlet and to guide change so that it contributes to and does not detract from the compact character of the Haml**et, in an environmentally protective and cost effective manner.

The Secondary Plan provides eleven general objectives for the Glen Williams Hamlet. One of the eleven objectives of the Secondary Plan is to define a boundary that permits limited growth appropriate to the hamlet, preserves hamlet scale and character and protects the natural features of the area. A planned population of approximately 2,000 persons for the Hamlet has been determined based upon a limited amount of growth to the year 2021 that maintains Hamlet scale and character.

In addition, the Town seeks to preserve and build upon the unique heritage character of Glen Williams as a distinct hamlet within the Town of Halton Hills. The character of the Hamlet of Glen Williams is largely defined by the heritage buildings, which shape the built form of Glen Williams. These buildings help create an environment that is distinctive and lays the foundation for not only a cohesive community but also for tourism development initiatives. The approval process for all planning applications within the Hamlet will include the application of the Hamlet Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines discussed in Section 5.2.3 below.

The Secondary Plan also aims to **encourage architectural styles that are consistent with the hamlet character** and meet a broad range of housing needs. Policies for Hamlet Community Core Area and Hamlet Residential Area are outlined below. Policies to preserve the balance between hamlet development and the protection of environmental features and are also outlined below.

## HAMLET COMMUNITY CORE AREA

This refers to the central portion of the Hamlet along Main Street where the greatest concentration of commercial activities and heritage features are located. An objective of this area is to define and strengthen the character of the Hamlet Area through the protection of its architectural style and natural heritage. This designation serves to allow for the concentration of primary commercial and community functions within the historic core area towards the creation of a vibrant centre of activity.

Permitted uses include:

- bakery;
- bank;
- bed and breakfast establishment;
- business or professional office;
- community centre;
- home occupations & cottage industries
   retail and service commercial uses; within single detached dwellings (not including adult entertainment uses)
- ice cream parlour;

- museum;
- open space uses;
- public parking area;
- recreational use;
- restaurant (not including drive through)
- single detached dwelling

In addition, the land use policies in section H4.4.3 state that building heights cannot exceed two storeys unless required to meet the objectives of the Hamlet Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines discussed in Section 5.2.3. Since the majority of the Hamlet Community Core Area is situated within the Regulatory Floodplain of the Credit River development is subject to additional policies.

## HAMLET RESIDENTIAL AREA

The Hamlet Residential Area designation recognizes existing residential areas and lands that may be suitable for new residential development. The objective of the Hamlet Residential Area designation is to allow for gradual and limited growth over time in a manner that is consistent with the character of the Hamlet using innovative subdivision design and architectural techniques. Applications for new development within the Hamlet of Glen Williams will require lot sizes, setbacks and architectural styles subject to the Official Plan and the Hamlet Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines.

Permitted uses include:

- single detached residential uses;
- bed and breakfast establishments (consistent with the policies in the Town of Halton
  - Hills Official Plan); and
- home occupations & cottage industries within single detached dwellings (not including adult entertainment uses)

## GREENLANDS

In addition, the Town outlines permitted uses, general land use polices, and development evaluation criteria for lands designated as Core Greenlands and Supportive Greenlands. The Core Greenlands designation contains the most important natural features and areas that perform the most critical ecological functions. Any expansion or replacement of existing uses or permitted buildings within Core Greenlands or lands identified as within the limits of the Regulatory Flood, shall only be considered for approval by the Town, in consultation with the Region of Halton and Credit Valley Conservation on the basis of policies outlined in Section H4.9.2.4 and H4.9.2.5 of the Secondary Plan.

The Supportive Greenlands designation contains functions and linkages that support the ecological function of the features in the Core Greenlands designation. In general, the land use policies that apply to the Core Greenlands designation shall also apply to the Supportive Greenlands designation. However, development may be permitted in Supportive Greenlands areas where an Environmental Implementation Report is completed that illustrates how the environmental function of this area can be protected and improved through actions such stream rehabilitation efforts, reforestation and vegetative planting programs.





# 5.2.3 Hamlet of Glen Williams Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines

Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines for Glen Williams are outlined in the Appendices of the Official Plan under Section X6. They do not form part of the operative part of the Official Plan but contain additional information to assist in implementing the Official Plan.

A hamlet design analysis revealed that despite the strong impact of heritage buildings in the hamlet centre, the overall architectural character of Glen Williams is a variety of building forms and styles, representative of Glen Williams' organic pattern of growth over the last century. Some of the guidelines below describe how the heritage character of the community should be retained as it relates to:

- street type and pattern
- lot configuration
- setbacks (front, side, rear)
- houses at focal locations
- garages and auxiliary buildings
- entrance architecture

- relationship to grade
- windows and projecting elements
- roofs
- construction materials
- landscaping

## Lot configuration

Allow varying lot frontages and depths to maintain the hamlet's random lot pattern. It is recommended that no more than four consecutive lots shall have the same frontage. Beyond a maximum of four lots, allow adjacent lot frontages to vary by 50%"





## **Front Yard Setbacks**

Ensure that no front wall of a house shall be set further back than half the length of the adjacent house to maintain privacy of rear yards.

## **Corner Lot Houses at Focal Locations**

The use of wrap-around porches and corner bay windows is encouraged to link the two facades and to accentuate the corner condition. The main entrance should be located on the long frontage to avoid blank sections of walls.

## Houses at Pedestrian Trails/Links and Open Space Areas

For both corner and pedestrian link locations, consider a reduction of the current exterior side yard setback of 30ft (9.1m) to 4.5m to increase the sense of community supervision at these public space connections. A 10 metre setback will be required from valley top of bank to lot lines to allow adequate space for pedestrian trails.

## **Garages and Auxiliary Buildings**

Encourage the use of detached garages that are located at the rear of the lot by considering the exemption of the area of rear yard garages from calculations for maximum coverage, under the zoning by-law. Where garages are attached, they shall be recessed a minimum of 1.0 m from the face of the house. Avoid garages that project forward from the front wall of the house.

## **Entrance Architecture**

The design of houses should accentuate the main entrance. Attention should be given to the architectural detailing of entrances and their importance in setting the character, or "identity" of the streetscape (porches, walkways.)

## **Relationship to Grade**

The relationship of the house to grade is important in the streetscape. The main floors of houses in the hamlet tend to be at grade or close to grade. In cases of strong topography, entrance levels are related to grade through terracing. Basement garages or high service floors do not appear in the hamlet and should be avoided.



Figure 5.2.3.1 Sketch describing neighbourhood guidelines. Source Hamlet of Glen Williams Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines

## Windows and Projecting Elements

Special attention should be given to the location and detailing of windows. Projections such as bay windows and balconies, chimney elements, projecting cornices and roof eaves are encouraged to create variety along the streetscape. Bay windows may be single or double storey in height. Their proportions should be appropriate to the building from which they project.

## Roofs

A variety of roof forms appropriate to the scale and architecture of the built form is encouraged.

## **Construction Materials**

A variety of building materials is used throughout Glen Williams. To promote the character of the hamlet, the use of materials found in heritage buildings, such as brick, stone and wood is encouraged. The use of colour is encouraged for building facades and/or for architectural details to create streetscapes that are in keeping with those of the hamlet centre. Materials for garages and outbuildings should be similar to those used for the main house.

## Landscaping

The use of fences and landscaped elements, used in combination, is encouraged to delineate between properties. Many paths to houses in the hamlet are identified with planted features. Where walkways extend to the street, they should be augmented with planting both to provide an alternate means of street address and to bring natural elements to the street edge.

The above guidelines are implemented through a Design Review process that occurs in conjunction with applications for Draft Plan Approval and prior to application for building permits. The Design Review process only takes place in conjunction with subdivision applications.

The Design Review process using the Urban Design Guidelines only takes place in conjunction with a planning application (minor variance, ZBLA, LOPA...) submitted under the provisions of the *Planning Act*. Proposals that do not require a planning application (such as most proposals for single detached houses within the Study Area) only need to obtain a building permit therefore there is no provision for a design review to take place to determine compliance with the Urban Design Guidelines.

## 5.2.4 Town of Halton Hills Zoning By-law 2010-0050

While the Official Plan provides for the land use designations and policies for detached dwellings in the Hamlet Residential Areas and Hamlet Core Areas, the Town of Halton Hills Zoning By-law 2010-0050 provides regulations that control the size of lots and the type of housing development that can occur on a residential lot. The zoning regulations essentially create a building envelope within which development can occur. The zoning regulations include provisions that control the size of the actual lots (lot area and frontage), the location of a house on a lot (setbacks) and the size of a house on the lot (height, coverage).

Under the *Municipal Act*, municipalities may pass zoning bylaws to regulate the use and density of land and the use and location of buildings. Often the existing use of land or buildings will not conform to the requirements of these new zoning bylaws. Section 911 of the Municipal Act allows the existing use of land or a building to continue despite a new bylaw as a legal non-conforming use, on certain conditions.

Two zone designations apply to a majority of properties within the study boundary as shown in the map below. The majority of the area is zoned Hamlet Residential One (HR1), with a portion zoned Hamlet Community Core (HCC). Some residential properties along Bishop Court, Main Street, Wildwood Road, Confederation Street and Eighth Line are zoned as Hamlet Residential Two (HR2) but these fall outside of the study boundary.



The following are tables outlining development standards in Hamlet Residential One (HR1), Hamlet Residential Two (HR2) and Hamlet Community Core (HCC) zones.

## HR1 HAMLET RESIDENTIAL 1

Min. lot frontage	30 m
Min. lot area	0.2 ha
Min. required front yard	4.5 m
Min. required rear yard	7.5 m
Min. required interior side yard	2.25 m
Min. required exterior side yard	4.5m
Max. height	11m

## HCC HAMLET COMMUNITY CORE

Min. lot frontage	30 m
Min. lot area	0.2 ha
Min. required front yard	4.5 m
Min. required rear yard	7.5 m
Min. required interior side yard	2.25 m
Min. required exterior side yard	4.5 m
Max. height	11m

## HR2 HAMLET RESIDENTIAL 2

Min. lot frontage	30 m
Min. lot area	0.4 ha
Min. required front yard	7.5 m
Min. required rear yard	7.5 m
Min. required interior side yard	4.5 m
Min. required exterior side yard	7.5 m
Max. height	11 m

The Town's existing Comprehensive Zoning By-law also provides regulation for driveway widths, parking, garages, and accessory structures and provides for definitions.

The Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhoods Study will examine these standards as well as the potential inclusion of additional zoning regulations, such as **lot coverage and floor area ratio,** to the Town's Comprehensive Zoning By-law. The zoning by-law definitions for standards and aspects of the lot and building. The following are the definitions of terms often used in zoning controls.

## Dwelling or Dwelling Unit

Means a room or suite of rooms designed or intended for use by one or more persons living together as one housekeeping unit and containing cooking, eating, living, sleeping and sanitary facilities.

### Single detached dwellings

Means a dwelling unit in a building containing two dwelling units each of which has an independent entrance, either directly from outside or through a common external access. A wall that has a minimum height of 2.4 metres above grade and which has a minimum depth of 6.0 metres is required to separate the pair of dwelling units within the same building.

### Dwelling, Single Detached

Means a building containing only one dwelling unit.

**Dwelling Depth:** The horizontal distance between the mid-point of the front lot line and the mid-point of the rear lot line.

**Dwelling Height:** With reference to a building or structure, the vertical distance measured from the established grade of such building or structure to

- a) The highest point of the roof surface or the parapet, whichever is the greater, of a flat roof;
- b) The deckline of a mansard roof;
- c) The mean level between eaves and ridge of a gabled, hip or gambrel roof or other type of pitched roof;
- d) In case of a structure with no roof, the highest point of the said structure.

Notwithstanding the above, the height of accessory buildings and structures is the vertical distance measured from the established grade of such building or structure to its highest point.

## Lot

Means a parcel of land that is registered as a legally conveyable parcel of land in the Land Titles Registry Office.

#### Building

Means a structure occupying an area greater than 10 square metres consisting of any combination of a wall, roof and floor, or a structural system serving the function thereof, including all associated works, fixtures and service systems.

### **Building Massing**

Massing is the volumetric design the building takes. It is the three dimensional space in which the building occupies. In simplest terms it is the three dimensional form of the building.

### Lot Area

Means the total horizontal area within the lot lines of a lot.

#### Lot Frontage

Means the horizontal distance between two interior side lot lines or between an interior side and exterior side lot line or between two exterior side lot lines with such distance being measured perpendicularly to the line joining the mid-point of the front lot line with the mid-point of the rear lot line at a point on that line 6.0 metres from the front lot line.

#### Lot Coverage

Means that percentage of the lot covered by all buildings and shall not include that portion of such lot area that is occupied by a building or portion thereof that is completely below grade. Lot coverage in each Zone shall be deemed to apply only to that portion of such lot that is located within said Zone. **Setbacks:** The horizontal distance from a property line or defined physical feature such as a stable top of bank measured at right angles from such line or feature to the nearest part of any building or structure or amenity area or other component of a use that is subject to the setback on the lot.

*Side Yard Setback (exterior)*: The yard of a corner lot extending from the front yard to the rear yard between the exterior side lot line and the nearest main walls of the main building or structure on the lot. (see illustration following definition of "Yard, Rear")

**Side Yard Setback (interior):** A yard other than an exterior side yard that extends from the front yard to the rear yard between the interior side lot line and the nearest main walls of the main building or structure on the lot. (see illustration )

**Back Yard Setback**: A yard extending across the full width of the lot between the rear lot line and the nearest main walls of the main building or structure on the lot.

*Front Yard Setback*: A yard extending across the full width of the lot between the front lot line and the nearest main walls of the main building or structure on the lot. (see illustration following definition of "Yard, Rear")

Figure 5.2.4.2 Yards and Required Yards diagram in Town of Halton Hills Zoning By-law 2010-0050



#### YARDS AND REQUIRED YARDS

## 5.2.5 Zoning By-law Variances (Minor Variances)

If a builder or homeowner wishes to make additions to an existing home or rebuild a home, they are required to comply with current zoning regulations in order to obtain a building permit. There is a process set out under the Planning Act which allows for considerations of minor adjustments to existing regulations of the Zoning By-law. These adjustments are referred to as "minor variances" and are considered through a planning application to a local body known as the Committee of Adjustment.

As was highlighted in Section 4, applications in the study area have been made in order to accommodate changes through the minor variance process. The Committee of Adjustment process is a public process with public notification requirements and the decisions are subject to appeal. Applications are assessed based on prescribed tests set out under the Planning Act including a requirement that the variance maintains the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law as well as being minor in nature and desirable for the development of the area.

Recent changes to the Planning Act allow municipalities to add policies to further define "minor" and establish criteria for the evaluation of minor variance applications.

## 5.2.6 Building Code

The Building Code and the Building Code Act governs the construction, renovation, change of use, and demolition of buildings in Ontario. Differing from planning policies, the Building Code is the implementing standard to ensure public safety in newly constructed buildings. These standards are established by the Province and enforced by local municipalities through the reviewing and issuing of building permits, inspections during construction, and the issuing of demolition permits.

Building permits are issued in accordance with the Ontario Building Code. There are no required public notifications for the issuance of building or demolition permits. In fact, a municipality is required to issue a permit within a prescribed timeframe established by the Code if the permit meets the zoning regulations and all Code requirements. For example, the timeframe on a permit application for a house is 10 days. Since these standards are under the jurisdiction of the Province, changes to the building code rests with Provincial Legislation and the Town must adhere to its requirements.

## 5.2.7 Other Municipal Regulatory Controls

## **Ontario Heritage Act**

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the Town of Halton Hills maintains a register of properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest to assist municipalities in identifying and conserving heritage resources. The register is comprised of both listed and designated properties in the Town.

Listed properties are regulated such that owners must provide a municipality with at least 60 days' notice of intention to demolish, which allows a municipality to consider conservation options. Council consent is not required for any alterations to a listed property. Designated properties are those that Council has determined to be of significant cultural heritage value or interest and may fall under Parts IV (individually designated properties) or Part V (Heritage Conservation Districts) of the Ontario Heritage Act. Designated properties require heritage permits for any alteration or removal of the heritage features of the property. The map below shows listed and registered properties in the Glen. See Appendix C for a full list of listed and designated heritage properties and characteristics.



*Figure 5.2.4.1 Map of Designated and Listed Heritage properties in Glen Williams* 



## **Demolition Permits**

Demolition of existing buildings in the Town of Halton Hills requires an application process to obtain demolition permits. As a part the application process, which is governed by Town By-laws, applicants are required to describe the existing use and occupancy of the building as well as the proposed future use of the building, if any.

If the building is listed on the Town's Heritage Register, the Town has 60 days to review the heritage value of the building and consider options as recommend by the municipal heritage committee. If the property is designated on the Town's Heritage Register, the property owner must request that Council repeal the designation by-law registered on the Title of the property.

The demolition process must be coordinated with the proper authorities for safe and complete disconnection of all existing water, sanitary and storm sewer, gas, electric, telephone and other utilities. Currently, property owners who apply for a demolition permit area not required to submit an application for a building permit for a replacement dwelling. Some municipalities have a demolition control by-law which requires property owner to obtain a building permit before a demolition permit is granted. This approach ensures that the demolition of existing structures would not result in a vacant parcel.



## **Property Standards**

Halton Hills has authority under the Building Code Act to enforce building standards. Property standards are enforced through a Property Standards By-law issued under the Municipal Act and implemented by a Property Standards Committee, to protect the public health, safety and general welfare of residents. The By-law is enforced once a formal complaint is filed with the municipality. Every owner of a property is responsible under the By-law to maintain and provide clean, sanitary and safe conditions, including during the construction of homes. This provision includes the maintenance of yards free from conditions that might create a nuisance, health, fire, safety, or accident hazard. Repairs must be conducted by Good Workmanship from skilled trade, with suitable materials.



## **Credit Valley Conservation**

The Credit Valley Conservation Authority (CVC) safeguards watershed health by preventing pollution and destruction of ecologically sensitive areas such as significant natural features and areas, wetlands, shorelines, valley lands and watercourses. Under Ontario Regulation 160/06, the CVC regulates development near watercourses through floodplain mapping and required setbacks. A permit may be required if the development is within the vicinity of a watercourse, floodplain, valley slope, wetland, or hazardous lands. While a Zoning By-law may permit land uses, the CVC may restrict development and add further limitations.



## **Tree Protection**

In settlement areas, the Town of Halton Hills Infrastructure Services has a regularly scheduled program for the replacement of dead trees on Town of Halton Hills boulevards and public areas. Currently, the Town does not regulate the removal of trees located on private property. However, the removal of trees located on public property by a private property owner is regulated by the Town, and subject to certain criteria.

Some Ontario municipalities implement private tree protection by-laws, which require municipal issued permits for the removal of larger trees on private property. Municipalities may require new plantings on-site to replace larger trees. Usually, the permitting process requires applicants to provide an arborist report and municipal staff to review the applications. This permitting process can be enforced in conjunction with site plan control, heritage conservation district and minor variances.

The higher costs associated with the administration of the permitting process can be an obstacle for the implementation of private tree protection by-laws. In addition, on-site tree replacement may not be possible due to site-specific issues such as inadequate soil volume.



## Site Plan Control

Site Plan Control is regulated under the Planning Act and addresses the functioning and design of development on a site. Municipalities can designate site plan control areas in their official plan and pass a by-law to exercise Site Plan Control in such an area. In general, Site Plan Control ensures that any proposed development can function appropriately on a site. Site Plan Control generally addresses issues of access, loading, parking, site circulation, lighting, landscaping, waste disposal, grading and drainage. Site Plan Control may also exercise architectural controls and matters relating to exterior design, including without limitation the character, scale, appearance and design features of buildings, and their sustainable design (but only to the extent that it is a matter of exterior design) if an official plan and a by-law passed contain provisions relating to such matters are in effect in the municipality.

In the Town of Halton Hills, the existing Site Plan Control process is not applicable to low density residential development. The Site Plan Control process is not a process for which public notice is required and there is no right of appeal of a decision other than by an applicant.

# **5.3 BEST PRACTICE REVIEW**

Many other municipalities have explored the issue of replacement housing as it affects the character of mature neighbourhoods and have addressed this form of change through the implementation of a wide array of strategies and approaches. This section of the background report explores the experiences and approaches of nine municipalities in Ontario, which serve as best practices and learning opportunities that may inform the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhoods Study.

The table below summarizes the outcomes from municipal reviews of mature neighbourhood areas in the seven municipalities examined. Many municipalities adopted a special zone in their Zoning By-laws to apply to special areas or adjusted existing area-specific zoning standards to maintain the existing character of mature neighbourhood areas. Best practice examples were chosen to be reflective of other similar contexts as Glen Williams.

Municipalities	Special Zoning Area	Focus of Special Zoning Area Provisions	Other Provisions to Protect Mature Neighbourhoods	Advantages	Disadvantages
Ottawa	Yes Front Yards And Corner Side Yards Parking And Driveway Front Entrance Treatment		Streetscape Character Analysis Form Urban Design Guidelines	Specific to distinct areas	Complex and rigorous development application process
Cambridge	e Yes (in Height proposed ZBL) Height ZBL) Garage Projections Driveway		Urban Design Guidelines	Easy to implement Simple application process	
Oakville	Yes	Lot Coverage Maximum Residential Floor Area Height	Urban Design Guidelines Design Guidelines for Stable Residential Communities	Easy to implement	Proportional zoning standards
Toronto	No Fragmented zoning provisions mostly aligned with development history of former municipalities		Proposed Official Plan policies for stable neighbourhoods Stable neighbourhood urban design toolkit (2016) Urban Design Guidelines	Extensive regulation framework	Resource intensive Subject to LPAT approval
Burlington	Yes Lot Coverage		Neighbourhoods character studies	Specific to character	
MississaugaYes -RoadsHeritageSidewalksConservatioStreet Signagen DistrictSetbacks(HCD) PlanBuilt Formcreated forLot SizeMeadowvaleDesignHeritage attributesLandscape		Official Plan policies Heritage Permitting System Heritage By-law Property Standards By-law Site Plan Approval Zoning By-law Private Tree Protection By- law	Provides full protection Carefully manages appropriate change at the individual property level as well as on the larger community scale Alteration process is easy and not lengthy		

## 5.3.1 City of Ottawa

## Context

In 2012, City of Ottawa Council adopted the Mature Neighbourhoods By-law as well as Urban Design Guidelines to address concerns shared by many residents regarding infill developments that do not match the communities in which they were being built.

This By-law was appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), for which the Board issued an interim decision in March 2013. The core issue at hand was the nature and extent of the City's authority to regulate "character" under s. 34(1) 4. of the *Planning Act*, and whether or not the By-law was in contravention of their authority.

In May 2014, the City of Ottawa Council endorsed a revised version of the By-law, which requires an infill development applicant to perform a "Streetscape Character Analysis" in order to obtain a building permit. In a decision dated May 26 2015, the Board found that the revised By-law operationalized the Act's statutory provision on "character" and created a methodical and analytically rigorous process for determining how "character" is defined.

Following the OMB decision, staff recommended the geographic expansion of the By-law as well as additional measures regarding rear yard conditions, infill massing, relief for long and narrow semi-detached housing, reduced building height, and rooftop design. Studies for these new provisions are currently underway.

## Outcome

Section 139 of the new City of Ottawa's Zoning By-law No. 2008-250 addresses the character of low-rise residential development within the overlay boundary, in order to ensure that development reflects the established character of the existing neighbourhood. The By-law section is called Low-Rise Residential Infill Development in the Mature Neighbourhoods Overlay. It pertains to new dwellings, conversions of a residential use to another permitted dwelling type, and additions to existing residential buildings that abut a front or corner side yard.

This By-law defines character as "the recurrence or prevalence of patterns of established building setbacks, site layouts, orientation of the principal entranceway to the street, incidental use of lands, and landscapes that constitute a streetscape, based on identified and confirmed land use attributes." The By-law continues to implement quantitative zoning standards in the mature neighbourhoods overlay. For example, setbacks of new developments are required to meet the existing average of the abutting lots. Other zoning standards, such as height, are based on the existing requirements in the parent Zoning By-law.

The architectural and landscaped character along a street is controlled with the aid of a "Streetscape Character Analysis Manual". This manual uses images and graphics to illustrate the By-law's requirements. A "Streetscape Character Analysis Form" is required for development applications to demonstrate the dominant streetscape of the surrounding area.

Through the "Streetscape Character Analysis", the City defines "streetscape" as the 21 lots surrounding a property. Depending on the size of the block and where the property sits in relation to intersections, the City outlines what to do in different scenarios. The characteristics of

the surrounding lots are used to determine the "dominant" pattern of each category which includes: front yard setbacks and patterns, parking access and parking space patterns, and entranceway patterns and provisions. Each of these 4 categories has character groups based on commonly found elements.

## Analysis

The "Streetscape Character Analysis" is a complex system that is able to quantify character based on the number of occurrences in an area and allows the streetscape design to be implemented in a systematic way. In addition, this process requires applicants to demonstrate how the proposed structures will fit into the existing streetscape. The number of properties used as a reference is large enough such that the general streetscape conditions are captured.

This process requires additional time and effort for the applicant and municipal staff to process the development application. In addition, the process relies on photo documentation supplied by the applicant and extensive property mapping resources provided by City of Ottawa.

## 5.3.2 City of Cambridge

## Context

In April 2013, the City of Cambridge initiated a review of its Zoning By-law. Through open houses and other public consultation events, staff identified the objectives to modernize its Zoning By-law, to encourage compatible infill and intensification in residential areas, and to provide a range of housing types. The preliminary draft by-law was released in June 2015. The second draft of the Zoning By-law is currently in progress.

## Outcome

Staff has recommended the consolidation of 18 existing residential dwelling types into 7 types: single-detached, semi-detached, townhouse, multiple, duplex, triple, and apartment.

Staff also reduced the number of residential zones from 16 down to 6, such that there is a spectrum of residential uses with increasing density ranging from rural to urban locations. For these consolidated zones, staff has recommended that the previous zoning standards with the lowest lot frontage requirements should be carried forward.

To discourage inappropriate infill development in "Established Neighbourhoods" (EN), a zoning overlay has been applied to 8 areas where there is a need to preserve the character of existing residential neighbourhoods. These areas have zoning standards with reduced permission for height (8 metres), averaging of side and front yard setbacks for development on vacant lots, limiting of garage projections, and minimum and maximum driveway widths.

## Analysis

The various adjustments of the Cambridge Zoning By-law have not been adopted. The City has used this opportunity to modernize its Zoning By-law to implement a system of zoning that protects the existing character of established neighbourhood areas while encouraging intensification and infill. Although the zoning standards are only slightly different in Established

Neighbourhood (EN) zones compared to the City-wide residential zones, these EN zone overlays are neighbourhood area specific and allow for different aspects of each neighbourhood to be regulated by standards that are appropriate to that neighbourhood.

The new proposed zoning is a simple way to update zoning standards for specific areas to control landscape and built-form (i.e. through height and building setbacks). The implementation of the proposed zoning overlay is minimally different from the standard zoning process and is relatively easy to put in place.

## 5.3.3 Town of Oakville

## Context

The Town of Oakville's Zoning By-law 2014-14 was adopted in 2014, developed through the inZone project to implement the policies of the Livable Oakville Plan. The Livable Oakville Plan provides for an overlay for the older mature neighbourhoods in the R1 zoned areas.

To control the development activities in established neighbourhoods, in 2013, a set of urban design policies were drafted called the "Design Guidelines for Stable Residential Neighbourhoods". The guidelines include four contextual categories for assessing the compatibility of new development within an existing stable residential community. Elements of these guidelines shaped the development of the Zoning By-law.

In addition, the "-0" Suffix Zone overlay designation was introduced to replace the R0 Zone framework from the previous Zoning By-law adopted in 1990 based on a Council-approved Infill Housing Study. The "0" Suffix introduces additional regulations for larger lots.

## Outcome

The neighbourhood contexts were considered with the establishment of zoning standards, such that the setback, frontage, and coverage requirements of each zone were considerate of the areas context.

A key zoning standard in Zoning By-law 2014-14 to maintain community character was a lot coverage ratio. The intent of regulating lot coverage is to regulate dwelling unit sizes and restrict the shape of the building envelope. In general, the maximum lot coverage for low-density residential zones ranges between 30 to 35 % for RL zones. These standards are developed based on observed lot coverages in the areas.

In addition, "-0" suffix zones are in place for historical areas, which provide further standards on size, height, and setback of homes. In RL1-0 and RL2-0 zones, buildings taller than 7.0 metres are only permitted to have a 25% lot cover, below what are permitted by the parent zones.

Another key provision for "-0" suffix zones is a proportional maximum residential floor area ratio (FAR) requirement. In general, larger lots would have increasingly smaller FAR ratios to discourage excessively large homes from being developed. The zoning standard keeps the floor area to be between 200 to 300 square metres.

The size of building envelopes in stable neighbourhood areas is further controlled by maximum height and setback requirements. Averaging provisions are also in place regarding minimum front yard setbacks, which allow for smaller front setbacks based on the established norm of the neighbouring buildings.

## Analysis

In Oakville, the larger number of parent residential zones allow for a diversity of zoning standards to be applied to different neighbourhoods without special area-specific provisions or area overlays. The character of a neighbourhood is maintained by "-0" Suffix Zone. The scaling of residential floor area based on lot size, while more complex compared to other municipalities, is seen as efficient in disallowing excessively large homes relative to the neighbourhood context. The implementation of these special zoning standards allows landscape and streetscape quality to be controlled moderately.

The administration of this process is slightly different from the previous zoning process and poses minimal obstacles for municipal staff. Combined with the "Design Guidelines for Stable Residential Neighbourhoods", the zoning in Oakville can maintain control on the height and massing of homes related to the neighbourhood context. This approach however has been questioned as to whether the control of internal floor space is relative to character.

## 5.3.4 City of Toronto

## Context

Specific neighbourhoods in Toronto have experienced pressures for larger infill housing or division of lots that has caused local residents to question the fit of these developments in their neighbourhood. In general, infill housing developments may be allowed through zoning variances to implement design that deviates from zoning standards.

The City's Zoning By-law generally maintains the zoning standards of former municipalities while providing a single source for zoning provisions.

## Outcome

In 2015, the City of Toronto adopted Official Plan Amendment 320, which was a result of the City's Official Plan Five Year Review, which has updated policies on the "Neighbourhoods" designation to manage changes in residential areas. OPA 320 has been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Relevant to stable neighbourhood areas, policies on the Development Criteria in Neighbourhoods is being changed in the Official Plan. The changes are centred around the requirement to maintain "prevailing" "physical character" within a "geographic neighbourhood".

The following definitions are important to the policy changes.

A **geographic neighbourhood** will be delineated by considering the context within the Neighbourhood in proximity to the development site, including: zoning; prevailing dwelling type

and scale; lot size and configuration; street pattern; pedestrian connectivity; and natural and human-made dividing features.

The **physical character** of the geographic neighbourhood includes both the physical characteristics of the entire geographic area and the physical characteristics of the properties in the same block that also face the same street as the development site.

The **prevailing** building type and physical character of a geographic neighbourhood will be determined by the predominant form of development in that neighbourhood. Some Neighbourhoods will have more than one prevailing building type or physical character. In such cases, a prevailing building type or physical character in one geographic neighbourhood will not be considered when determining the prevailing building type or physical character in another geographic neighbourhood.

Specifically, proposed Policy 4.1.5 requires developments to respect and reinforce the existing physical character of the geographic neighbourhood, including street pattern, prevailing lot size, building height, massing, density, building type, setbacks, and driveway design.

Proposed Policy 4.1.9 requires infill developments that vary from local pattern to have appropriate heights, massing and scales compatible with adjacent properties, provide adequate privacy, sunlight and sky views through adequate separation between buildings, and provide appropriate landscaping and walkways. These policies provide the planning rationale to assess minor variances for infill housing.

Currently, the City can permit specific zoning standards for a neighbourhood area. Individual zoning standards may be allowed through this method such that a neighbourhood has a certain density, lot area, coverage, or lot frontage that differs from the general citywide zoning standards. It is noted that the City has not updated its Zoning By-law since its amalgamation of former Zoning By-laws.

In addition, the City has also taken initiative to develop a set of Neighbourhood Urban Design Guideline tools to study various stable neighbourhood areas within the City. This toolkit is being designed with the intent to allow the communities to come together to create a variety of architectural and urban design solutions. Since this process can result in a set of urban design guidelines, the process can provide flexibility to accommodate change and growth that occurs differently in various neighbourhoods.

## Analysis

The proposed policy changes in the Official Plan will provide the planning basis for future changes to zoning, and reinforce desired physical elements in the on-going assessment of development approvals in neighbourhood areas. New terms, such as "prevailing", "physical character" and "geographic neighbourhood", can be used to require new developments to be compatible with its neighbourhood context.

Currently, neighbourhood-specific Zoning By-laws in the City of Toronto are the historical result of the old zoning provisions. As a result, infill housing continues to meet the same standard as existing development, thereby maintaining neighbourhood character.

The on-going process to establish urban design guidelines for individual stable neighbourhoods will give communities the ability to guide the design of new housing and reinforce existing neighbourhood conditions. It is important to note that urban design guidelines do not have the same legislative strength as zoning by-laws but are informative for the development application process.

## 5.3.5 City of Burlington

## Context

The City of Burlington has conducted a number of neighbourhood character studies in 2015 to address community concerns regarding new infill housing. The neighbourhoods studied include Shoreacres, Indian Point, and Roseland, which are areas that face increasing infill building activities. The recommendations of these studies were endorsed by Council in early 2016.

## Outcome

Burlington's Zoning By-law 2020 has 5 low density residential zones (R1, R2, R3, R4, R5) which are relevant to mature neighbourhood areas.

The majority of the mature neighbourhood areas have the parent zone of R1 or R2, which only permits single-detached homes. Throughout the City of Burlington, a number of areas are identified on the Zoning maps as being "designated areas" for reduced lot coverage provisions.

In general, lot coverage maximum decreases based on building height that ranges between 27% and 40%. In Designated Areas, the permitted lot coverage ranges between 17% and 35%. The recommendations of the character studies and proposed draft Zoning By law Amondments include the following:

Zoning By-law Amendments include the following:

- Reduction of front yard setback from parent zone
- Revision of side-yard setback as a percentage of lot width
- Permit one driveway per property
- Adding new neighbourhood areas to "Designated Area" zones
- Require 50% landscaped open space for lots wider than 18 m.

## Analysis

The Zoning By-law in Burlington focuses on controlling the lot coverage of homes in mature areas. Maximum lot coverage varies based on building height, allowing the building envelope of infill homes and additions to be controlled. The special overlay of "Designated Area" allows for further standards related to home size. The provisions such as proportional side-yard setbacks are based on observed patterns in specific neighbourhood areas and are examples of context sensitive zoning standards.

## 5.3.6 City of Mississauga

## Context

In 1980, the City of Mississauga approved the Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Plan to address concerns raised by residents who recognized the cultural heritage value of their village and sought ways to protect it. The City initiated a collaborative heritage planning process with the Meadowvale Village community to establish a HCD. The 1980 Meadowvale Village HCD Plan had various methods to determine which properties should be subject to demolition control and conservation.

The original plan was too broad and did not meet the expectations of residents and Council in providing clarity regarding development. In 2002, the City of Mississauga initiated a process to improve and update the original set of Design Guidelines for the 1980 HCD Plan. In 2005, the Ontario Heritage Act established new requirements for heritage conservation districts. The Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Plan was updated in 2014 with conforming policies and guidelines.

## Outcome

The Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Plan was the first heritage district of its type in Ontario. The plan boundary consists of 53 residential properties, a church and a Town Hall. In order to implement the plan, the following regulatory tools are in place:

- Heritage Permitting System
- Heritage By-law
- Site Plan Approval
- Zoning By-law
- Design Guidelines
- Property Standards By-law (regulates minimum heritage property requirements and minimum standards for the maintenance of heritage attributes)
- Private Tree Protection By-law (regulates the removal and replacement of trees)

The Heritage Permitting System conserves the cultural heritage attributes of a property and the general character of the HCD by regulating alterations to public and private property within the district. The alterations are broken down into non-substantive alterations and substantive alterations. Non-substantive alterations may be considered for the 'clearance to alteration process' which requires property owners to submit a form and consult with Heritage Planning staff regarding the proposal. Substantive alterations require a Heritage Property Permit and consultation to determine if Site Plan Application is required. The Site Plan application process involves Heritage Planning Staff and the Meadowvale Village HCD Subcommittee of Heritage Advisory Committee (HAC) to determine compliance. In order to facilitate the Heritage Property Permit process, City Council adopted Heritage By-law 215-07 in 2007 which outlines the legal parameters through which a Heritage Property Permit may be issued.

Design Guidelines provide references for any proposed alterations, new development and public works projects. Design Guidelines provide clarity on standards for non-substantive and

substantive alterations as it relates to form, scale, impact to abutting properties, architectural elements, landscaping and more.

The City of Mississauga Zoning By-law was amended to include zoning regulations pertaining to minimum lot area, minimum lot frontage, maximum lot coverage, maximum gross floor area, height restrictions and other requirements which support and implement the heritage conservation objectives. The Zoning By-law also identifies specific conditions and exceptions for certain properties within the Meadowvale HCD.

## Analysis

Overall, the objectives of the Meadowvale HCD to maintain and conserve buildings and maintain a village-like atmosphere have been met. A survey conducted in the district revealed that 86% of people were satisfied or very satisfied with the protective measures. The residents who have sought alterations have claimed the process was not difficult or lengthy. In addition, the district has influenced the urban planning of the surrounding area.

# 6.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

# 6.1 KEY ISSUES TO CONSIDER

This Background Report for the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study also includes a reflection of the public consultation and stakeholder engagement to date. In addition, the research undertaken in this Background Report provides contextual and policy information to help inform the next phase of the study and the upcoming workshop.

A summary of the key findings from this phase are as follows:

- 1. Understanding the unique history of Glen Williams and how the current neighbourhood character has evolved is integral to future development.
- 2. Neighbourhood Character can be defined by several elements related to the broader neighbourhood area (lot patterns, street network), the lots themselves, and the homes on the lots. Prevalent neighbourhood features in the Glen include unique street patterns, distinct rooflines, and random lotting patterns among other features.
- 3. The stakeholder interviews and public consultation provided input on defining neighbourhood character and identifying features that are most important to the community. The interviews also assisted in identifying the key issues related to replacement housing.
- 4. Background research on trends and factors influencing change in neighbourhoods identified the historical shifts in demographics and the housing market which have led to an evolving pattern of residents seeking changes to older housing stock through both replacement housing and major renovations to accommodate changing lifestyles and needs. The majority of changes sought for development was focused on changes to setbacks and floor area of accessory structures and garages though the minor variance process.
- 5. Several municipalities have implemented changes to control development which range from prescriptive regulations and processes to those that are more flexible and implemented through general policies and guidelines.
- 6. The planning process involves polices, regulations and guidelines that can manage and control change. There are a variety of regulations and provisions that warrant further consideration through the study including specific zoning regulations and other processes that impact redevelopment. Through the initial public engagement the following zoning regulations have been highlighted as those through which potential revisions may be warranted:
  - a. Height
  - b. Massing

- c. Scale and Proportion to lot frontage and area
- d. Setbacks
- e. Landscaping f. Garages

These elements and other controls will be explored through the next phase of the study.

# 6.2 NEXT STEPS

The findings of this background report summarize information collected from the first phase of the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study. This report will inform the upcoming public workshop in May 2018.



Figure 6.2.1 Study process chart

The next steps of the Mature Neighbourhood Study will be informed by additional public feedback that will be collected from the public workshop. This information will be evaluated in Phase 2 of the study. The recommendation and options will be drafted in summer 2018 and will be presented to the public in a second public workshop and open house. The public will be invited to provide feedback on the draft options. Public consultation results will be incorporated in the final recommendation report to be presented to Town Council in early 2019.

## APPENDIX A STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW RESPONSES (QUESTIONS 1-4)

Responses	1. How would you describe the character of the Glen? What, if anything, makes the mature neighbourhood of the Glen unique?	2. Can you describe the changes that you are noticing in the Glen (building and development/demographics)?	3. Do you have any concerns with these changes?	4. Please provide any examples of new houses (or new house additions) that are of an appropriate size/style for the Glen? What makes this fit in well within the neighbourhood?
1	<ul> <li>Glen Williams is a quaint village with a historically focused community and a uniquely creative flare.</li> <li>Residents are interested in quality and willing to pay more for it. They also love the abundance of green space and the out of town feel.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Overall there has been very little development over the last 20 years and the community likes it that way.</li> <li>Any development has been very small scale and very high end.</li> <li>The demographics of the glen would be middle age to early retired seniors looking to down size in the near future but not looking to leave the neighborhood and their established families.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The glen is a great to live and raise a family.</li> <li>The development to date has been a great addition.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The demographic for the glen really drives what would be most popular.</li> <li>Sprawling bungalows and smaller story and a half's would do best or larger units with tastefully integrated in-law suites. Yet it really does depend on Site Specific conditions.</li> <li>The larger lots can sustain the larger homes.</li> </ul>
2	<ul> <li>It is a rural hamlet, where housing settlement has evolved in an eclectic manner.</li> <li>In most cases, Glen neighbourhoods have been built accepting that they exist in a unique natural environment of greenspace, trees and wild vegetation, and a valley with hills and plateaus.</li> <li>There is an understated randomness of housing styles and lot sizes (big and small) that is not found in overly planned and manicured subdivisions.</li> <li>It is the simpler "rural look" and feel of the Glen that is important to those who live here and attracts those who wish to.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>There is a trend to construct new larger homes in existing neighbourhoods by tearing down current homes or by subdividing larger lots. These single replacement homes are being constructed with complex designs and greater mass and are being inserted among simpler homes.</li> <li>Additions on some homes are twice the size of the existing homes and are not well integrated architecturally.</li> <li>Architectural changes are being made to heritage homes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Though it is understood that it is not the purview of this Study, there is a trend in current new subdivision applications in the Glen to alter and overengineer the unique natural environment, instead of accepting the vegetation and other natural features as an appropriate design constraint for a hamlet. This trend is tipping the balance of the Glen's overall "rural look" towards something more urban/suburban in character. We must avoid this trend with our rebuilds and additions or even more of our rural character will be lost.</li> <li>The architectural style, scale and overmassing, roof style and height of some new single replacement homes and existing home additions are intrusive and don't fit the character of their neighbourhoods.</li> <li>There seems to be no municipal oversight or control to the extent to which modifications are allowed to heritage properties.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>87 and 85 Wildwood Road – both are currently under renovation with fascade updates and the addition of second stories over enlarged garages. The owners have retained the existing sideyard setbacks and the houses are far enough back from the road that the front garage extensions with upper stories don't intrude on the look of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>16 Wildwood Road at the corner of Erin Street – currently under renovation with the addition of a second storey and a small addition. The owners have utilized the existing foootprint to retain the same openness to neighbours and have selected a simple architectural style that fits nicely with other styles in the adjacent neighbourhood.</li> </ul>
3	<ul> <li>The character of the Glen is varied and diverse – very eclectic. Originally it was folksy and a little rustic.</li> <li>The houses ranged from small "cottages" along the river to majestic brick houses belonging to the mill owners that could easily have been lifted from downtown Toronto.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Some buildings are being lovingly updated while retaining the original characteristics and charm. Others are being razed with new modern edifices in their places.</li> <li>New "neighbourhoods" are being built such as "Meadows in the Glen" etc . These pretentious houses are a far cry from the modest down-to-earth clapboard houses down the way. These new neighbourhoods reflect a much higher income bracket than the original areas – some with original owners with farmer/rural roots. The tonier neighbourhoods are in turn being serviced by some of the businesses in town – restaurants, gym, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Yes in that the higher income neighbourhoods homogeneous and isolated – at least geographically. I think a mixed neighbourhood – mixing professions and incomes is better for the neighbourhood and society overall though it can make it harder for a realtor.</li> <li>For many there is a proud past to the Glen that extended back generations, even though it was considered a lower income area years ago.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>I think we need to define "new". I will give specific details on this later but the one at the corner of beaver/Alexander is thoughtful. The house on Glen Crescent isn't terrible, and the new one going up on Confederation north of Main and the one on Mountain blend fairly well unlike the ones on Erin St.</li> </ul>
4	<ul> <li>Old and historic</li> <li>Knitting mill is significant to the history of the Glen</li> <li>Not all that different from other small towns</li> </ul>	There are houses being added that are taller in height which is fine as long as it suits the character of the hamlet and more specifically the neighbour – for example a 2.5 story house is fine beside a bungalow as long as long as it fits overall	<ul> <li>Resident is moving out of the Glen and is no longer affected by</li> </ul>	70

## APPENDIX A STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW RESPONSES (QUESTIONS 1-4)

	but special to community members due to historic significance	<ul> <li>Certain features such as flat line roofs are not okay and do not match the rural look of the hamlet</li> <li>Windows should be taken into consideration as well</li> </ul>		
5	<ul> <li>Environmental features</li> <li>Random housing and street patterns</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Monster houses being built within the hamlet</li> <li>People with higher income are moving in to the Glen</li> <li>Saught after place to live along the Credit River</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Concerned with big houses towering over small houses</li> <li>Other than that, the houses are generally built well with good design.</li> <li>A little more discretion should be advised when considering for certain features such as roofline and windows</li> </ul>	All houses on Mountain street look nice

## APPENDIX A STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW RESPONSES (QUESTIONS 5-8)

Responses	5. In your opinion, what factors are driving these changes (e.g. market conditions, desirability of the area, large property sizes, lifestyle etc.)?	6. In your opinion, what measures or tools should be implemented by the Town to protect the character of the Glen)?	7. What would you like to see resulting from this study? What are your expectations?	8. Do you have any other comments or concerns?
1	<ul> <li>All of the above are factors, the Glen has always been very desirable due to the large lot sizes and the lifestyle due to the distance/proximity to Georgetown.</li> <li>Market conditions in town have been exceptionally high for the last 20 years so there is a lot of disposable income.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The overall scale of the glen is a benefit to the quaint feel yet not necessarily always keeping old homes that are falling apart.</li> <li>I don't feel that a high density development would suit the Glen's character.</li> <li>Small neighborhoods with larger lot sizes should be maintained and preserved.</li> <li>Green space is also a major factor that should be preserved.</li> <li>Cutting down older not safe trees is not a problem if planting some new.</li> <li>I believe the study area should have stopped a bit sooner when heading North up Confederation Street. The larger lots don't need to be so restrictive. That area is no longer the Village.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The village culture and community to be maintained and the lush green spaces preserved yet there are some heritage properties in the Glen but not many that really are worth preserving.</li> <li>I feel it is more important to focus on the quality of new constriction that will ultimately become historic then creating exceptional rules and regulations on maintaining properties that really can't been saved.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>One concern is making the rules so tight that you will require a Minor Variance for most projects. There is also a lot of area where the CVC has many policies in place already making it more difficult to build.</li> <li>Unfortunately I do not like the wide paint brush that paints all the properties. There is such a mix of lots sizes in the Glen. If you put the same Lot coverage on all of them, some will build too big and other won't be able to build much at all.</li> </ul>
2	<ul> <li>Residents and visitors are attracted to a rural look and feel of the hamlet that has been created by the eclectic mix of lot sizes and simple housing styles.</li> <li>Developers/builders and new owners are capitalizing on this unique feel of the hamlet. They are seeking to acquire smaller or more modestly designed homes on larger lots as teardowns for the construction of larger homes that architecturally don't fit. They are changing the look and feel of the hamlet for personal gain.</li> <li>Residents with growing families who live on larger lots in the Glen are adding on to their existing houses in lieu of moving. Often more attention is paid to adding living space than to the architectural look of the final product and its impact on the existing neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Recommendations to control massing, heights, setbacks, separation, and architectural design.</li> <li>Restrict the massing of new builds or additions to use the existing home's footprint plus a small addition by formula, eg: 25%. Prevent bulking up and pushing out.</li> <li>Restrict the scale of any home, its height and roof design to something that is compatible with its neighbourhood.</li> <li>Recommendations to preserve landscaped open areas, privacy and minimize the impact of shadowing between neighbours.</li> <li>Recommendations to minimize the amount of hard surfaces on property (LID) and to be sensitive to grading and drainage impacts among neighbours.</li> <li>Restrict encroachment on the existing home's sideyard and front yard setbacks and separation from neighbours. Many homes in the Glen are placed on larger lots with more open space and larger setbacks than current Town of Halton Hills urban setbacks. Additions and new builds should not be allowed to use those THH urban standards to push out to the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The Study should emphasize recommendations designed to retain the "rural look and character" of Glen Williams.</li> <li>The Study should review all applications and decisions of the Committee of Adjustment for the last five years for Glen Williams properties and summarize any trends and make recommendations for improvement. Are their decisions helping or hindering the rural look and character of the hamlet?</li> <li>The Study should review of all Building Permit applications and scale of enforcement for the last five years for Glen Williams properties and summarize any trends and make recommendations for improvement. Are the Building Department's decisions helping or hindering the rural look and character of the hamlet?</li> <li>The Study should propose unique recommendations on massing, heights, setbacks, separation, and architectural design control, etc. for Glen Williams, and not simply repeat of the recommendations implemented for the Georgetown and Acton Mature Neighbourhoods. For the character of our</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>If we are to maintain the character of our Mature Neighbourhoods in Glen Williams, mechanisms, policies and procedures must be included for the retention of unique features on Public property (neighbourhood-related), in addition to recommendations for unique features on Private property (building-related, property-related).</li> <li>The Public look of a community is defined by its road profile - width, curbs or no curbs, ditches, width of sidewalk or no sidewalk, treed boulevard or no boulevard, etc. A change in road width, curb design, sidewalk installation by the Town or the Region can dramatically change the look of a neighbourhood. Similarly Public spaces in a neighbourhood that residents see as being open both physically and visually can be dramatically changed by the installation of fences, rails, etc. by the Region or Town. Installations like these can remove the connectivity that the neighbourhood is defined by its tree canopy, streetscape, public lands, connectivity, and openness, in addition to the look of its private homes.</li> <li>The issues of Tree Protection for Mature Neighbourhoods and Careful Re-design of Public Space in Mature Neighbourhoods must be addressed in any final Mature Neighbourhood Policy for Glen Williams.</li> </ul>
## APPENDIX A STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW RESPONSES (QUESTIONS 5-8)

		<ul> <li>edges of the property.</li> <li>Recommendations for architectural design oversight are needed. This should include design character and materials used for both additions and new builds. Additions shouldn't be foreign in look to the original house and shouldn't dwarf the original home. New builds shouldn't outmass the neighbours, push out the setbacks, and be in a style or use materials that are out of keeping with the neighbouring housing stock.</li> <li>Recommendations for tree and natural heritage protection on Private and Public property need to be included.</li> <li>Recommendations that all Town depts. retain and implement a "rural look" in any new planned infrastructure improvements on Public property in the Glen need to be included.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>rural hamlet to be retained, more prescriptive detail will be required.</li> <li>The Study should include architectural design control.</li> <li>The Study should include tree and natural heritage protection on both Private and Public property (see Ques. 8).</li> <li>The Study should include a requirement that all Town depts. retain and implement a "rural look" in any new planned infrastructure improvements on Public property in the Glen (see Ques. 8).</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>must provide recommendations that require appropriate design treatment of all redevelopment on both Private and Public property.</li> <li>I believe that the scope of the Mature Neighbourhood Character Study should include all of Glen Williams, with no neighbourhoods excluded. The eclectic nature of all of the Glen neighbourhoods forms the look and feel of our rural hamlet. A definable hamlet boundary within Halton Hills already exists and should be used as the boundary for this study.</li> <li>In any planning for Glen Williams, bylaws and policies need to articulate that the overarching design goal is to retain the "rural look and character" of the hamlet. To achieve this "rural" form and function, Town policies and design expectations must require that any changes to existing and all new construction will: <ul> <li>accept the topography as it is and work with it</li> <li>respect the wild natural heritage</li> <li>keep the land open visually and physically</li> <li>favour small versus big in any design solution</li> <li>accept and encourage a random look</li> <li>advocate low impact development (LID)</li> <li>utilize design and engineering solutions that are the least intrusive</li> <li>avoid the use of concrete, asphalt and steel as the only solutions</li> <li>resist the use of "urban looking" solutions for every challenge</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3	<ul> <li>The charm of the Glen and its small scale with charming geographic features – river, hills &amp; valley, and fields make it attractive to many. Many people want to get out of the Burbs and like the idea of no neighbours behind. Larger lots lend themselves to custom builds and people with toys ie ATVs. These aspirations are not always in keeping with the current Glen culture.</li> <li>There are many looking for smaller houses as they are downsizing. Bungalows are in big demand especially – many people with bad knees etc.</li> <li>It really is a mix of people wanting a lot, their own piece of land or their idea of it, wanting to move into a certain neighbourhood ie Bishop Court - and then those who see the Glen for what it is and want to move there. I recently had clients who bought there because they were looking for a house with a yard big enough for a skating rink (and a garage). He also had family from there. They bought the old school house. They were the perfect family for that property.</li> </ul>	Designate zones and realize things are going to happen beyond the boundaries. Enforce the bylaws.		
4	People moving in with different backgrounds	Planning and development should look at	Resident is moving away for retirement so will	70

## APPENDIX A STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW RESPONSES (QUESTIONS 5-8)

	thinking modern is the way to go	design of the home on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the home fits within the neighbourhood	not be affected by this study	
5	Older houses should be renewed to reflect lifestyle changes	<ul> <li>The character of the Glen is to allow for random housing styles therefore the houses should not be overly regulated</li> </ul>		

### Tell us what you value about the character of the Glen!

The following list includes some of the features that are often used to define the character of a neighbourhood. During the walking tour, we are interested in hearing your thoughts about these features, and others, as they relate to neighbourhood character. Please check the boxes below to indicate which features best define neighbourhood character, in your opinion.

#### **NEIGHBOURHOOD FEATURES**

- □ Street Trees
- □ Sidewalks
- □ Streetscape

- Lotting Pattern / Street Pattern
   Road Widths
- □ Other Neighbourhood Features (parks)

#### **HOUSING FEATURES**

Building Height

□ Façade Details

□ Roofline Pattern

and Textures

□ Architectural Style

Building Massing / Volume

□ Size of Homes (Floor Area)

Building Materials, Colours

- LOT FEATURES
  - - □ Trees and Landscaping
    - Style, Size and Location of Garages
    - □ Front, Side and Rear Yard Setbacks
    - □ Location and Placement of Driveways and Walkways
    - Location and Placement of Porches and Decks

Please rank <u>3 features</u> that you believe to have the strongest impact on the Glen.

1.			
2.			
3.			

Please provide any examples of new houses (or new house additions) that are of an appropriate size for the Glen. What makes this fit in well within the street?"

Do you have any additional comments or concerns?



# MATURE NEIGHBOURHOOD STUDY WALKING TOUR



MHBC Planning and Town of Halton Hills are currently undertaking a planning study regarding the potential impact of the construction of large-scale residential rebuilds (often referred to as "monster homes") on the character and appearance of the mature neighbourhoods of Glen Williams. During this Walking Tour, you are invited to provide your input to the Study Team on your views and concerns.

## NORTH GLEN WALKING TOUR

- Head north on Main St towards Forester St.
- A Head east on Forester St towards Tweedle St.
- B Head south on Tweedle St towards Mountain St. Turn right on Glen Crescent Dr.
- C Turn left on Confederaton St.
- Turn right on Mountain St towards Main St. Turn right on Main St to return back to the engagement station.

## SOUTH GLEN WALKING TOUR

- Head south on Main St towards Confederation St. Main St. becomes Wildwood Rd.
- **(P** Turn left on Erin St towards Alexander St.
- **(**F) Turn left on Alexander St towards Confederation St.
- G Turn right on Confederation St towards Karen Dr. Turn right on Karen Dr.
- Head northeast on Karen Dr towards Confederation St. Turn left on Confederation St towards Alexander St. Turn right on Alexander St towards Beaver St. Turn right on Beaver St.
- Head northwest on Beaver St towards Wildwood Rd. Turn right on Wildwood Rd to return back to the engagement station.





#### **APPENDIX C** HERITAGE PROPERTIES

#### DESIGNATED PROPERTIES

504 Main Street Williams-Holt House	Built as a cabinet and chair factory by Issac Williams, son of the Glen Williams founder Benajah Williams. Associated with the neighboring tool factory since both buildings are the same size and have identical facades. Good example of the Georgian style.
515 Main Street Williams Mill	Includes the Williams Mill - a frame former saw mill built by Williams family in 1826 and stone former hydro-electric plant building that was the first commercial power plant in the area.
519 Main Street Laidlaw House & Frazier Shop	Laidlaw House was built in 1858 by James S. Laidlaw. The Frazier Shop, built in 1847 by Thomas Frazier, is an excellent preserved example of an early Victorian commercial building. Also associated with Timothy Eaton (future founder of the T. Eaton commecial empire) who was hired to serve as a clerk and bookkeeper.
586 Main Street Beaumont Knitting Mill	Former Tweedle Saw Mill and limestone industrial building. Associated with significant early settlers and fathers of Glen Williams
1 Prince Street Glen Williams Town Hall	Built of local brick in a Colonial Cape Cod style. It has been central to the history of the Village & associated with Canadian author LMM.
6 Prince Street Alexander Homestead	It is a cultural heritage landscape comprising of three buildings encircled with numerous trees and situated on a slope of the Credit Valley along a winding road entering the village of Glen Williams. The buildings consist of the Alexander House, an old schoolhouse and a cabin (only the house and old schoolhouse are of cultural heritage significance). The Alexander House is a representative example of the Georgian style of architecture. The 1837 schoolhouse building is an early example of a schoolhouse building and a rare example of plank-on-plank construction.

#### LISTED PROPERTIES

152 Confederation Street	Good example of Neoclassical style architecture including decorated frieze, moulded soffit, decorated fascia, returned eaves, finials and drops on gables, circular vent in front gable, six-over-six windows with corbelled cornice trim below and entablature with keystone above, and double window with semicircular window above
179 Confederation Street	Representative of Vernacular style architecture, a former farm house, even course cut stone construction, two-over-two windows on second storey, four-over-four double windows on first storey, projecting center bay faced with newer stone, and decorative, wrap around porch
508 Main Street Williams Edge Tool Factory	Was used as a the "Edge Tool Factory" until 1870; Associated with the neighboring cabinet and chair factory since both buildings are the same size and have identical facades; Good example of the Georgian style.
510 Main Street Williams House	Built and occupied by Dr. Moffatt Forester who married Charles' Williams daughter Elizabeth; The Williams Family ran the cabinet and tool factories at 504 and 508 Main Street; Good example of the Georgian style of architecture.
511 Main Street Joseph Williams House	Residence was built for Joseph Williams when he was the manager of the Williams Mill; Joseph was the third generation of Williams.
514 Main Street Charles Williams House	Built for Charles Williams, patriarch of the second generation of the Williams who founded the village; Home of Joseph Beaumont, owner of the Beaumont Knitting Mills; Excellent example of a Gothic Revival style residence.
517 Main Street General Store and Post Office	Built by Charles Williams, of the Williams family that founded the village, as a general store; Served as the local general store and post office until 1972; Good example of a commercial building with excellent decorative brickwork.

524 Main Street Glen Williams Hotel	Associated with Mr. William Alexander, a local innkeeper and Thomas Jefferson Hill, the father of the first mayor of Halton Hills; The hotel provided rooms and meals for salesmen, farmers ar merchants who had business in Glen Williams.		
26 & 528 Main Street Beaumont Duplex	Associated with Joseph Beaumont, owner of Beaumont Knitting Mills who likely built the building as worker housing; Good example of Gothic Revival architecture used in row housing.		
30 Main Street ogan Cottage	Unique stone addition built on original stone cottage (rear)		
31 Main Street	Associated with James Laidlaw who built the house; Built very similar to the frame house at 532 Main Street; Early Village vernacular residence.		
32 Main Street	Associated with John Rutledge, a local butcher, who owned the building; Good example of an early Vernacular building in the Village of Glen Williams.		
533 Main Street St. John's United Church	Unique wood frame Methodist church built 1840 and bricked over in 1903; Has functioned as a church since 1840; Located in the heart of Glen Williams next to the Credit River.		
536 Main Street Fannery	Associated with Thomas Board, owner of the Dominion Glove Works as a tannery; Purchased by Joseph Beaumont in 1906 as a complement to his Beaumont Knitting Mills.		
537 & 539 Main Street St. Alban's Anglican Church	Associated with Rose Ann McMaster, a prominent local who donated land for the church; Has functioned as a church since 1902; Designed by architect F.S. Baker.		
541 Main Street	Typical example of a frame residence from the 1850s.		
543 Main Street Murray House	Owned by John Murray a local carpenter; Three generations of Murrays lived in the home. Circa 1849		
548 Main Street	Good example of an early Village vernacular residence; May have been constructed for mill employees.		
549 Main Street Isaac Cook House	Built in 1852 by Isaac Cook who sold to William Alexander who owned the Glen Hotel and later his son Thomas Alexander, the Village's blacksmith.		
552 Main Street Holdroyd House	Owned by the bookkeeper for the Sykes and Ainley Mills Harry Holdroyd; Located on a large prominent corner lot in Glen Williams.		
554 Main Street	The house is of a pattern similar to several others in the Village which provided comfortable family homes for factory workers.		
15 Mountain Street Frances Williams House	The house was built for Woolen Mills Company owner Jacob William's widow; It later served as Thompson and Wilson Ginger Beer Bottling Facility; Good example of Georgian style architecture with Gothic Revival tail.		
24 Mountain Street Mino Cottage	Good example of a 1850s cottage; Built by George Mino a local labourer.		
25 Mountain Street Barraclough House	The home was built for John Sykes the owner of Sykes and Ainley Manufacturing Company and later resided in by E.Y. Barraclough, General Manager of the Glen Woolen Mills Company; Located on an embankment overlooking the Credit River; Unusual example of Edwardian style of architecture including a unique stain glass window.		
28 Mountain Street Ainley House	The home was built for Norman Ainley, owner of the Sykes and Ainley Manufacturing Company.		
Prince Street Glen Williams Cemetery			
3 Prince Street Schenk House /	Good example of brick industrial building from the 1870s; Owned by William Tost, a local blacksmith who operated a carriage works out of a two-storey residence and owned the patent for "iron beam harrow"; The building was later used by William Schenk who operated an Orange Crush bottling business.		

Blacksmith Shop	
7 Prince Street Hawkins Shop	One of the original store buildings from the Village's core.
9 Prince Street Norton House	Owned by school teacher Theophilus Norton; Good example of a two-storey Gothic Revival home.
3 Tweedle Street David Williams House	
5 Tweedle Street Woollen Mills Housing	Glen Woollen Mills Company had storage sheds located on the site until the early 20th century; 5, 7 and 9 Tweedle Street were built as worker housing for the mill employees; Used from 1964- 1981 as housing for Sheridan Nurseries.
7 Tweedle Street Woollen Mills Housing	Glen Woollen Mills Company had storage sheds located on the site until the early 20th century; 5, 7 and 9 Tweedle Street were built as worker housing for mill employees.
9 Tweedle Street Woollen Mills Housing	Glen Woollen Mills Company had storage sheds located on the site until the early 20th century; 5, 7 and 9 Tweedle Street were built as worker housing for the mill employees.
11 Tweedle Street Rutledge Cottage	Owned by one of the first property owners in Glen Williams, John Rutledge, who was also a butcher.
14 Tweedle Street	Excellent example of the Gothic Revival style; Built by Sykes and Ainsley Woollen Mills as a worker's home.
22 Tweedle Street Mino House	Good example of the Gothic Revival style; Built by George Mino a local labourer.
15 Prince Street School House	Served as a two-room school house for 75 years; Land donated by mill owner Charles Williams.

Schedule Two to Report PLS-2018-0030



#### BY-LAW NO. 2018-

A By-law to extend the period of time during which Interim Control By-law 2017-0070 will be in effect by an additional year to November 25, 2019.

**WHEREAS** on November 27, 2017, Council for the Town of Halton Hills enacted Interim Control By-law 2017-0070 to control the erection of, or additions resulting in, any large scale single-detached dwellings within defined areas of the Hamlet of Glen Williams for a period of one year.

**AND WHEREAS** Section 38(2) of the Planning Act provides Council with the discretion to extend the period of time during which Interim Control By-law 2017-0070 will be in effect, provided the total period of time does not exceed two years from the date of the passing of Interim Control By-law 2017-0070.

**AND WHEREAS** the Glen Williams Mature Neighbourhood Study is progressing well but cannot be completed before the Municipal Elections in October 2018; and as such additional time is required to permit the completion of all phases of the Study and approval of final Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments, while ensuring adequate time for public consultation.

**AND WHEREAS** on June 11, 2018, Council for the Town of Halton Hills approved Report No. PLS-2018-0030 dated May 9, 2018, in which certain recommendations were made relating to the mature neighbourhoods of Glen Williams.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF HALTON HILLS ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Interim Control By-law 2017-0070, as amended, is hereby further amended by repealing Section 5A and replacing it with the following:
  - "5A. This By-law shall come into force and take effect immediately upon the passage thereof, and shall be in effect until November 25, 2019, unless repealed by Council at an earlier date."

**BY-LAW** read and passed by the Council for the Town of Halton Hills this day of , 2018.

MAYOR – RICK BONNETTE



## REPORT

REPORT TO:	Chair and Members of Planning, Public Works & Transportation Committee
REPORT FROM:	Romaine Scott, Legal Coordinator Planning & Sustainability
DATE:	April 30, 2018
<b>REPORT NO.:</b>	PLS-2018-0035
RE:	Dedication of Reserve Block 26, Plan 20M-1029 Location: 14329 Highway 25 at Davidson Drive, Halton Hills

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Report No. PLS-2018-0035 dated April 30, 2018 regarding a by-law to dedicate 0.3 m (1 ft) reserve as part of the public highway system be received.

AND FURTHER THAT staff be authorized to bring forward a by-law to dedicate the 0.3m (1 ft) Reserve Block 26, Plan 20M-1029 as part of the public highway system to allow legal access from Davidson Drive onto the property at 14329 Highway 25 (the "Property").

#### **BACKGROUND:**

Reserve Block 26, Plan 20M-1029 was acquired by the Town in 2008 during the development of the Halton Green Estates Subdivision. The purpose of the Reserve was to control access from the then undeveloped Property onto Davidson Drive, which was at the time, being constructed as part of Subdivision Plan 20M-1029.

The Transportation & Public Works Department has recently received applications from the Owner of the Property for an Entrance Permit and a Site Alteration Permit to construct a driveway access from Davidson Drive onto the Property, between 9 and 11 Davidson Drive. Staff understands that the Owner is preparing the Property for the development of a single family home as permitted under the Town's Zoning By-law.

The location of the Reserve is illustrated on the map attached to this Report as Appendix "1".

#### COMMENTS:

The Owner has provided the information and drawings required for the approval and issuance of the requisite permits for the construction of the proposed entrance and driveway. Staff noted that the entire 20m width of the Property, between 9 and 11 Davidson Drive has several existing trees in the area of the proposed driveway. The proposed driveway will be constructed to a maximum of 6m wide between the trees, leaving a treed buffer on both sides of the driveway and the adjacent properties. Transportation & Public Works staff have reviewed the permit applications and are satisfied that all efforts will be made to minimize the removal of the existing trees on the private Property and therefore has no concerns with the proposal.

The drawing showing the proposed driveway and tree removal is attached to this Report as Appendix "2".

The Transportation & Public Works Department concurs that it is in order to dedicate the Reserve as shown on Appendix "1" as part of the public highway system which will effectively permit legal access from Davidson Drive onto the Property.

#### **RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This is a procedural issue. The proposed Reserve dedication has no relationship to the Town's Strategic Plan.

#### FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no financial impact with respect to this Report.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

There has been consultation between the Owner and with the Transportation & Public Works Department.

#### **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:**

No public engagement is required for this Report.

#### SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

There is no sustainability implication with respect to this Report.

#### **COMMUNICATIONS:**

The Owner of the Property will be required to notify the adjacent owners at 9 and 11 Davidson Drive prior to the issuance of the permits herein.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Reserve Block 26, Plan 20M-1029 is no longer required as the development of the subdivision has been completed for some time. It is now expedient that the Town lifts the Reserve to provide legal access from Davidson Drive onto the Property, and to further facilitate the development of the single family home as contemplated by the owner. Therefore, staff recommend that the appropriate by-law be enacted to effectively lift the reserve and provide legal access as set out in this Report.

Reviewed and Approved by,

John Linhardt, Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability

renthanska

Brent Marshall, CAO

## **APPENDIX "1"**







## REPORT

- **REPORT TO:** Chair and Members of the Planning, Public Works and Transportation Committee
- **REPORT FROM:** Anne Fisher, Heritage Planner
- **DATE:** April 27, 2018
- **REPORT NO.:** PLS-2018-0036
- RE: Intent to Designate the Glen Williams Schoolhouse at 15 Prince Street, Glen Williams

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Report No. PLS-2018-0036 dated April 27, 2018 and titled "Intent to Designate the Glen Williams Schoolhouse at 15 Prince Street Glen Williams under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act", be received;

AND FURTHER THAT Council indicate its intention to designate the property at 15 Prince Street, Glen Williams (Plan 56 Part lot 68; RP 20R11535 Part 5, Glen Williams, Town of Halton Hills, Regional Municipality of Halton); and known as the Glen Williams Schoolhouse, under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND FURTHER THAT Clerks staff proceed with serving a notice of intention to designate, as mandated by Section 29(3) of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND FURTHER THAT once the 30-day objection period has expired, and if there are no objections, a designation by-law for the Glen Williams Schoolhouse be brought forward to Council for adoption.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The owners of the property at 15 Prince Street, Glen Williams have requested that this property be designated under the provisions of Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. This property is situated on the south side of Prince Street at the eastern side of its intersection with Princess Lane (see Location Plan in Schedule One to this report). It contains the old Glen Williams Schoolhouse (SS# 11) that was built in 1873 and is now used as a house. The property is a landscape of heritage resources comprised of the old schoolhouse building, encircled with numerous trees. It is surrounded by properties containing single detached houses set in mature landscaped grounds.

Glen Williams Schoolhouse is the third school building to have been built in the village of Glen Williams and it is the first to be constructed in brick. It was used for school purposes from 1873 until 1949 before being converted into a house. This property meets the requirements for heritage designation as set out in the *Ontario Regulation 9/06* in that it:

- Has design and physical value as a rare and early example of the conversion of a large brick schoolhouse into a two-storey house;
- Has historic and associative value as one of two nineteenth century old schoolhouses that remain in the village of Glen Williams; and
- Has contextual value as being physically, functionally, visually and historically linked to the development of the village of Glen Williams and as it is associated with the theme of the school system created by the early residents of this part of Halton Hills. It also is a heritage resource that helps to define, maintain and support the character of Glen Williams.

Heritage Halton Hills prepared a Designation Report (attached as Schedule 2 of this report) which was considered at their meeting on February 21, 2018. At this meeting Heritage Halton Hills passed a resolution supporting the owners' request for designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act.* 

Staff consider the Glen Williams Schoolhouse to be a cultural heritage resource that complies with the provisions of *Ontario Regulation 9/06*. As such it is recommended that this property be designated under the provisions of Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

#### COMMENTS:

The, Glen Williams Schoolhouse (SS#11) is the third school building to have been built in the village of Glen Williams and was the first to be constructed in brick. It was originally a large single storey 5-bay brick schoolhouse with chimneys at both ends and a projecting central gabled entrance porch. A prominent cupola that contained the school bell existed on the front of the roof situated just behind the projecting front gable. The schoolhouse displayed characteristics of the Gothic Revival style of architecture.

In 1949 the eastern end of the school collapsed during a building project to expand the school building. As a consequence a new school was built elsewhere in the village and the old brick schoolhouse was renovated and converted into a house. The renovations included adding a new internal floor to make the building two storeys in height with a loft above. The long windows were removed to allow for the insertion of new upper floor and lower floor windows. The original stone window sills were reused and the original buff coloured brick voussoirs were reused to create voussoirs for the new house. Most of the Gothic inspired features of the original schoolhouse were removed when the building was converted into residential use; however the location and shape of the original window and door openings can still be seen in the brickwork facades. In addition many of the bricks retain scratch marks that form graffiti made by the pupils. These features

reflect the evolution of the building since its construction in 1873 and reflect its identity and heritage value as a former schoolhouse building. The Glen Williams Schoolhouse (SS#11) is of design and physical value as a rare and early example the conversion of a large brick schoolhouse into a two storey house.

The old brick Glen Williams Schoolhouse has historical or associative value as one of two nineteenth century old school houses that remain in the village.

The property is physically, functionally, visually and historically linked to the development of the village of Glen Williams and the school house is associated with the theme of the school system created by the early residents to this part of Halton Hills. This landscape of heritage resources helps to define, maintain and support the character of the Glen Williams.

Key attributes of the Old Brick Glen Williams SS#11 that reflect its design and physical value to the village of Glen Williams and the wider community of Halton Hills include its:

- Rectangular form with projecting two-storey front gable wing containing the front entrance and a single storey rear wing.
- Pitched roof;
- Three-bay front façade;
- Red brick laid in stretcher bond on the front, rear and side gable end walls on both sides of the house and laid in common bond on single-storey rear projecting wing.
- A water table comprising two projecting brick courses above the foundations of the original school building (not on the truncated eastern end or the rear single storey projecting wing);
- Buff coloured bricks providing decorative "quoin" features at the corners of the original school building (not the truncated eastern end);
- Buff coloured brick voussoirs above the windows and entrance door on the front and western gable end wall of the original school building;
- Red brick voussoirs above the windows and doors on the rear wall
- Scratched letters and marks from schoolchildren in many original exterior bricks
- Line of original window and door openings present in brickwork;
- Fieldstone foundation on exterior

- Lug stone window sills with tooled edges on original school building. [Lug sills are not present on the truncated eastern end or the rear projecting single storey wing (including the small square window above the projecting rear wing)];
- Brick chimney with corbelled brick detailing and a buff brick base on western end of roof.

It is noted that the front chimney, the existing windows and doors and the detached garage are not of heritage significance.

If Council decides to proceed with designation, a notice of intention to designate will be served on the property owner, Ontario Heritage Trust, and published in the local newspaper. Any person may object to the notice of intention to designate within 30 days of its publication. If there are no objections within the 30-day period, the designation bylaw for the Glen Williams Schoolhouse will be brought forward to Council for approval. If, however there are objections, they will be referred to the Conservation Review Board for a hearing. Subsequently, Council will receive a recommendation report from the Conservation Review Board for consideration, prior to making a final decision regarding designation of the property.

#### **RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This report directly relates to the implementation of Strategic Direction D: Preserve, Protect, and Promote Our Distinctive History, the Goal to preserve the historical urban and rural character of Halton Hills through the conservation and promotion of our built heritage, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources, and the following Strategic Objectives:

- D.2 To encourage the preservation and enhancement of the historical character of the Town's distinctive neighbourhoods, districts, hamlets and rural settlement areas; and,
- D.4 To use the conservation of built heritage and cultural heritage landscape resources to enhance the character and vitality of neighbourhoods, and to provide opportunities for economic development and tourism.

#### FINANCIAL IMPACT:

If designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the property will be eligible for the Town's Heritage Property Tax Refund Program.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

Consultation between Heritage Halton Hills, Town staff, and the current property owners of the Glen Williams Schoolhouse led to the preparation of this report.

#### **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:**

The property owners and Heritage Halton Hills were engaged in the process leading to the preparation of this report.

#### SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

The Town is committed to implementing our Community Sustainability Strategy, Imagine Halton Hills. Doing so will lead to a higher quality of life.

The recommendation outlined in this report advances the Strategy's implementation.

This report supports the Cultural Vibrancy pillar of Sustainability and in summary the alignment of this report with the Community Sustainability Strategy is good.

#### **COMMUNICATIONS:**

If Council decides to proceed with designation a notice of intention to designate will be served on the on the property owner, Ontario Heritage Trust, and published in the local newspaper. Further, if Council proceeds with passing a designation by-law for the Glen Williams Schoolhouse upon lapse of the 30-day objection period, a notice of designation will be served on the property owner, the Ontario Heritage Trust, and published in the local newspaper.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

It is recommended that Council indicate its intent to designate the Glen Williams Schoolhouse under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Reviewed and Approved by,

Steve Burke, Manager of Planning Policy

John Linhardt, Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability

Drenthanka

Brent Marshall, CAO



15 Prince Street, Glen Williams

HALTON HILLS

# Glen Williams Schoolhouse





ARCHITECTURAL CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## Heritage Halton Hills Designation Report 2018

By John Mark Rowe & Anne Fisher

## Location

The Glen Williams Schoolhouse is located at 15 Prince Street, Glen Williams, Halton Hills, village lot #69, being part of Lot 21, Concession 10, Esquesing township. It is found at GIS co-ordinates 43.671161 North and -79.923093 East. It is registered as Halton Hills Assessment Roll #2415070.003.62500.0000.

## **Historical Background**

The son of a Loyalist family, John Butler Muirhead (1800-1824) received a location ticket for Lot 21, Concession 10 Esquesing in 1818. John Butler Muirhead completed his settlement duties on his 200 acres on 13 June 1823. On 25 September 1824, the Crown patent was issued to Muirhead. John Butler Muirhead died suddenly on 29 November 1824 and was buried at St. Mark's Church, Niagara.

Niagara woollen miller Benajah Williams sold his property to move to this lot. Whether Benajah had a deal with the young Muirhead or it was happenstance, he purchased Lot 21, Concession 10, Esquesing Township from the heirs of John Butler Muirhead on 9 November 1825. Sixty-year old Benajah reportedly had the saw mill up and running that same year, which suggests an understanding with the Muirhead heirs.

The village of Glen Williams is believed to have established a school in 1830. The early schools were usually in the



The 1837 schoolhouse at 6 Prince Street.

home of one of the families involved. As the number of scholars rose (a fee was payable) the need for a separate building arose. A small frame and plaster building, which still stands east of 6 Prince Street, is believed to have been built as the school house in 1837. In 1840 John Colling was the school teacher.

In 1842, Esquesing Township divided the Township into 15 school sections (SS#16 and #17 were added later). Glen Williams became the centre for Section 11. James Stirrat was engaged in 1848 to keep a regular school for 11 months, as was now required by law.



Engraving of 1852 frame schoolhouse.

A new frame school was built in 1852 at the bottom of Prince Street. Lachlan McDonald was the teacher that year.

A growing population prompted Trustees to call a special meeting on 18 January 1873, where they were empowered to borrow up to \$3200 to build a new brick school.

On 26 February 1873, Charles Williams sold the Trustees of School Section #11 land half-way up Prince Street, on which they erected a two-room, brick school house. William Ewart was the school teacher. Theophilus Norton served as the senior teacher from 1876 until 1900. He was consistently paid \$500 per annum. Mr. Norton built his home across from the school at 9 Prince Street.



Students return chairs to the schoolhouse after an event. -EHS00964

The school grounds were often used for garden parties to raise funds for the war efforts, while the stage at the Town Hall provided a venue for Christmas performances.

The school may not have had a bell originally, since a fine

bell was ordered by school Trustees in 1909 from Meneely & Co. bell foundry in West Troy, New York.

It was cast with the raised letter inscription "Installed June 1909 on behalf of the pupils and teachers. Trustees: H. Holdroyd, G. Beaumont, D. Reid. Geo. Fittall, Principal." The bell is currently mounted on a cairn in front of the present school at 512 Main Street. It was dedicated in June 1967 as a Centennial project by the people of the village.

The school registers reveal some interesting tidbits of history. The 1909 register lists 80 students enrolled in the two-room school. The teacher was sick for two weeks from November 29<sup>th</sup>. By that time scarlet fever had been confirmed in the village. For the remaining two weeks before Christmas only 12 students showed up.



Glen School bell, cast in 1909 and engraving of 1852 schoolhouse mounted on a cairn at 512 Main Street, dedicated in 1967.

The following year the school closed on the day of King Edward VIII's funeral and again for Coronation Day in 1911. Teacher Mabel Erma Norton was paid \$450 for 1913 for teaching 90 students, while Margaret Currie had 60 senior students! In 1926, two Mildred Norton's enrolled.

Rising salaries after the Great War worried Trustees, resulting in their refusal of an increase for Miss Currie to \$1300 in 1923, who resigned. She was replaced by Miss Edna Neil of Renfrew. By 1932 Miss Neil made \$1150, but the Depression resulted in a reduction of pay. Miss Neil became Mrs. William Beaumont in 1941 and she continued to teach at the Glen School until June 1958, retiring after 36 years.



Glen Williams Public School, S.S. #11, Junior Department with teacher Margaret Leslie. 11 June 1924 -EHS13138

The Glen Williams School Board joined the Esquesing School Board about 1949, ending the use of section numbers. The growing number of children in the village prompted Trustees to authorize the construction of a third classroom addition. Construction began in the spring of 1949. On Monday 11 July, while two workmen were on the site of the excavation, the senior room wall collapsed into a pile of rubble. A hastily convened Board meeting was called, and it was decided to build a new school building.

Consequently, a new school was built in 1950 at 512 Main Street, where the school operates today. The original school property at Lot 69 was sold on 23 October 1951 to Herbert and Catherine Hancock for \$1600. The original school structure was modified into a private residence.



Glen Public School (SS#11) class picture taken outside the school house on Prince Street about 1908. George Fittall is the teacher in the bowler

6

## **Site Analysis**

SS#11, Glen Williams is the third school building to have been built in the village and was the first to be constructed in brick. It was originally a large single storey 5-bay brick schoolhouse with chimneys at either end and a projecting central gabled entrance porch. A prominent cupola that contained the school bell existed on the front of the roof situated just behind the projecting front gable.



The schoolhouse displayed characteristics of the Gothic Revival style of architecture.

The red brick was laid is a stretcher bond pattern on the front, rear and side gable end walls on both side of the house and laid in common bond on the single-storey rear projecting wing.

Buff coloured bricks providing



decorative "quoin" features are found at the corners of the original school building.



A water table comprising two projecting brick courses above the foundations is found on the original school building, except for the truncated eastern end and the rear single storey projecting wing. The foundation is comprised of fieldstone on the exterior.

Buff coloured brick voussoirs sit above the windows and entrance door on the front and western gable end wall of the original school building, while red brick voussoirs support





the window and door openings on the rear wall.

The original stone window sills were reused and the



original buff coloured brick voussoirs were reused to create voussoirs for the new house.

The renovations included adding a new internal floor to make the building two storeys in height with a loft above. The long windows were removed to allow for the insertion of new upper floor and lower floor windows. However, the line of the original window and door openings are easily discernible in the brickwork.



The front chimney and existing doors and windows are not of heritage significance.



Scratched letters and marks from schoolchildren can be found in many original exterior bricks.



## SCHEDULE OF DETERMINING CRITERIA

## **Description of Property**

The old brick Glen Williams SS#11 is located at 15 Prince Street, Glen Williams. It was the first brick schoolhouse to be built in the village of Glen Williams and was used for school purposes from 1873 until 1949 before being converted to use as a house. It is a cultural heritage landscape comprising of an old schoolhouse encircled with numerous trees and situated on the south east side of Prince Street to the east of the village centre.

## Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The Glen Williams Schoolhouse meets the requirements of Ontario Regulation 9/06 by meeting several criteria that determine its cultural heritage value or interest.

The old brick Glen Williams SS#11 building is of design and physical value as a rare and early example the conversion of a large brick schoolhouse into a two-storey house.

The old brick Glen Williams SS#11 has historical or associative value as one of two nineteenth century old school houses that remain in the village.

This property is physically, functionally, visually and historically linked to the development of the village of Glen Williams and the school house is associated with the theme of the school system created by the early residents to this part of Halton Hills. This heritage landscape helps to define, maintain and support the character of the Glen Williams.

## **Description of Heritage Attributes**

- a) Rectangular form with projecting two-storey front gable wing containing the front entrance and a single storey rear wing.
- b) Pitched roof;
- c) Three-bay front façade;
- d) Red brick laid in stretcher bond on the front, rear and side gable end walls on both sides of the house and laid in common bond on single-storey rear projecting wing.

- e) A water table comprising two projecting brick courses above the foundations of the original school building (not on the truncated eastern end or the rear single storey projecting wing);
- f) Buff coloured bricks providing decorative "quoin" features at the corners of the original school building (not the truncated eastern end);
- g) Buff coloured brick voussoirs above the windows and entrance door on the front and western gable end wall of the original school building;
- h) Red brick voussoirs above the windows and doors on the rear wall;
- i) Scratched letters and marks from schoolchildren in many original exterior bricks;
- j) Line of original window and door openings present in brickwork;
- k) Fieldstone foundation on exterior;
- Lug stone window sills with tooled edges on original school building. [Lug sills are not present on the truncated eastern end or the rear projecting single storey wing (including the small square window above the projecting rear wing)];
- m)Brick chimney with corbelled brick detailing and a buff brick base on western end of roof.

## Documentation

Annual Report of the Local Superintendent of Common Schools for *Esquesing*, Department of Education, Ontario Archives. Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Halton, J.H. Pope, Toronto:1877. The Georgetown Herald The Acton Free Press Halton Land records for Lot 21, Concession 10, Esquesing Township Halton Land Records for Glen Williams Village Lot 69 **Esquesing Historical Society Archives** Glen Williams Cemetery Transcription, Ann Sampson, Dale Ward et. al., Ontario Genealogical Society, Halton-Peel Branch, 1990. Photographs of 15 Prince Street by J. M. Rowe, 8 January 2011; 5 January 2016; 20 May 2017; 17 August 2017. School Registers of Glen Williams Public School 1902-1933, John Mark Rowe, ed., Esquesing Historical Society, Georgetown: 1996 Trustee Meeting Minutes of Glen Williams Public School 1873-1893, John Mark Rowe, ed., Esquesing Historical Society, Georgetown: 1994

## **CURRENT OWNERS**

Dan and Allison Roffel

## RECOMMENDATION

It is the recommendation of Heritage Halton Hills to designate The Glen Williams Schoolhouse under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.



## REPORT

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	Chair and Members of the Planning, Public Works and
	Transportation Committee

**REPORT FROM:** John McMulkin, Planner – Development Review

**DATE:** May 17, 2018

**REPORT NO.:** PLS-2018-0039

RE: Proposed CTC Source Protection Plan Policy Amendments under Section 34 of the Clean Water Act, 2006

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Report No. PLS-2018-0039 dated May 17, 2018, with respect to the "Proposed CTC Source Protection Plan Policy Amendments under Section 34 of the Clean Water Act, 2006", be received;

AND FURTHER THAT Council endorse the proposed policy amendments (Transition, T-8, GEN-1, SWG-3, SAL-10, SAL-11, SAL-12, SAL-13, SNO-1 and REC-1) including explanatory text, to the Source Protection Plan (SPP) under Section 34 of the Clean Water Act, 2006, for the Credit Valley, Toronto and Region, and Central Lake Ontario (CTC) Source Protection Region (SPR), as outlined in Schedule 1 to this report;

AND FURTHER THAT the Resolution of Council, as well as a copy of this report, be forwarded to the Chair of the CTC Source Protection Committee (SPC), Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, Region of Halton, Credit Valley Conservation, City of Burlington, and the Towns of Oakville and Milton.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

As outlined in the previous staff report (PI-2015-0056) regarding the status of the implementation of the policies of the CTC Source Protection Plan (SPP), the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change approved the CTC SPP in July of 2015. The main objective of the SPP is to protect the quality and quantity of Halton Region's municipal water supplies (i.e. municipal wells). The SPP came into effect on December 31, 2015, and is now in its third year of implementation. The Town of Halton Hills was involved in the preparation of the CTC SPP throughout its development from 2011 to 2014.

The majority of policies in the CTC SPP impose obligations on municipalities, Source Protection Authorities (SPAs), and local boards to ensure that the municipal drinking water supplies are protected. The three SPAs located within the CTC Source Protection Region (SPR) are Credit Valley, Toronto and Region, and Central Lake Ontario (see Schedule 2); the Town of Halton Hills is partially located within the Credit Valley SPA, whose Assessment Report applies to the Town.

The Town of Halton Hills has a mandatory duty to implement several SPP policies, especially with regard to land use planning. The Town's Official Plan will be updated to include any relevant land use SPP policies once the Region of Halton Official Plan Review has been completed.

Through ongoing implementation of the CTC SPP policies, staff from the implementing agencies, including the Town of Halton Hills, has identified policies where amendments are warranted to improve overall implementation. The Clean Water Act, 2006 enables SPPs to be amended, so through collaboration and consultation with staff, policies have been identified where improvements could be made to facilitate implementation within the Town of Halton Hills and throughout the CTC SPR.

#### Amendments to the CTC SPP

The Clean Water Act, 2006 enables the SPA to make amendments under Section 34, Section 36 and Section 51. Section 34 provides an option for the SPA to make amendments that cannot wait until an update resulting from a comprehensive review under Section 36 and do not qualify as minor administrative amendments under Section 51. Amendments that are appropriate to make under Section 34 include those necessary to ensure new or expanded municipal sources of drinking water are protected, implement important information not available at the time the SPP was first approved, and address other critical implementation issues.

The CTC SPP policies subject to the proposed Section 34 amendments are contained within Schedule 1 to this report. The main objectives of the proposed amendments are to provide clarity of policy intent, address gaps in the policies and provide reasonable flexibility in policy implementation. The Clean Water Act, 2006 requires that SPAs through pre-consultation obtain a municipal Council Resolution from each municipality impacted by the amendments prior to conducting public consultation.

The Town of Halton Hills is impacted because it is located within the geographic area related to the amendments and is responsible for taking actions for implementing SPP policies related to the amendments. As such, the purpose of this report is to obtain a Resolution of Council endorsing the proposed Section 34 amendments to the CTC SPP.

#### COMMENTS:

#### **Amendment to Transition Provision**

The CTC Source Protection Plan (SPP) has a Transition Provision to allow proposals filed prior to the enactment of the Plan to be treated as an "existing threat" when approval of further implementing applications is required.

The amended Transition Provision has clarified when a threat can be considered "existing" for in-progress development proposals and when a water balance assessment is needed for transitioning applications. In addition, the Planning Approval Authority now has flexibility regarding water balance assessment requirements based on the site-specific nature of the proposal.

#### Amendment to Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Conformity Timeline Policy (T-8)

The Clean Water Act, 2006 requires the Council of a municipality to amend its Official Plan to conform to the SPP's significant threat policies before the date specified in the SPP. Timeline T-8 in the CTC SPP currently requires that Official Plans be amended for conformity within 5 years from the date the SPP took effect (i.e. December, 2020).

Upper tier municipalities are expected to review and update their Official Plans to conform to the new Growth Plan (2017) by July, 2022, and lower tier municipalities must conform within 1 year of their upper tier counterparts. Policy T-8 has been updated to allow for Official Plan conformity with the SPP to align with the Growth Plan conformity dates referenced in the previous sentence.

#### Amendment to Restricted Land Use Policy (GEN-1)

The GEN-1 policy requires all planning, and in particular, building permit applications for land uses (excluding residential) that may involve significant drinking water threat activities to be sent to the Region to provide a Notice under Section 59 of the Clean Water Act, 2006 outlining whether the proposed activity is prohibited or subject to a Risk Management Plan. This includes building permits for buildings that have already gone through the planning approval process and been deemed not to be significant drinking water threats.

The revised policy contains clear policy direction allowing the Region the flexibility to determine when proposals are subject to Section 59 Notices, thereby streamlining the approval process.

## Amendment to Land Use Planning Policy for Septic Systems Governed under the Building Code Act, 1992 (SWG-3)

SWG-3 is a land use planning policy for future septic systems, including holding tanks, governed under the Building Code Act, 1992. The intent of SWG-3 is to ensure that site plan control, as a planning and development control tool, is used to optimize the location and design of septic systems when existing vacant lots of record are proposed to be developed within certain designated vulnerable areas identified in the policy. The
policy states that septic systems shall only be permitted if they are sited to ensure they do not become a significant drinking water threat.

The CTC SPC recognized that prohibiting a septic system on a vacant lot in the rural area would make it impossible to obtain a building permit for the lot and thereby void previous planning decisions to create and zone the lot for development. Revisions to the text of this policy were necessary to ensure that the original intent of the CTC SPP is being achieved.

# Amendment to Storage of Snow Policy (SNO-1)

The SNO-1 policy addresses existing and future significant drinking water threats as a result of snow storage. In the approved CTC SPP, the policy prohibits the future storage of snow within a 100 metre radius of a municipal well, as well as within certain designated vulnerable areas outside the 100 metre radius of a municipal well.

Given the large surface areas in the Credit Valley Source Protection Area covered by Issue Contributing Areas for sodium and chloride, municipal staff has communicated the difficulty of implementing a prohibition for this potential future activity. Since a number of provisions could be included in a Risk Management Plan to ensure the storage of snow does not become a significant threat, the CTC SPC has opted instead to manage any future instances of the activity outside the 100 metre radius of a municipal well, while maintaining the prohibition on the storage of snow within the 100 metre radius.

#### Amendment to Planning Policy to Protect Groundwater Recharge (REC-1)

REC-1 is a land use planning policy that manages activities that reduce recharge to an aquifer. This policy applies to future threats in Well Head Protection Areas for Quantity – Recharge (WHPA-Q2) with a significant or moderate risk level (see Schedule 3). The Planning Approval Authority through the planning review process (i.e. Planning Act applications) will determine what is required and determine the acceptability of the proposed actions in the water balance assessments.

Proposed revisions to this policy through the Section 34 amendment clarify that proposals for agricultural uses and minor developments are not subject to water balance assessments and are instead encouraged to maintain pre-development recharge to the greatest extent feasible through the implementation of best management practices such as low impact development.

# Amendment to Moderate and Low Threat Policies for the Application of Road Salt (SAL-10, SAL-11, SAL-12 and SAL-13)

The approved CTC SPP contains a land use planning policy using Planning Act applications and regulates road salt where the threat is low or moderate (in addition to significant threats) in recognition that road salt application and storage activities are carried out throughout the SPR. Where the application of road salt would be a low or moderate drinking water threat, the planning approval authority is "encouraged" to require a salt management plan. Where the application of road salt would be a significant threat, the planning approval authority "shall" require a salt management plan, in addition to regulating the size of new parking lots within the 100 metre radius of a municipal well based on whether the parking lot is located within an Issue Contributing Area for sodium/chloride.

To ensure that the application, handling, and storage of road salt can be addressed in all instances within 100 metres of a municipal well (even when those activities are classified as low or moderate threats), additional Well Head Protection Areas have been added to this policy.

# **RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The Town's participation in the Source Water Protection process and amendments for Source Protection Plan (SPP) implementation is consistent with the following Strategic Directions:

B: Preserve, Protect and Enhance our Environment, the Goal to preserve, protect and enhance our natural environment for enjoyment by present and future generations, and the following:

Strategic Objectives:

B.1 To protect and conserve the quantity and quality of our ground and surface water resources, and ensure the integrity of our watersheds and aquatic ecosystems through integrated watershed planning and management.

Strategic Actions:

B.1. (f) Participate in Source Water Protection programs.

Town staff participated in the Amendments Working Group established by CTC for the proposed Section 34 amendments along with Credit Valley Conservation staff to protect the quantity and quality of our ground and surface water resources through integrated watershed planning and management.

F: Protect and Enhance Our Agriculture, the Goal to protect and enhance the viability of our agricultural land base and agricultural industry.

Strategic Objectives:

- F.1 To support and promote the agricultural industry as an integral part of the Town's economy.
- F.2 To support and promote agricultural land uses and other compatible rural business activities.

The REC-1 policy has been amended to clarify that proposals for agricultural buildings and structures are exempt from the requirement to submit water balance assessments, which can be expensive and negatively impact the viability of our agricultural land base and agricultural industry.

I: Provide Responsive, Effective Municipal Government, the Goal to provide strong leadership in the effective and efficient delivery of municipal services.

Strategic Objectives:

L.1 Support Council and staff participation in efforts to advocate for issues important to the Halton Hills Community.

The Resolution of Council endorsing the proposed Section 34 amendments to the CTC SPP will support staff's and Council's participation in efforts to advocate for issues important to Halton Hills and facilitate the effective and efficient delivery of municipal services.

# FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The proposed amendments are an administrative matter and have no financial impact.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

Staff participated in the Amendments Working Group established by the CTC Source Protection Committee (SPC) that consisted of staff from CTC member conservation authorities and municipalities to develop recommendations for Section 34 amendments to the CTC SPP. The recommendations were reviewed by Town of Halton Hills Planning, Development Engineering and Building staff, and Halton Region Planning and Public Works staff, and comments were provided to CTC. The CTC SPC considered the feedback received from municipal and conservation authority staff in the development of the updated recommendations for amendments to the CTC SPP policies.

Staff will continue to engage with other municipalities and SPAs through the various Working Groups created to assist with ensuring consistent implementation of the CTC SPP.

#### **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:**

As with the development of the CTC SPP, public consultation is an important step in the process of approving a Section 34 amendment. The CTC SPC will review the comments and Council Resolutions obtained during pre-consultation at their meeting in June, 2018, and consultation with the public will take place for a period of 35 days through late June and July, 2018. Notification of this consultation will be provided to all implementing bodies, including impacted municipalities.

Following the public consultation period, the Section 34 amendments will be endorsed by the three SPAs in the CTC SPR prior to submission to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change in late September of 2018 for final approval.

#### SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

Staff notes that Source Water Protection is not a Town initiative; however, when reviewing the proposed CTC SPP policies, staff has given consideration to the environmental, economic and social impacts of the proposed policies to the Town's operations and to the community.

Staff notes that SPP implementation supports the Water pillar of the Town's Integrated Community Sustainability Strategy and the following related goals:

- Support safe municipal drinking water and wastewater services and facilities as provided by Halton Region;
- Ensure private septic systems and water wells are safe and healthy; and
- Protect groundwater recharge areas.

Overall, the alignment of this report with the Community Sustainability Strategy is: Very Good.

#### **COMMUNICATIONS:**

If endorsed, the Resolution of Council, as well as a copy of this report, will be forwarded to the Chair of the CTC SPC for endorsement of the Section 34 amendments by the three SPAs, as well as to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change for final approval. In addition, these documents will be forwarded to the Region of Halton, Credit Valley Conservation, the City of Burlington, and the Towns of Milton and Oakville for their information.

Staff will report back to Council, as necessary, about any additional obligations or for authorizations required to implement the CTC SPP.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

This report has provided an overview of the proposed policy amendments to the CTC Source Protection Plan under Section 34 of the Clean Water Act, 2006, which are included within Schedule 1 and have been endorsed by the CTC Source Protection Committee. As the main objectives of these amendments are to provide clarity of policy intent, address gaps and provide reasonable flexibility in policy implementation, it is recommended that Council endorse this report in order to facilitate the final approval of the amendments by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.

Reviewed and Approved by,

Steve Burke, Manager of Planning Policy

John Linhardt, Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability

Marsha

Brent Marshall, CAO

#### SCHEDULE 1 TO RPT-PLS-2018-0039 – PROPOSED SECTION 34 AMENDMENTS TO CTC SPP

TEXT HIGHLIGHTED IN GREY INDICATES A REMOVAL (STRIKETHROUGH) OR ADDITION (BOLD) FROM APPROVED CTC SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN (JULY 2015)

#### **TRANSITION PROVISION**

Under the Clean Water Act, 2006, there is consideration for source protection plans (SPPs) to have a Transition Provision that outlines the circumstances under which a "future" drinking water threat activity, that would otherwise be prohibited, may be considered as "existing", even if the activity has not yet commenced. The intent is to allow applications in transition to proceed while drinking water threats are managed under the "existing threat" policies.

The CTC Source Protection Committee included a Transition Provision to recognize situations where an approval-in-principle to proceed with a development application had already been obtained, or where a complete application was made prior to the date the SPP came into effect, but requires further planning approvals to implement the application in progress.

The CTC SPP was approved by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change on July 28, 2015 and became effective on December 31, 2015. Applications submitted after the effective date of the CTC SPP may only be transitioned if they are helping to implement an application in process prior to the date the CTC SPP took effect.

"Existing Threat" policies apply to prescribed drinking water threat activities under the following circumstances:

- 1) A drinking water threat activity that is part of a development proposal where a Complete Application (as determined by the municipality or Niagara Escarpment Commission) was made under the *Planning Act, Condominium Act* or *Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act* (NEPDA) prior to the day the Source Protection Plan comes into effect. The policy for "existing" drinking water threats also applies to any further applications required under the *Planning Act, Condominium Act*, Prescribed Instruments, or a development permit under the NEPDA, to implement the development proposal.
- A drinking water threat activity that is part of an application accepted for a Building Permit, which has been submitted in compliance with Division C
   1.3.1.13 (5) of the Ontario Building Code under the Building Code Act, 1992 as amended, prior to the day the Source Protection Plan comes into effect.
- 3) A drinking water threat activity that is part of an application accepted for the issuance or amendment of a Prescribed Instrument prior to the day the Source Protection Plan comes into effect.

The Transition Provision outlines the circumstances under which a future significant drinking water threat activity may be considered an existing significant drinking water threat activity.

The *Clean Water Act, 2006* requires source protection plans to contain policies to address both existing and future threat activities. *The Clean Water Act, 2006* further specifies that all policies will come into effect upon the plan approval date or an effective date specified by the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change. Transition provisions have been developed to recognize those situations where an applicant has either obtained an approval-in-principle to proceed with a development application, or where a complete application has already been made to a planning approval authority that are "in process" on the date the Source Protection Plan comes into effect. They are not designed to allow proponents to ignore or circumvent the provision contained in this Plan. They will allow the applications to proceed subject to existing significant drinking water threat policies.

The CTC Source Protection Committee concluded a transition provision should be included in the Source Protection Plan to be fair to those with applications in progress or that have received an approval-in-principle to proceed with works. The policy will allow those with complete applications made under the *Planning Act* or *Condominium Act*, building permits submitted in compliance with Division C.1.3.1.13(5) of the *Ontario Building Code Act*, **1992 as amended**, development permits under the *Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act*, or an application for the issuance or amendment of a Prescribed Instrument prior to the day the Source Protection Plan comes into effect to be treated as existing threat activities.

#### **Transition Provision and Policy REC-1**

Policy REC-1 is intended to apply to "future threats" in a WHPA-Q2 with a significant or moderate risk level. However, if an application subject to REC-1 Parts 2a) and 2b) is submitted after the date the source protection plan came into effect (December 31, 2015), but is required to implement a development proposal in progress (as per the Transition Provision), the threat (reducing aquifer recharge) is to be managed as "existing".

Through the plan review process, the Planning Approval Authority will decide what is required to ensure the "existing" threat does not become significant. This is generally to be determined through water balance assessments, or their equivalent (e.g. addendums or amendments to previous stormwater management reports undertaken on site). The Planning Approval Authority may, however, determine that an application submitted after the Transition Provision deadline to implement an application in progress would not increase impervious cover and a water balance assessment (or equivalent) is not required.

The CTC Source Protection Committee intended to allow the Planning Approval Authority the flexibility to require the appropriate level of detail in a specific water balance assessment (or equivalent) that is commensurate with the scale and location of the proposed development. Some areas of the WHPA-Q2 are particularly important for recharge (i.e. Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas) and should be given specific protection, while others may not be as important and/or cannot provide the required level of infiltration. Therefore, the water balance assessment (or equivalent) should include a site specific assessment, acknowledgement of previous planning approvals obtained or in progress that could impact infiltration, and an identification of recharge characteristics.

Ultimately, the intent of the water balance assessment is to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Planning Approval Authority, that pre-development recharge will be maintained to the greatest extent feasible through best management practices such as low impact development (LID), minimizing impervious surfaces, and lot level infiltration.

Policy ID	Timelines for Policy Implementation							
	Land Use Planning							
T-8	Official plans shall be amended for conformity with the Source Protection Plan within 5 years from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect, or at the time of the next review in accordance with s.26 of the <i>Planning Act</i> , whichever occurs first. Zoning by-laws shall be amended within 3 years after the approval of the official plan.							

#### Explanatory Document Text

Section 40(1) of the *Clean Water Act, 2006* requires that the Council of a municipality or a municipal planning authority that has jurisdiction in an area to which the source protection plan applies shall amend its Official plan to conform with significant threat policies and designated Great Lakes policies set out in the source protection plan. In part 2 of Section 40, the Council or municipal planning authority are required to make these amendments before the date specified in the source protection plan. Timeline T-8 in the CTC Source Protection Plan required that Official Plans be amended for conformity within 5 years from the date the Plan took effect (i.e., December 2020).

Several upper tier municipalities within the CTC Source Protection Region have communicated the difficulty with achieving the December 2020 timeline as outlined in the CTC Source Protection Plan which also impacts the ability of those lower tier municipalities dependent on the completion of the conformity exercise by their upper tier counterparts in meeting the same timeline. Further, the Government of Ontario released the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe ('Growth Plan') in May 2017. The Growth Plan was prepared and approved under the *Places to Grow Act, 2005* and took effect on July 1, 2017. Upper Tier municipalities are expected to review and update their Official Plans to conform with the updated Growth Plan by July 2022; lower tier municipalities must conform within 1 year of their upper tier counterparts. CTC Source Protection Region municipalities have communicated that completing conformity with the CTC Source Protection Plan and the Growth Plan, 2017, in unison, would be more time and cost effective.

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	When Policy Applies	Monitoring Policy
GEN-1	Municipality RMO	A		Immediately (T-9) Amend OPs for conformity within 5 years and ZBLs within 3 years of OP approval (T-8)	MON-1 MON-2
			<ul> <li>a. The application complies with the written direction issued by the Risk Management Official; and,</li> <li>b. The applicant has demonstrated that a significant drinking water threat activity designated for the purposes of Section 57 or 58 will not be engaged in, or will not be affected by the application.</li> <li>c. Where the Risk Management Official has provided written direction designating a land use for the purpose of section 59, a written Notice from the Risk Management Official shall be required prior to approval of any Building Permit under the Building Code Act, 1992 as amended, in addition to Planning Act and Condominium Act applications in accordance with Section 59 of the Clean Water Act, 2006.</li> </ul>		

Policy GEN-1 manages existing and future activities within vulnerable areas where the activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat as designated under section 59 of the *Clean Water Act, 2006*, by requiring Risk Management Officials to screen applications for works proposed under the *Planning Act,* the *Condominium Act,* and the *Building Code Act, 1992* as amended, excluding residential uses.

Where the activities are or would be a significant drinking water threat, this policy requires municipalities to designate land uses within their Official Plans and Zoning By-Laws. This will allow for the pre-screening by the Risk Management Official, via using section 59 of the *Clean Water Act, 2006*. Section 59 policies require that municipalities put a process in place to "flag" for the **Chief** Building Official and the Planning Department applications made under the *Planning Act* and or the *Condominium Act*, as well as or an application for a building permit under the *Building Code Act, 1992*, as amended, that is within a vulnerable area where a threat could be significant and where Part IV authorities are being used to prohibit or manage activities. The "flag" would indicate to the **Chief** Building Official or the Planning Department that the proposal needs to be reviewed by the Risk Management Official. Once the Risk Management Official is satisfied that the applicable Part IV policies are addressed, he/she would issue a "Notice to Proceed". This Notice is used to let the **Chief** Building Official or Planning Department know they can proceed with in processing the proposal.

Risk Management Officials in the CTC Source Protection Region have communicated that Policy GEN-1, as originally written, had ambiguity regarding their ability to determine when site-specific land uses, activities, or building projects are or are not subject to Section 59 Notice requirements under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*. The revised policy text now has clear policy direction allowing Risk Management Officials the autonomy to determine the site specific land uses that both are and are not subject to Section 59 Notice.

Policy ID	Threat Description	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	Where Policy Applies	When Policy Applies	Monitoring Policy
SWG-3	Septic Systems Governed under the <i>Building Code</i> Act, <b>1992 as</b>	Planning Approval Authority	А	Land Use Planning Where septic systems, including holding tanks, governed under the <i>Building Code Act</i> (vacant existing lot of record) would be a significant drinking water threat, vacant lots of record shall be subject to site plan control so that the location of the individual on-site sewage systems and replacement beds only be permitted if they are sited to ensure they do not become a significant drinking water threat in any of the following areas: Municipalities shall adopt Official Plan policies that require the enactment or amendment of Site Plan Control By-laws containing provisions for the siting and design of septic systems, including holding tanks, governed under the <i>Building Code Act, 1992</i> as amended, as follows:	See Maps 1.1 - 1.21	Future: Immediately (T-9) Amend OPs for conformity <del>within</del> <del>5 years</del> and	MON-1
	amended			<ul> <li>Site Plan Control is required for existing vacant lots of record to ensure that the siting and design of on-site septic systems, including the siting of future reserve bed locations, is optimized in relation to significant drinking water threats in any of the following areas:</li> <li>WHPA-A (future); or</li> <li>WHPA-B (VS = 10) (future); or</li> <li>WHPA-E (VS = 10) (future); or</li> <li>the remainder of an Issue Contributing Area for Nitrates or Pathogens (future).</li> </ul>		ZBLs within 3 years of OP approval (T-8)	

Policy SWG-3 is a land use planning policy for future septic systems, including holding tanks, governed under the *Building Code Act*, **1992**, as amendedensuring that vacant lots of record be subject to site plan control so that the location of individual on-site sewage systems and replacement beds are only permitted if they are sited to ensure they do not become a significant drinking water threat. The intent of this policy is to ensure that site plan control, as a planning and development control tool, is used to optimize the location and design of septic systems when existing vacant lots of record are proposed to be developed within certain designated vulnerable areas identified in the policy.

The CTC Source Protection Committee recognizes that prohibiting a septic system on a vacant lot where there is no municipal sewer connection available may make it impossible to build on such a lot which has received prior approval for such a use from the municipality. to obtain a building permit for the lot and thereby void previous planning decisions to create and zone the lot for development. This was deemed considered to be a significant hardship for the landowner. For this reason, the Source Protection Committee has provided through this policy for the municipality to subject vacant lots of record to site plan control to ensure sewage systems and replacement beds are only permitted if they can be appropriately sited and constructed to protect the municipal well. chosen to require the enactment or amendment of municipal site plan control by-laws to allow for the detailed review of on-site sewage systems for vacant lots in order to optimize their location and design relative to the designated vulnerable areas present.

The verb "optimize" means "to make as effective as possible" or "to make the best of" and was chosen to allow municipal planning authorities the flexibility to use sound professional judgement in the review and approval of the siting and design of on-site sewage systems proposed to facilitate the development of existing vacant lots as part of the municipal site plan control process.

The policy directs municipalities to "adopt Official Plan policies that require the enactment or amendment of Site Plan Control By-laws" for the purposes of the policy. This structure is introduced for the following reasons. First, the *Clean Water Act, 2006* provides in s. 40 and s. 42 that a municipality shall amend its Official Plan and Zoning By-laws to conform to the significant threat policies set out in the source protection plan. There is no authority for the source protection plan to direct that site plan control by-laws conform to the source protection plan outside of the Official Plan conformity process. Second, the *Planning Act* requires municipalities to have enabling policy in their Official Plans in order to use the site plan control by-law policies is therefore consistent with the provisions of the *Clean Water Act, 2006* and current practice under the *Planning Act*.

Municipalities affected by the SWG-3 policy are encouraged to amend their site plan control by-law and associated application review processes in order to conform with this policy in advance of future Official Plan conformity policy direction on a voluntary basis in order to advance the implementation of the source protection plan in as timely a manner as possible. Municipalities are also required to continue to monitor the aquifer and report on the results (see GEN-7). Should the contaminant levels continue to increase, it may be necessary to review this policy and others associated with the Issue.

Policy ID	Threat Description	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	Where Policy Applies	When Policy Applies	Monitoring Policy
SAL-10	Moderate/ Low Threats Application of Road Salt	Planning Approval Authority	В	Land Use Planning Where the application of road salt would be a moderate or low drinking water threat, the planning approval authority is encouraged to require a salt management plan, which includes a reduction in the future use of salt, as part of a complete application for development which includes new roads and parking lots in any of the following areas: • WHPA-A (VS = 10) (existing, future); or • WHPA-B (VS $\leq$ 10) (existing, future); or • WHPA-C (future); or • WHPA-D (future); or • WHPA-E (VS $\geq$ 4.5 and <9) (future); or • HVA (future); or • SGRA (VS $\geq$ 6) (future). Such plans should include, but not be limited to, mitigation measures regarding design of parking lots, roadways and sidewalks to minimize the need for repeat application of road salt such as reducing ponding in parking areas, directing stormwater discharge outside of vulnerable areas where possible, and provisions to hire certified contractors.	See Chapter 5 of the respective Assessment Report	Future: Immediately (T-9) Amend OPs for conformity within <del>5 years</del> and ZBLs within 3 years of OP approval (T-8)	N/A
SAL-11	Moderate/ Low Threats Application of Road Salt	MOECC	ſ	Specify ActionWhere the application of road salt is, or would be, a moderate or low drinking water threat, the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change in consultation with other provincial ministries and municipal associations should promote best management practices for the application of road salt, to protect sources of municipal drinking water in any of the following areas:• WHPA-A (VS = 10) (existing, future); or • WHPA-B (VS ≤ 10) (existing, future); or • WHPA-C (existing, future); or • WHPA-D (existing, future); or • WHPA-E (VS ≥ 4.5 and <9) (existing, future); or • HVA (existing, future); or • SGRA (VS ≥ 6) (existing, future).	See Chapter 5 of the respective Assessment Report	Existing & Future: Consider within 2 years (T-15)	N/A

Policy	Threat	Implementing	Legal	Policy	Where Policy	When Policy	Monitoring
ID	Description	Body	Effect		Applies	Applies	Policy
SAL-12	Moderate/ Low Threats Application of Road Salt	Municipality		<ul> <li>Specify Action</li> <li>Where the application of road salt on unassumed roads and private parking lots with greater than 200 square metres is, or would be, a moderate or low drinking water threat in any of the following areas: <ul> <li>WHPA-A (VS = 10) (existing, future); or</li> <li>WHPA-B (VS ≤ 10) (existing, future); or</li> <li>WHPA-C (existing, future); or</li> <li>WHPA-D (existing, future); or</li> <li>WHPA-E (VS ≥ 4.5 and &lt;9) (existing, future); or</li> <li>HVA (existing, future); or</li> <li>SGRA (VS ≥ 6) (existing, future);</li> </ul> </li> <li>the municipality is encouraged to: <ul> <li>a) require implementation of a salt management plan which includes the goal to minimize salt usage through alternative measures, while maintaining public safety; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) require the use of trained individuals in the application of road salt (could include technicians and technologists and others responsible for salt management plans, winter maintenance supervisors, patrollers, equipment operators, mechanics, and contract employees).</li> </ul>	See Chapter 5 of the respective Assessment Report	Existing & Future: Consider within 2 years (T-15)	N/A

				Specify Action			
SAL-13	Moderate/ Low Threats Application of Road Salt Handling and Storage of Road Salt	SPA Municipality	J	Where the application, handling and storage of road salt is, or would be, a moderate or low drinking water threat, the municipality is requested to report the results of its sodium and chloride monitoring conducted under the <i>Safe Drinking Water Act</i> and any other monitoring programs annually to the Source Protection Authority. The Source Protection Authority shall assess the information for any increasing trends and advise the Source Protection Committee on the need for new source protection plan policies to be developed to prevent future drinking water Issues, in any of the following areas: • WHPA-A (VS = 10) (existing, future); or • WHPA-B (VS $\leq$ 10) (existing, future); or • WHPA-D (existing, future); or • WHPA-D (existing, future); or • WHPA-E (VS $\geq$ 4.5 and <9) (existing, future); or • HVA (existing, future); or • SGRA (VS $\geq$ 6) (existing, future).	See Chapter 5	Existing & Future: Consider within 2 years (T-15)	N/A

Policies SAL-10 through SAL-13 apply to low and moderate threat areas.

The CTC Source Protection Committee has chosen to include a land use planning policy using *Planning Act* tools and a number of Specify Action policies where the threat is low or moderate in recognition that road salt application and storage activities **are** carried out throughout **all source protection areas the source protection region**; chloride and sodium are very mobile chemicals that move easily and rapidly into and through aquifers; and that there are many other sources of drinking water that may be protected as well through implementation practices to reduce the threat.

All of these low and moderate threat policies are non-legally binding. Each specific implementer must have regard for the policy in making decisions, but has the flexibility of determining what action(s) will be taken. While an implementer is not required to provide a report on their actions on implementing low or moderate threat policies, the CTC Source Protection Committee encourages them to provide information that will help in future review and revision of policies.

Policy ID	Threat Description	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	Where Policy Applies	When Policy Applies	Monitoring Policy
SNO-1	Storage of Snow	RMO	G	<ul> <li>Part IV, s.57, s.58</li> <li>Where the storage of snow is, or would be, a significant drinking water threat, the following actions shall be taken: <ol> <li>The storage of snow is designated for the purpose of s.57 under the <i>Clean Water Act</i>, and is therefore prohibited where the threat is, or would be significant, in <del>any of</del> the following areas: <ol> <li>WHPA-A (existing, future); or</li> <li>WHPA-B (VS = 10) (future); or</li> <li>WHPA E (VS ≥ 9) (future); or</li> <li>the remainder of an Issue Contributing Area for Sodium or Chloride (future).</li> </ol> </li> <li>Notwithstanding the above, emergency snow storage may be permitted outside of WHPA-A as determined by the risk management official and the municipality responsible for snow storage.</li> </ol></li></ul>	See Maps 1.1 - 1.21	Future: Immediately (T-5) Existing: 180 days (T-4)	MON-2
	Snow		Н	<ul> <li>2) The storage of snow is designated for the purpose of s.58 under the <i>Clean Water Act</i>, requiring risk management plans, where the threat is significant in any of the following areas:</li> <li>WHPA-B (VS = 10) (existing, future); or</li> <li>WHPA-E (VS ≥ 9) (existing, future); or</li> <li>The remainder of an Issue Contributing Area for Sodium or Chloride (existing, future).</li> <li>Without limiting other requirements, risk management plans shall include appropriate terms and conditions to ensure the storage of snow, and associated runoff, ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.</li> <li>Notwithstanding the above, emergency snow storage may be permitted outside of WHPA-A as determined by the risk management official and the municipality responsible for snow storage in the absence of a Risk Management Plan.</li> </ul>		Existing: 1 year/ 5 years (T-6)	MON-2

Policy SNO-1 prohibits existing and future snow storage in WHPA-A and future snow storage in WHPA-B (VS = 10), WHPA-E ( $VS \ge 9$ ) and in the remainder of an Issue Contributing Area for Sodium or Chloride. In the WHPA-B (VS = 10), WHPA-E ( $VS \ge 9$ ) and in the remainder of an Issue Contributing Area for sodium and chloride, existing and future significant drinking water threats are managed using a Risk Management Plan. In **Emergency snow storage may be permitted outside of WHPA-A as determined by the Risk Management Official and the municipality responsible for snow storage in the absence of a Risk Management Plan.** situations, future snow storage may be permitted outside of WHPA-A requiring a Risk Management Plan.

Storage of snow can pose a significant drinking water threat depending on the geographic location of the storage area and whether the snow is stored above or below grade. In general, the greater the snow storage area, the greater the risk to drinking water. Generally, snow storage is a seasonal activity that takes place on along roadsides, parking lots, and vacant land without the construction of permanent facilities. When originally developing this policy the CTC Source Protection Committee encouraged, where possible, the existing storage of snow (which often contains road salts and other contaminants) be located outside of vulnerable areas where possible. The policy as currently written prohibits the existing and future storage of snow in the WHPA-A, the most vulnerable area to a municipal well, as well as future occurrences of the activity where it would be a significant drinking water threat in the WHPA-B (VS=10), WHPA-E (VS≥9), and the remainder of the Issues Contributing Area for sodium and chloride. Given the large surface areas in the Credit Valley Source Protection Area covered by Issues Contributing Areas for sodium and chloride, municipalities have communicated the difficulty implementing a prohibition of a potential future activity. A number of provisions could be included in a Risk Management Plan to ensure that the storage of snow does not become a significant drinking water threat, therefore, the CTC Source Protection Committee has opted to manage any future instances of the activity outside of the WHPA-A.

Page **11** of **14** 

#### CTC Source Protection Plan Policies for Section 34 Amendment

Policy ID	Threat Description	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	Where Policy Applies	When Policy Applies	Monitorin g Policy
REC-1	An activity that reduces recharge to an aquifer	Planning Approval Authority		<ul> <li>Land Use Planning (Planning Policies for Protecting Groundwater Recharge)</li> <li>For applications under the Planning Act within the Tier 3 Water Budget WHPA-Q2 identified as having significant water quantity threats, the relevant Planning Approval Authority shall ensure recharge reduction does not become a significant drinking water threat by:</li> <li>1) Requiring new development and site alteration under the <i>Planning Act for lands zoned Low</i> Density Residential (excluding subdivisions) or zoned Agricultural to implement best management practices such as Low Impact Development (LID) with the goal to maintain predevelopment recharge. Implementation of best management practices is encouraged, but voluntary, for Agricultural Uses, Agriculture-related Uses, or On-farm Diversified Uses where the total impervious surface does not exceed 10 per cent of the lot. </li> <li>2) Requiring that all site plan (excluding an application for one single family dwelling) and subdivision applications to facilitate major development (excluding development on lands down-gradient of municipal wells in the Toronto &amp; Region Source Protection Area [Figure X]) for new residential, commercial, industrial and institutional uses provide a water balance assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Planning Approval Authority which addresses each of the following requirements: <ul> <li>a) maintain pre-development recharge to the greatest extent feasible through best management practices such as LLD, minimizing impervious surfaces, and lot level infiltration;</li> <li>b) where pre-development (excluding a minor variance) within the WHPA-Q2 and within an Issue Contributing Area (for sodium, chloride or nitrates), the water balance assessment shall consider water quality when recommending best management practices and address how recharge will be maintained and water quality will be protected.</li> </ul> The Planning Approval Authority shall use its discretion to implement the requirements of t</li></ul>	See Maps 3.1 3.2 Future: WHPA-Q2 with a moderate risk level See Maps 3.3 3.4	Future: Immediately (T-9) Amend OPs for conformity within 5 years and ZBLs within 3 years of	MON-1

#### CTC Source Protection Plan Policies for Section 34 Amendment

#### EXPLANATORY DOCUMENT TEXT

Policy REC-1 is a land use planning policy that manages activities that reduce recharge to an aquifer. This policy applies to future threats in a WHPA-Q2 with a significant or moderate risk level.

The intent of the policy is to ensure that the Planning Approval Authority makes decisions that do not result in recharge reduction from new development becoming a significant drinking water threat within a WHPA-Q2. The Planning Approval Authority, through the plan review process (i.e., *Planning Act* applications) will determine what is required, and determine the acceptability of the proposed actions, in the water balance assessments.

The CTC Source Protection Committee wants the Planning Approval Authority to have the flexibility to require the appropriate level of detail in a specific water balance assessment commensurate with the scale and location of a proposed development. For example, within the WHPA-Q2 are areas that have been identified as Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas which are particularly important due to the nature of the soils and slope that permit higher than average infiltration of precipitation to replenish the groundwater. These areas should be given particular protection. Other areas **within the Tier 3 WHPA-Q2**, may not be important for recharge and **/or** cannot provide the required infiltration due to the local soil and slope conditions. Site specific assessment and identification of the recharge characteristics of the site should be part of such water balance assessments **or equivalent**. Where a detailed assessment is warranted, using the current version of the Tier 3 Water Budget model and updated information should ensure that the results are technically robust and comparable to the original analysis. The local source protection authority has the model files and information to support this analysis, but it is envisioned that an applicant will have to retain qualified expertise to do the analysis.

The Source Protection Committee encourages the "complete application" check list be updated to include the Water Balance Assessment.

The intent of Part 1) of the policy is to avoid the burden on individual residential owners or agricultural operations by requiring that they undertake expensive hydrogeological assessments, but to protect recharge by requiring instead that they implement best management practices that will reduce or eliminate any impact from their building or development activities that are subject to planning approvals. provide an appropriate level of policy direction to maintain recharge for development and site alteration associated with smaller-scale or agriculture-related development not covered by Part 2 of this policy. In lieu of providing hydrogeological assessments, applicants are required, or in the case of agriculture-related development where the total lot impervious surface is beneath a threshold of 10 per cent, encouraged to voluntarily implement best management practices, that will reduce or eliminate any impact from their building, or development, or site alteration activities that are subject to planning approvals.

With respect to the voluntary implementation of Part 1) of this policy for Agricultural Uses, Agricultural-Related Uses, and On-farm Diversified Uses these terms have the same meaning as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 and as further articulated in the Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario's Prime Agricultural Areas, 2016. The 10 percent impervious threshold for agricultural-related uses is adapted from Policy 3.2.4.2 of the Greenbelt Plan, 2017 for the purposes of this policy.

In general, on low density and agriculturally zoned lands, it is possible to ensure that roof and impermeable surface run-off can be directed to on-site infiltration and thus maintain recharge without requiring technical assessments.

The intent of Part 2) of this policy is to ensure **certain** *Planning Act* applications <del>(excluding an application for one single family dwelling and on lands zoned agricultural)</del> include an assessment of the potential reduction in recharge so that specific measures are identified and implemented to ensure the proposal does

Page **13** of **14** 

#### CTC Source Protection Plan Policies for Section 34 Amendment

not result in recharge reduction becoming a significant drinking water threat within a WHPA-Q2. This requirement applies to *major development* on lands with the greatest potential for reducing recharge, such as commercial, employment, institutional, industrial uses and includes residential subdivisions. but excludes an application for one single family dwelling. Planning Act applications applicable to Parts 2 (a) and (b) include site plan applications, draft plan of subdivision applications, and any associated implementing official plan or zoning by-law amendment applications, however, applications for development on lands zoned agricultural, which do not meet the criteria for major development, and any development on lands down-gradient of municipal wells in the Toronto and Region Source Protection Area [See Figure X], are exempt from Part 2).

The intent of Part 2 (b) is to allow the municipality the option where it meets local requirements to require the applicant to locate compensating recharge on another site within the WHPA-Q2 where it is not feasible to protect pre-development recharge within the development site. The CTC Source Protection Committee concluded that the local municipality is best placed to determine the optimal actions to protect recharge and this provides them some local flexibility in their decision-making.

Part 2 (c) of this policy applies ONLY to those parts of a WHPA-Q2 which are also within an Issue Contributing Area for Sodium, Chloride or Nitrate. These areas are shown on the maps in the appendices **in of** the **CTC** Source Protection Plan and also will be provided by the Source Protection Authority in other formats upon request to municipalities or other planning approval authorities. This requirement is intended to ensure that any risk management measure that is implemented to maintain recharge does not create a threat to source water quality. For example, infiltration of stormwater containing road salt in an Issue Contributing Area for Sodium or Chloride is a significant drinking water threat and subject to policies SWG-11 and SWG-12. The CTC Source Protection Committee has included Part 2 (c) of this policy for clarity to ensure that an implementing body does not inadvertently approve an activity to protect water quantity that is a threat to water quality.

The intent of Part 3) is to ensure municipalities evaluate planned growth against recharge reduction at a large scale and only proceed if the planned growth will not result in new significant drinking water threats. Once feasibility of the growth is confirmed, development proponents are subject to Parts 1) and 2) of this policy which are site-specific.



#### SCHEDULE 2 TO RPT-PLS-2018-0039 – CTC SPR WITH WHPA-Q DOWNGRADIENT LINE FOR REC-1 POLICY

#### SCHEDULE 3 TO RPT-PLS-2018-0039 - TOWN'S WELL HEAD PROTECTION AREAS (QUANTITY)



APPROVED SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN: CTC Source Protection Region

Map 3.2: Acton – Significant Groundwater Quantity Threat Areas

Page 219 of 239



#### APPROVED SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN: CTC Source Protection Region

Map 3.3: Georgetown – Future Significant Groundwater Quantity Threat Areas

Page 222 of 239



# REPORT

REPORT TO:	Chair and Members of Planning, Public Works & Transportation Committee
REPORT FROM:	Romaine Scott, Legal Coordinator Planning & Sustainability
DATE:	May 8, 2018
REPORT NO.:	PLS-2018-0041
RE:	Authorization to allow Encroachment onto Victoria Street Address: 24 John Street, Halton Hills File No: D16 JO

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Report PLS-2018-0041 dated May 8, 2018 regarding the continuation of the encroachment of a house at 24 John Street, Halton Hills (Georgetown) onto the untraveled portion of Victoria Street, be received.

AND FURTHER THAT the appropriate by-law be enacted to authorize the Mayor and Clerk to execute an encroachment agreement with the owner of 24 John Street to permit the encroachment of the house onto the untraveled portion of Victoria Street to continue.

# **BACKGROUND:**

The house at 24 John Street extends approximately 1.42 m (4.67 ft) onto the untraveled portion of Victoria Street. The last encroachment agreement with a previous owner has expired and the current owner is required to legalize the longstanding encroachment by entering into an encroachment agreement with the Town. The extent of the encroachment is shown on the drawing attached as Appendix "1" to this Report.

The location of the property is illustrated on the attached Appendix "2".

#### COMMENTS:

In the past, staff has routinely recommended that encroachments be continued for the earlier of 10 years or the date upon which the encroachment is removed. The agreement also contemplates that in the event that the property is sold prior to the end of the term set out in the encroachment agreement, the new owner would be required to either assume the existing encroachment agreement or enter into a new agreement approved by Council. The owner has requested a term of 20 years.

Transportation & Public Works staff has no objection to the encroachment continuing for a term of 20 years, subject to the conditions set out in the encroachment agreement. The owner of the property will be required to indemnify the Town and provide the appropriate certificate of insurance showing that the Town has been added to its insurance policy and an additional insured.

#### **RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This Report is operational and has no bearing on the Town's Strategic Plan.

#### FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The Town's costs associated with this matter are covered by the administration fee allowed for in the Town's Rates and Service Charges By-law. There is no annual license fee for the encroachment.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

The Town's Manager of Transportation and Superintendent of Public Works were consulted with respect to this Report.

#### **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:**

There is no public engagement with respect to this Report.

#### SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

There is no sustainability implication with respect to this Report.

#### **COMMUNICATIONS:**

There is no communications implication with respect to this Report.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

The encroachment is entirely on the untraveled portion of the road and does not impede the current operation of the roadway. Staff therefore recommends that Council passes the necessary by-law to authorize the Mayor and Clerk to sign the encroachment agreement to allow the encroachment to continue as discussed herein.

Reviewed and Approved by,

John Linhardt, Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability

Drenthanka

Brent Marshall, CAO







# REPORT

- **REPORT TO:** Chair and Members of the Planning, Public Works and Transportation Committee
- **REPORT FROM:** Jeff Markowiak, Manager (Acting) of Development Review
- **DATE:** May 16, 2018
- **REPORT NO.:** PLS-2018-0044
- RE: Recommended changes to the Planning & Sustainability development application fee structure

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Report No. PLS-2018-0044, dated May 16, 2018, regarding "Recommended changes to the Planning & Sustainability development application fee structure" be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Planning & Sustainability Application Fees be approved by Council as outlined in SCHEDULE 2 attached to this report;

AND FURTHER THAT staff bring forward a by-law to establish the approved Planning & Sustainability Application Fees and to amend By-law 2017-0074;

AND FURTHER THAT the approved Planning & Sustainability Application Fees come into effect on July 1, 2018.

#### PURPOSE OF THE REPORT:

The purpose of this report is to present to Council a new Planning & Sustainability development application fee structure for consideration and approval. The new fee structure will be imposed on applicants and is intended to more accurately recover the cost to the Town to process and review development applications.

The recommended fee structure outlined in **SCHEDULE 2** of this report was prepared by Watson & Associates following their review of the Town's current planning application fees and development review process.

# BACKGROUND:

The Town last reviewed its planning application fees in 2011, which resulted in the adoption and implementation of a 5 year fee model for the 2012 to 2016 time period.

The preparation of that fee model relied on estimates of development application volume and type expected to be received during that 5 year time frame.

In 2016 Town Finance staff undertook a review of all rates and fees being collected by each Town department. As a result of that review, a general fee update was approved for implementation at the beginning of 2017. However, Finance staff concluded that the Planning & Sustainability application fees required further review outside the scope of the 2016 fee update given that:

- over the past 5 years the Town has experienced an increase in the number of complex development applications, especially infill proposals, which require more multifaceted reviews to be completed; and
- since the 2011 fee review the Town's development review and approval process has undergone substantial changes, including a greater emphasis on preconsultation and increased community engagement.

As a result, in April 2017 Town Council approved the retention of Watson & Associates to assess the current cost of processing development applications in Halton Hills and make recommended changes to the Planning & Sustainability fee structure to ensure that fees are appropriately structured relative to cost recovery and competitiveness with comparator municipalities (Report PI-2017-0052).

Through 2017 and into early 2018 Watson & Associates undertook a review of the Town's development review process, with a primary objective to:

- study the Town's current planning application fees and determine historical levels of cost recovery; and
- assess the current costs of processing development applications in the Town of Halton Hills.

Watson completed their review and prepared a draft report entitled "Town of Halton Hills Planning Fees Review" that was presented to the Planning, Public Works and Transportation Committee on April 30, 2018. That draft report contained recommended changes to the Town's development application fee structure. At the April 30<sup>th</sup> Committee meeting Town staff was directed to undertake consultation with development industry stakeholders regarding the recommended changes to the development application fee structure (Report PLS-2018-0033).

#### COMMENTS:

As outlined in the Watson & Associates report, the changes being recommending to the Town's development application fee structure are intended to:

- balance the Town's need to maximize cost recovery with stakeholder interests, affordability and competitiveness with comparator municipalities;
- reflect industry best practices; and
- conform to applicable legislation and be defensible if challenged.

In addition to a recommended fee structure, the report also outlines Watson's methodology for calculating the full cost recovery for the Town's development review service delivery. Watson estimates that the Town's current planning application fees presently recover about 40% of the Town's cost to process development applications. The fee structure being recommended by Watson & Associates should achieve approximately 70% cost recovery of Town staff's development review service delivery.

As directed at the April 30<sup>th</sup> PPT Committee meeting, Town staff held a consultation meeting with industry stakeholders on May 10, 2018, to obtain their comments and feedback on Watson's findings and the recommended fee structure changes. Notice of the meeting was provided to approximately 50 industry stakeholders, including BILD, the Chamber of Commerce and the Georgetown and Acton BIAs. Only 4 parties attended the meeting and no objections were raised regarding the recommended changes to the Town's planning application fees (questions asked by the attendees, along with answers provided by Watson, are outlined in the "Public Engagement" section of this report).

Following the May 10 meeting Town staff directed Watson & Associates to finalize their draft report and recommended fee changes for consideration and approval by Council. The final May 16, 2018, "Town of Halton Hills Planning Fees Review" document is attached as **SCHEDULE 1** to this report. An excerpt from the report outlining the recommended fee changes is attached as **SCHEDULE 2**.

This report is recommending that Council approve the Planning & Sustainability Development Application Fees being recommended by Watson & Associates (**SCHEDULE 2**). The report also seeks direction from Council to bring forward a by-law to establish the new fee schedule; staff are targeting July 1, 2018, for implementation of the new fees.

# **RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This report supports the following strategic directions outlined in Council's 2014-2018 Strategic Action Plan:

#### Municipal Service Delivery:

• Effective, efficient and economical delivery of the Town's existing services.

#### Financial Sustainability:

• Establish sustainable financing, asset management, and master plans to acquire, operate, maintain, renew and replace infrastructure.

#### FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The revenue collected from the recommended fees will ensure appropriate cost recovery of the Town's development review service delivery and the competitiveness of the Town's development review fee structure.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

Planning staff and Watson & Associates consulted with staff from the various Town departments involved in the development review function (ie. Development Engineering, Transportation, Rec & Parks, Buildings and Zoning) to determine the relative level of effort by those departments in processing planning applications. These effort estimates were important to help determine the current costs to the Town for processing development applications.

#### **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:**

On May 10, 2018, Town staff and Watson & Associates held a consultation meeting with industry stakeholders at the Gellert Community Centre to obtain comments and feedback on the fee structure changes being recommended by Watson.

Notice of the consultation meeting and a copy of Watson's draft report and recommend fee changes was provided to approximately 50 industry stakeholders via e-mail on April 27, 2018. Stakeholders that were notified included BILD, the Chamber of Commerce, the Georgetown and Acton BIAs and known developers/planners/lawyers who regularly or currently have active applications being considered by the Town.

Notified stakeholders were requested to RSVP to indicate their intention of attending. The Town received 6 RSVPs; however, only 4 parties attended the May 10 meeting:

- BILD (Carmina Tupe);
- Mattamy Homes (Ryan Oosterhoff);
- Matthews Design & Drafting Services (Doug Matthews); and
- Ray Chesher.

At the meeting Watson & Associates gave a presentation to outline their review of the Town's current planning application fees, the estimated cost to the Town to process development applications and the fee changes being recommended by Watson. While no objections were raised by any of the stakeholders, a summary of the questions asked at the consultation meeting, along with answers provided by Watson, are outlined below:

Q1. For a residential Official Plan Amendment, would the declining block rate fee apply to the total number of units proposed or just to the units that exceed the permitted density? (ie. for an OPA seeking a 100 unit condominium on a site that permits a density of 60 units, would the variable per unit fee be applied to all 100 units or just the 40 units that exceed the density permission) The variable declining block rate would be applied to the entire application (ie. all units being proposed, not just the ones exceeding the density permissions). The fee is intended to cover the cost to the municipality to process and review the entire proposal, not just the units that exceed the current permissions.

# Q2. Did Watson ever consider increasing the base application fee and lowering the variable per unit/gross floor area fees in order to reduce the cost for larger proposals?

Watson's review of the current costs to the Town to process development applications identified that there was a greater effort required by staff to review larger proposals. Therefore, the variable rate fee was structured to try and ensure that costs were commensurate with the level of review required by staff. Establishing a reasonable base fee should make sure that smaller development proposals would incur negligible increases to the planning application fees, which is important from an affordability and municipal competitiveness standpoint.

# Q3. Did the Town ever consider reducing their processing/review efforts to address cost recovery instead of changing the planning application fees?

Questions of this nature are typically geared towards a desire to obtain development approvals more quickly. The fee review studied the Town's current development review process, which is necessary to ensure that development occurs in an appropriate manner and is consistent with mandatory and Council approved policies, procedures and guidelines. Typically, municipalities are continuing to look for ways to improve their level of service and offer a more efficient review process; however, doing so often does not result in a less expensive process as this may require greater resources to be dedicated to the review.

# SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

The Town is committed to implementing our Community Sustainability Strategy, Imagine Halton Hills. Doing so will lead to a higher quality of life.

The recommendation outlined in this report is not applicable to the Strategy's implementation.

# **COMMUNICATIONS:**

There are no communications impacts associated with this report.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

The planning application fees being recommended by Watson & Associates should better reflect the current costs to the Town to process and review development proposals. Therefore, this report recommends that the Planning & Sustainability Application Fees prepared by Watson & Associates, as outlined in **SCHEDULE 2**, be approved by Council.

Further, this report recommends that Council direct staff to bring forward a by-law to establish the new Planning & Sustainability Application Fees. Town staff are targeting July 1, 2018, for the implementation of the new planning fee structure.

Reviewed and Approved by,

John Linhardt, Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability

renthansk

Brent Marshall, CAO

# Town of Halton Hills Planning Fees Review

**Final Report** 

May 16, 2018





Plaza Three 101–2000 Argentia Rd. Mississauga, Ontario Canada L5N 1V9

Phone: (905) 272-3600 Fax: (905) 272-3602 e-mail: info@watson-econ.ca www.watson-econ.ca

Planning for growth

142

# Contents

1.	Introde 1.1 1.2 1.3	uction	1
2.	Activit 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5 2.6	y Based Costing Methodology	1 2 6 6 7
3.	Planni 3.1 3.2 3.3	ing Application Fees Review	1 2 6
4.	Impac 4.1 4.2	t Analysis of Recommended Fee Structure	-1 -1 -2 -3
5.	Conclu 5.1	usions	
Apper	ndix A -	- Recommended Fee StructureA-	1
Apper	ndix B -	Planning Application Fee SurveyB-	1

# 1. Introduction

# 1.1 Background

Planning application fees imposed by the Town of Halton Hills (Town) were last updated in 2011 for the 2012-2016 period. In 2017, Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. (Watson), was retained by the Town to assess the full costs of processing development planning applications and to make recommended changes to the Planning and Sustainability fee structure within the Town. Since the 2011 fee review, there have been changes in the Town's approval processes such as greater pre-application consultation and increased public consultation and community engagement. In addition, the Town has experienced an increase in the complexity and scale of applications including those concerning infill development. These changes have necessitated the need to re-assess the Town's planning application fees.

A planning fees review will also support the Town in determining a cost recovery budget/policy framework that balances the interest of new and existing development, and creates a pathway towards fiscal sustainability. Also, a full cost recovery fee review will ensure the Town achieves/maintains legislative compliance with Section 69 of the *Planning Act*, which established fee provisions limiting cross-subsidization of anticipated processing costs across application categories and fees. In this regard, the review will be useful in providing an evidence-based defense around any potential future planning application fee appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board (O.M.B.).

This study reviews all planning application fees, including Committee of Adjustment (C.O.A.) application fees. The primary objectives of the study are to:

- Review Town's current planning application fees and determine historical level of cost recovery;
- Determine full cost recovery fees;
- Recommend new fees and fee structure improvements that:
  - o are defensible and conform with legislation;
  - balance the Town's need to maximize cost recovery with stakeholder interests, affordability, and competitiveness;
  - o reflect industry best practices; and
  - o considers the administrative implementation of fees
- Consider implementation of additional fees for service.
Page 1-2

This technical report summarizes the legislative context for the fees review, provides in detail, the methodology utilized to assess the full costs of processing planning applications, and presents the full costs of service and recommended fee schedule.

#### 1.2 Study Process

Set out in Table 1-1 is the project work plan that has been undertaken in the review of the Town's planning fees.

Work Plan Component	Description
1. Project Initiation and Orientation	<ul> <li>Project initiation meeting with Project Team to review project scope, work plan legislative context, fee review trends, A.B.C. full cost methodology and refinements to fee categorization and service delivery</li> </ul>
2. Review Background Information	<ul> <li>Review of cost recovery policies, by-laws, 2011-2016 cost recovery performance and application patterns</li> <li>Establish municipal comparators</li> </ul>
3. Municipal Policy Research and Municipal User Fee Comparison	<ul> <li>Municipal development fee policy research regarding development fee structures and implementation policies</li> <li>Prepare municipal comparison survey for municipalities and fees identified in Task #2</li> </ul>
4. Development Fee Application Processing Effort Review	<ul> <li>Meetings with Project Team members to review and refine fee design parameters and establish costing categories</li> <li>Working sessions to review established costing categories with regard to processing distinctions by application type.</li> <li>In collaboration with Town staff, develop process maps for categories/processes established through these discussions.</li> </ul>
5. Design and Execution of Direct Staff Processing Effort Estimation	<ul> <li>Town staff conducted effort estimation workshops with participating divisions and sections to collect processing effort estimates</li> <li>Process maps were populated by Town staff and reviewed with each of the departments to establish effort estimation data reflecting established processes</li> <li>Effort estimates were examined to quantify and test overall staff capacity utilization (i.e. capacity analysis) for reasonableness</li> </ul>
6. Develop A.B.C. model to determine the full costs processes	<ul> <li>Develop Town's A.B.C. model to reflect the current cost base (i.e. 2017\$), fee costing categories, direct and indirect cost drivers, and full cost fee schedule generation</li> </ul>
7. Calculation of Full Cost Recovery Fees and Financial Impact Analysis	<ul> <li>Modeled costing results were used to generate full cost recovery fee structure options</li> <li>Full cost recovery fee structure calculated and compared to Halton Region municipal comparators in consultation with the Project Team</li> <li>Recommended fee structure developed to increase costs recovery levels while maintaining market competitiveness</li> <li>Overall financial impact and planning fee structure impact analysis was undertaken</li> </ul>

Table 1-1Planning Fees Review Study Work Plan

Work Plan Component	Description
	<ul> <li>Provided impact analysis for sample development types and for municipal comparators</li> <li>Draft fee structure and findings presented to the Town's Senior Management Team</li> </ul>
8. Draft Report	<ul><li>Preparation of Draft Report</li><li>Presentation of findings to Council</li></ul>
9. Development Industry Stakeholder Consultation	Study results presented to development industry stakeholders
9. Final Report	<ul> <li>Final Report and Proposed Fee Schedules prepared for Council consideration</li> </ul>

#### **1.3 Legislative Context for Fees Review**

The context for the fees review is framed by the statutory authority available to the Town to recover the costs of service. The *Planning Act*, 1990 governs the imposition of fees for recovery of the anticipated costs of processing planning applications. The following summarizes the provisions of this statute as it pertains to application fees.

Section 69 of the *Planning Act*, allows municipalities to impose fees through by-law for the purposes of processing planning applications. In determining the associated fees, the Act requires that:

The council of a municipality, by by-law, and a planning board, by resolution, may establish a tariff of fees for the processing of applications made in respect of planning matters, which tariff shall be designed to meet only the anticipated cost to the municipality or to a committee of adjustment or land division committee constituted by the council of the municipality or to the planning board in respect of the processing of each type of application provided for in the tariff.

Section 69 establishes many cost recovery requirements that municipalities must consider when undertaking a full cost recovery fee design study. The Act specifies that municipalities may impose fees through by-law and that the anticipated costs of such fees must be cost justified by application type as defined in the tariff of fees (e.g. Subdivision, Zoning By-Law Amendment, etc.). Given the cost justification requirements by application type, this would suggest that cross-subsidization of planning fee revenues across application types is not permissible. For instance, if Site Plan application fees were set at levels below full cost recovery for policy purposes this discount could not be funded by Subdivision application fees set at levels higher than full cost recovery. Our interpretation of the Section 69 is that any fee discount must be funded from other general revenue sources such as property taxes. The legislation further indicates that the fees may be designed to recover the "anticipated cost" of processing each type of application, reflecting the estimated costs of processing activities for an application type. This reference to anticipated costs represents a further costing requirement for a municipality. It is noted that the statutory requirement is not the actual processing costs related to any one specific application. As such, actual time docketing of staff processing effort against application categories or specific applications does not appear to be a requirement of the Act for compliance purposes. As such our methodology, which is based on staff estimates of application a reasonable approach in determining anticipated costs.

The Act does not specifically define the scope of eligible processing activities and there are no explicit restrictions to direct costs as previously witnessed in other statutes. Moreover, recent amendments to the fee provisions of the Municipal Act and Building Code Act are providing for broader recognition of indirect costs. Acknowledging that staff effort from multiple departments is involved in processing planning applications, it is our opinion that such fees may include direct costs, capital-related costs, support function costs directly related to the service provided, and general corporate overhead costs apportioned to the service provided.

The payment of *Planning Act* fees can be made under protest with appeal to the O.M.B. if the applicant believes the fees were inappropriately charged or are unreasonable. The O.M.B. will hear such an appeal and determine if the appeal should be dismissed or direct the municipality to refund payment in such amount as determined by the Board. These provisions confirm that fees imposed under the *Planning Act* are always susceptible to appeal. Unlike other fees and charges (e.g. Development Charges) there is no legislated appeal period related to the timing of by-law passage, mandatory review period or public process requirements.

The *Building Better Communities and Conserving Watersheds Act, 2017* (Bill 139) received royal assent on December 12, 2017 and is anticipated to be proclaimed into force on April 3, 2018. Bill 139 fundamentally changes the planning appeal system in Ontario by introducing significant amendments to the *Planning Act* and other legislation including replacing the O.M.B. with the Local Planning Act Tribunal (L.P.A.T.). At the time of writing, the proposed regulation has not yet been finalized and the new L.P.A.T. rules have not yet been published. Potential changes in legislation have not been reflected in the planning processes, and to the extent that changes are required in the underlying application review processes, the fees may need to be reconsidered.

#### Page 1-2

Moreover, once finalized, the implications of the new planning regime will need to be considered with regard to the rules surrounding appeals to planning applications.

## 2. Activity Based Costing Methodology

#### 2.1 Methodology

An Activity-Based Costing (A.B.C.) methodology, as it pertains to municipal governments, assigns an organization's resource costs through activities to the services provided to the public. Conventional municipal accounting structures are typically not well suited to the costing challenges associated with development or other service processing activities, as these accounting structures are department focussed and thereby inadequate for fully costing services with involvement from multiple Town departments. An A.B.C. approach better identifies the costs associated with the processing activities for specific user fee types and thus is an ideal method for determining full cost recovery planning application fees.

As illustrated in Figure 2-1, an A.B.C. methodology attributes processing effort and associated costs from all participating municipal departments to the appropriate planning application categories. The resource costs attributed to processing activities and application categories include direct operating costs, indirect support costs, and capital costs. Indirect support function and corporate overhead costs are allocated to direct departments according to operational cost drivers (e.g. information technology costs allocated based on the relative share of departmental personal computers supported). Once support costs have been allocated amongst direct departments, the accumulated costs (i.e. indirect, direct, and capital costs) are then distributed across the various fee categories, based on the department's direct involvement in the processing activities. The assessment of each department's direct involvement in the planning application review process is accomplished by tracking the relative shares of staff processing effort across each fee category's sequence of mapped process steps. The results of employing this costing methodology provides municipalities with a better recognition of the costs utilized in delivering fee review processes, as it acknowledges not only the direct costs of resources deployed but also the operating and capital support costs required by those resources to provide services.

The following sections of this chapter review each component of the A.B.C. methodology as it pertains to the Town's planning application fees review.

Page 2-2



#### Figure 2-1 Activity Based Costing Conceptual Cost Flow Diagram

#### 2.2 Application Category Definition

A critical component of the full cost fees review is the selection of the planning application costing categories. This is an important first step as the process design, effort estimation and subsequent costing is based on these categorization decisions. It is also important from a compliance stand point where, as noted previously, the *Planning Act* requires application fees to be cost justified by application type consistent with the categorization contained within the Town's tariff of fees. Moreover, the cost categorization process will provide insight into any differences in processing costs for each costing category within an application type, which is informative to the fee structure design exercise.

Fee categorization decisions were made using the Town's existing fee structure to guide further disaggregation of application types into costing categories for fee review purposes. Each application type was disaggregated to understand the potential differences in processing effort based on application size, location (greenfield vs. infill), development type (residential vs. industrial vs. other non-residential), and application type (new vs. revision). The fee categorization process was developed during the initial working sessions with Town staff at the outset of this review.

Given the cost justification requirements of the *Planning Act* and comments of the O.M.B. with respect to marginal costing, this level of disaggregation within application types is in direct response to the comments of the OMB and reflects an evolution in the costing methodology to exceed the statutory requirements and to better understand the factors influencing processing effort.

Summarized in Table 2-1, are the planning application fee costing categories that have been included in the Town's model and used to rationalize changes to the Town's Planning and Sustainability fee schedules.

The following explains the rationale for the major planning application categorization decisions utilized in the fee review:

- Official Plan Amendments, Zoning By-Law Amendments, Site Plan Applications, and Subdivision applications were disaggregated to consider the impact of application location (infill vs. greenfield), development type (residential vs. industrial vs. other non-residential), and application size to reflect differences in processing effort typically experienced. The differences in effort for new applications compared to revision applications was also considered;
- For Condominium applications, the size of the application was considered as well as whether the application was for draft plan approval, conversion, or common elements;
- Cost of Legal staff related to by-law and agreement preparation was considered for Site Plan, Subdivision, Condominium, and Part-lot Control Applications, as well as Pre-Servicing Agreements;
- For Minor Variance applications, processing requirements for residential vs. nonresidential development types was assessed; and
- For the majority of application types, the scope of the potential applications was also assessed by giving consideration to Minor vs. Major application types.

Table 2-1				
Planning Application Fee Types and Costing Categories				

Type         Costing Category           OPA Processing Fee - Greenfield Residential, >S0 dwelling units         OPA Processing Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, s9, 290m2 GFA / s2ha land area           OPA Processing Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, >9, 290m2 GFA / s2ha land area         OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units           OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units         OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units           OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units         OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units           OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units         DPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, sep to 50 dwelling units           ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, S9, 290m2 GFA / s2ha land area           ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, S9, 290m2 GFA / s2ha land area         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, S9, 290m2 GFA / s2ha land area           ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units           ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units           ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling u	Application	
Vot         OPA Processing Fee - Greenfield Residential, <50 dwelling units           OPA Processing Fee - Greenfield Residential, <50 dwelling units         OPA Processing Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9, 290m2 GFA / <2ha land area           OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units         OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units           OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units         OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units           OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, S50 dwelling units         OPA Processing Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area           OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units           ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area           ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units           ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units           ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units           ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater upa to 20 dapplication Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than		Costing Category
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area		
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area	0	
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area	ent	
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area	цр	
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area	Jen	
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area	Amr	
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area	an /	
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area	IPI	
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area	icia	OPA Revision
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, ≤9,290m2 GFA / ≤2ha land area         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, ≤9,290m2 GFA / ≤2ha land area         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, ≤9,290m2 GFA / ≤2ha land area         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, ≤9,290m2 GFA / ≤2ha land area         ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         ZBA Revision         Holding Removal Fee         Holding Removal Fee         Holding Removal Fee         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infi	Ъ.	Halton Region OPA Review
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling unitsZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, >9,290m2 GFA / s2ha land areaZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling unitsZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling unitsZBA Application Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, >9,290m2 GFA / s2ha land areaZBA Application Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, >9,290m2 GFA / s2ha land areaZBA Application Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, >9,290m2 GFA / s2ha land areaZBA Application Fee - SpecialDeeming By-lawTemporary Use By-lawRequest for Council Extension of Temporary UseSPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling unitsSPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, gross area up to 2 hectaresSPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectaresSPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, yoo 50 dwelling unitsSPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, gross area up to 2 hectaresSPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, gross area up to 2 hectaresSPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, gross area up to 2 hectaresSPA Application Fee -		
Year       ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional, <9,290m2 GFA / <2ha land area		
Temporary Use By-law         Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares		
Temporary Use By-law         Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares	(ZB	
Temporary Use By-law         Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares	ent	
Temporary Use By-law         Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares	цц	
Temporary Use By-law         Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares	Jen	
Temporary Use By-law         Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares	An	
Temporary Use By-law         Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares	la v	ZBA Revision
Temporary Use By-law         Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares	By-	Holding Removal Fee
Temporary Use By-law         Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares	ing	Holding Removal Fee - Special
Temporary Use By-law         Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use         SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, greater than 2 hectares	Zon	Deeming By-law
SPA Agreement         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares		Temporary Use By-law
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft. SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft. SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares		Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft. SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft. SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, gross area up to 2 hectares SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares		SPA Agreement
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares         SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares		SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectaresSPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling unitsSPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling unitsSPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectaresSPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares		SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling unitsSPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling unitsSPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling unitsSPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectaresSPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares		SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling unitsSPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling unitsSPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectaresSPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares		SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares
SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares		SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.
SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares	us	SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.
SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares	Pla	SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units
SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 2 hectares		SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units
		SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares
SPA Application Fee - Infill Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.		
SPA Revision		
Extension Fee		

# Table 2-1 (Cont'd)Planning Application Fee Types and Costing Categories

Application				
Туре	Costing Category			
	SUB Agreement			
	SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units			
	SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units			
	SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 10 hectares			
Ś	SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 10 hectares			
Subdivision (SUB) Fees	SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.			
(Bl	SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.			
(SL	SUB Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units			
ion	SUB Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units			
livis	SUB Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 5 hectares			
npq	SUB Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area greater than 5 hectares			
Ñ	SUB Application Fee - Infill Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.			
	SUB Application Fee - Infill Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.			
	SUB Reivision			
	SUB Ext. of Draft Approval			
	SUB Admimistrative Final Approval			
	Condo Agreement			
Ę	Condominium Minor, up to 50 buildable lots/blocks or units or applies to a gross area up to 2 hectares			
Condominium Minor, up to 50 buildable lots/blocks or units or applies to a gross area up to 2 hectares Condominium Major, greater than 50 buildable lots/blocks or units or applies to a gross area greater than 2 h Condominium Conversion or Exemption Condominium Common Element				
hom	Condominium Conversion or Exemption			
ouc	Condominium Common Element			
Ŭ	Condominium Revision			
	Condominium Ext. of Draft Approval			
cB)- CB)	PLC By-Law Preparation			
Part Lot ontrol By w (PLCB	PLCB Application Fee, up to 50 buildable lots/block or units or applies to a gross area up to 5 hectares			
Part Lot Control By- law (PLCB) Fees	PLCB Major Application Fee, greater than 50 buildable lots/block or units or applies to a gross area greater than 5 hectares			
0 <u>~</u>	PLCB Extension			
ses	Consent Application Fee (1 lot)			
it Fe	Consent Application Fee (Multiple lots)			
sen	Consent Application Fee (Lot Line Adjustment, Easement)			
Consent Fees	Consent Revision			
	Consent Post Approval (Certification)			
Minor Variance	Minor Variance Application Fee			
Mi Vari	Minor Variance - Minor Residential Application fee			

#### 2.3 Processing Effort Cost Allocation

To capture each participating Town staff member's relative level of effort in processing planning applications, process templates were prepared for each of the above-referenced application costing categories. The process templates were generated using sample templates based on processes in neighboring municipalities and then refined and modified to reflect the planning application review process as it occurs in the Town.

The individual process maps were populated by Town staff in internal working sessions. The effort estimates used reflect the level of involvement by participating staff within each department on processing activities.

Annual processing effort per staff position was compared with available processing capacity to determine overall service levels. Subsequent to this initial capacity analysis, working sessions were held with the Town staff to further define the scope and nature of various departments' involvement in planning application fee review activities to reflect current staff utilization levels. These refinements provided for the recognition of efforts within the planning application fees review ancillary to direct processing tasks, i.e. departmental support activities and management and application oversight activities by departmental senior management. Effort related to planning policy and special projects related to planning applications were not included in the definition of planning application processing activities.

The capacity utilization results are critical to the full cost recovery fee review because the associated resourcing costs follow the activity generated effort of each participating staff member into the identified planning application fee categories. As such, considerable time and effort was spent ensuring the reasonableness of the capacity utilization results. The overall departmental fee recovery levels underlying the calculations are provided in Chapter 3 of this report.

#### 2.4 Direct Costs

Direct costs refer to the employee costs (salaries and wages, employer contributions), stationery and office supplies, and consulting and professional fees that are typically consumed by directly involved departments. Based on the results of the resource capacity analysis summarized above, the proportionate share of each individual's direct costs is allocated to the respective fee categories. The direct costs included in the Town's costing model are taken from the Town's 2017 budget (subsequently indexed to

Page 2-7

2018\$ using the Town's 2018 cost of living increase of 3% and includes cost components such as:

- Labour Costs, e.g. salary, wages and benefits;
- Insurance Costs;
- Communication Costs;
- Hardware and Software Maintenance Costs;
- Utility Costs;
- Repairs and Maintenance Costs; and
- Materials, Supplies and Other Services.

It should be noted that transfers to reserves (reserve funds) and transfers to capital have been excluded from the direct service costs, as these reflect financing costs. Moreover, capital costs have been provided for separately within the analysis.

Based on the modelling results, the following departments have direct participation in the review and approval of planning applications.

- Planning and Sustainability
- Building;
- Engineering;
- Office of the CAO;
- Finance;
- Corporate Communications;
- Fire Services; and
- Recreation and Parks;

#### 2.5 Indirect Cost Functions and Cost Drivers

An A.B.C. review includes both the direct service cost of providing service activities as well as the indirect support costs that allow direct service departments to perform these functions. The method of allocation employed in this analysis is referred to as a stepdown costing approach. Under this approach, support function and general corporate overhead functions are classified separate from direct service delivery departments. These indirect cost functions are then allocated to direct service delivery departments based on a set of cost drivers, which subsequently flow to planning application fee categories according to staff effort estimates. Cost drivers are a unit of service that best represent the consumption patterns of indirect support and corporate overhead services by direct service delivery departments. As such, the relative share of a cost driver (units of service consumed) for a direct department determines the relative share of support/corporate overhead costs attributed to that direct service department. An example of a cost driver commonly used to allocate information technology support costs would be a department's share of supported personal computers. Cost drivers are used for allocation purposes acknowledging that these departments do not typically participate directly in the development review process, but that their efforts facilitate services being provided by the Town's direct departments.

The indirect support and corporate overhead cost drivers used in the fees model reflects accepted practices within the municipal sector by municipalities of similar characteristics.

#### 2.6 Capital Costs

The inclusion of capital costs within the full cost planning application fees calculations follow a methodology similar to indirect costs. The annual replacement value of assets commonly utilized to provide direct department services has been included to reflect capital costs of service. The replacement value approach determines the annual asset replacement value over the expected useful life of the respective assets. This reflects the annual depreciation of the asset over its useful life based on current asset replacement values using a sinking fund approach. This annuity is then allocated across all fee categories based on the capacity utilization of direct departments.

The annual replacement contribution applied for facility space is \$4.84/square foot. This information derived from the Town's 2017 Development Charges Background Study. The capital replacement costs of staff work stations that would be in addition to facility replacement costs was also considered. The annual replacement contribution applied for work stations was \$406 per work station. These annual capital costs estimates were then allocated to the fee categories based on resource capacity utilization.

## 3. Planning Application Fees Review

#### 3.1 Staff Capacity Utilization Results

The planning application review process considered within this assessment involves to varying degrees, staff from multiple departments across the organization. The planning application processing effort estimates in this report reflect the Town's current business processes, 2011-2016 average application volumes, and staffing allocation patterns currently in place across Town departments. Moreover, the processing effort estimates were developed with regard to the typical application types within the 2011-2016 period.

Table 3-1 summarizes the staff capacity utilization and number of full time equivalent (F.T.E.) positions attributable to planning application processes. Currently, planning application processes consume approximately 13 F.T.E.s annually across the organization.

	No. of	Staff Utilization	
Department	Staff	%	FTE
Planning & Sustainability	19	47.9%	9.09
Building	17.25	0.7%	0.12
Engineering	21	11.7%	2.46
Office of the CAO	15	3.6%	0.54
Finance	21	0.3%	0.06
Corporate Communications	2	1.4%	0.03
Fire Services	22	0.2%	0.04
Recreation and Parks	7	6.3%	0.44
Total			12.78

 Table 3-1

 Planning Application Resource Utilization by Department (in F.T.E.)

The following observations are provided based on the results of the capacity analysis presented in Table 3-1:

 On average approximately 48% of all available staff resources within the Planning & Sustainability department are fully consumed processing planning applications. Staff from this department provide the largest amount of effort to planning applications within the Town at 71% of the overall involvement. This level of planning recovery is comparable with levels of participation in other Greater Toronto Area (G.T.A.) municipalities, reflecting a significant amount of non-planning application processing effort provided by planning departments for corporate management, policy initiatives, O.M.B. appeals, and public information tasks.

- Engineering Services provides the second largest allocation of staff resources (2.5 F.T.E.s) to planning application review, accounting for 12% of their available staff resources. Staff from the Engineering department provide 19% of the overall planning application review process.
- There are a number of other Town departments such as Recreation and Parks and the Building department that individually provide relatively small allotments of effort to planning application review. In aggregate, these other departments contribute 1.2 F.T.E.s or 10% of the overall effort.

#### 3.2 Planning Application Type Impacts

As presented in the introduction, the *Planning Act* requires fees to be cost justified at the application type level. Moreover, recent O.M.B. decisions require that there is consideration given to the marginal costs of processing applications of varying size and complexity. In this regard, planning application review processes have been costed at the application type and sub-type level. This level of analysis goes beyond the statutory requirements of cost justification by application type to better understand costing distinctions at the application sub-type level to provide the basis for more a more defensible fee structure and fee design decisions. Application costs reflect the organizational direct, indirect and capital costs based on 2017 budget estimates, indexed to 2018\$ values. Table 3-2, summarizes the per application processing costs compared with per application fees currently charged by the Town in 2018.

# Table 3-2Planning Fees Modelling Impacts by Application Sub-Type (2018\$)

	Cost	2018	Cost
Application Type and Costing Category	per	Application	Recovery
	Application	Fees	%
Official Plan Amendment (OPA)			75
OPA Processing Fee - Greenfield Residential, ≤50 dwelling units	69,054	22,846	33%
OPA Processing Fee - Greenfield Residential, >50 dwelling units	69,054	22,846	33%
OPA Processing Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional,	,		
≤9,290m2 GFA / ≤2ha land area	69,054	22,846	33%
OPA Processing Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional,			
>9,290m2 GFA / >2ha land area	69,054	22,846	33%
OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, ≤50 dwelling units	83,600	22,846	27%
OPA Processing Fee - Infill Residential, >50 dwelling units	83,600	22,846	27%
OPA Processing Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional,			
≤9,290m2 GFA / ≤2ha land area	69,348	22,846	33%
OPA Processing Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional,			
>9,290m2 GFA / >2ha land area	69,356	22,846	33%
OPA Revision	26,748	19,057	71%
Halton Region OPA Review	3,365	9,070	270%
Zoning By-Law Amendment (ZPA)		-	0%
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units	45,030	19,746	44%
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling			
units	45,166	19,746	44%
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional,			
≤9,290m2 GFA / ≤2ha land area	44,894	19,746	44%
ZBA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial/Commercial/Institutional,			
>9,290m2 GFA / >2ha land area	45,030	19,746	44%
ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units	67,935	19,746	29%
ZBA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units	68,074	19,746	29%
ZBA Application Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional,			
≤9,290m2 GFA / ≤2ha land area	67,935	19,746	29%
ZBA Application Fee - Infill Industrial/Commercial/Institutional,			
>9,290m2 GFA / >2ha land area	68,074	19,746	29%
ZBA Revision	21,470	16,187	75%
Holding Removal Fee	14,516	5,166	36%
Holding Removal Fee - Special	18,732	574	3%
Deeming By-law	4,012	2,296	57%
Temporary Use By-law	43,775	12,284	28%
Request for Council Extension of Temporary Use	29,637	5,396	18%

# Table 3-2 (Cont'd)Planning Fees Modelling Impacts by Application Sub-Type (2018\$)

Application Type and Costing Category	Cost per Application	2018 Application Fees	Cost Recovery %
Site Plan Application (SPA)			
SPA Agreement	5,114	4,707	92%
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units	49,035	12,284	25%
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling			
units	61,316	43,625	71%
hectares	47,422	12,284	26%
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 2			
hectares	60,384	43,625	72%
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial,			
gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.	47,422	12,284	26%
SPA Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial,			
gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.	60,384	43,625	72%
SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units	54,574	12,284	23%
SPA Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units	67,520	43,625	65%
SPA Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 2 hectares	51,267	12,284	24%
hectares	61,169	43,625	71%
SPA Application Fee - Infill Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross	- ,		
floor area up to 100,000 sg.ft.	51,267	12,284	24%
SPA Application Fee - Infill Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross	,		
floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.	61,169	43,625	71%
SPA Revision	10,381	9,644	93%
Extension Fee	1,121	1,033	92%
Subdivision (SUB)		-	
SUB Agreement	29,818	6,314	21%
SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, up to 50 dwelling units	171,998	43,739	25%
SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Residential, greater than 50 dwelling			
units	198,935	62,107	31%
SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area up to 10			
hectares	109,057	43,739	40%
SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Industrial, gross area greater than 10			
hectares	109,057	62,107	57%
SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial,			
gross floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.	109,057	43,739	40%
SUB Application Fee - Greenfield Non-Residential, Non-Industrial,			
gross floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.	109,057	62,107	57%
SUB Application Fee - Infill Residential, up to 50 dwelling units	181,112	43,739	24%
SUB Application Fee - Infill Residential, greater than 50 dwelling units	209,702	62,107	30%
SUB Application Fee - Infill Industrial, gross area up to 5 hectares	119,426	43,739	37%
hectares	119,426	62,107	52%
SUB Application Fee - Infill Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross		,	
floor area up to 100,000 sq.ft.	119,426	43,739	37%
SUB Application Fee - Infill Non-Residential, Non-Industrial, gross		-,	
floor area greater than 100,000 sq.ft.	119,609	62,107	52%
SUB Revision	32,081	28,586	89%
SUB Ext. of Draft Approval	3,671	1,033	28%
SUB Administrative Final Approval	1,335	2,870	215%

## Table 3-2 (Cont'd)Planning Fees Modelling Impacts by Application Sub-Type (2018\$)

Application Type and Costing Category	Cost per	2018 Application	Cost Recovery %
Condominium (CDM)	Application	Fees	70
Condo Agreement	26,394	6,314	24%
Condominium Minor, up to 50 buildable lots/blocks or units or	20,394	0,314	24/0
applies to a gross area up to 2 hectares	45,947	24,452	53%
Condominium Major, greater than 50 buildable lots/blocks or units or	43,347	24,432	55/6
applies to a gross area greater than 2 hectares	46,621	43,510	93%
Condominium Conversion or Exemption	31,025	20,779	67%
Condominium Common Element	26,589	20,779	92%
	13,521	22,386	166%
Condominium Ext. of Draft Approval	3,344	4,133	124%
Part Lot Control By-Law (PLCB)	5,544	4,155	0%
PLC By-Law Preparation	1,800	- 1,837	102%
PLCB Application Fee, up to 50 buildable lots/block or units or applies	1,800	1,057	102%
to a gross area up to 5 hectares	6,630	5,970	90%
5	0,050	5,970	90%
PLCB Major Application Fee, greater than 50 buildable lots/block or	C 7C2	C 774	100%
units or applies to a gross area greater than 5 hectares	6,763	6,774 689	
PLCB Extension	3,140		22%
Consent	14.022	-	0%
Consent Application Fee (1 lot)	14,022	9,758	70%
Consent Application Fee (Multiple lots)	14,539	9,758	67%
Consent Application Fee (Lot Line Adjustment, Easement)	16,134	4,707	29%
Consent Revision	2,729	1,891	69%
Consent Post Approval (Certification)	368	2,755	749%
Minor Variance		-	
Minor Variance Application Fee	8,218	4,936	60%
Minor Variance - Minor Residential Application fee	7,973	2,870	36%

As presented in Table 3-2, almost all planning application fees are recovering less than the average costs of processing. Table 3-3 summarizes the direct, indirect, and capital costs by application type and the cost recovery percentage after netting out the cost related to development agreements (costs recovered through separate fees). The overall recovery levels are based on the weighted average annual historical application volumes over the 2011-2016 period. Current application fees are on average recovering 40% of the annual costs of service

	Annual Costs		Less:				
						Net Modelled	
				Annual Costs		Revenue	
		Indirect &		(Development	Net Annual	(Current 2018	% Cost
Application Type	Direct	Capital	Total	Agreements)	Costs	Fees)	Recovery
Condominium	33,256	17,791	51,047	18,124	32,924	18,178	55%
Consent	96,780	24,667	121,447		121,447	76,188	63%
H Removal	70,476	14,593	85,069		85,069	23,534	28%
Minor Variance	144,969	35,057	180,026		180,026	80,625	45%
Official Plan Amendment	80,891	16,431	97,322		97,322	30,692	32%
Part Lot Control By-Law	8,128	3,186	11,315	2,399	8,915	8,285	93%
Site Plan	653,051	157,568	810,619	65,629	744,989	285,554	38%
Subdivision	484,941	127,469	612,410	101,878	510,531	205,651	40%
Zoning By-Law Amendment	157,863	32,985	190,848		190,848	67,046	35%
Total	1,730,354	429,748	2,160,102	188,031	1,972,071	795,753	40%

Table 3-3Planning Fees Modelling Impacts by Application Type

#### 3.3 Rate Structure Analysis

Fee structure recommendations were developed in regard to the cost and revenue impacts presented in Tables 3-2 and 3-3. The recommended fee structure seeks to align the recovery of processing costs to application characteristics to balance *Planning Act* compliance, applicant benefits and municipal revenue certainty. The recommended fee structure, which is presented in 2018\$ values has been developed to increase cost recovery levels while being consistent with industry best practices and comparable to those of Halton Region area municipalities. The Town currently imposes a flat per application fee for all planning application fees. Although the costing categories examined the difference in costs between applications occurring in greenfield vs. infill areas, it was determined that the average cost by area would be assessed in the design of fees to reflect affordability concerns and to consider the administrative process of imposition. For most application types, the recommended fee structure includes a base fee and variable fee in recognition of the decreasing marginal costs of processing.

Table 3-4 displays the cost recovery levels by major application type based on the recommended fee structure. The fee structure recommendations are anticipated to increase overall planning application cost recovery performance from 40% currently to 71% (based on average historical application volumes and typical size characteristics) or an increase in revenue of 75%. Within the overall cost recovery levels, the performance by application types varies between 33% for H Removal and full cost recovery for Condominium and Part Lot Control By-law applications. This variation is related to the average application processing costs and considerations for affordability and competitiveness.

Table 3-4
<b>Recommended Fee Structure Impacts by Application Type</b>

· · · · · -	% Cost
Application Type	Recovery
Condominium	100%
Consent	80%
H Removal	33%
Minor Variance	48%
Official Plan Amendment	62%
Part Lot Control By-Law	100%
Site Plan	81%
Subdivision	61%
Zoning By-Law Amendment	83%
Total	71%

A summary of the recommended changes to fee structure is provided in section 3.3.1, while the complete fee schedule is provided in Appendix A.

#### 3.3.1 Fee Structure Recommendations

#### Official Plan Amendment

For Official Plan Amendments (O.P.A.), currently the Town typically imposes a base fee of \$22,846 depending on the scope of the application. Based on the results of the A.B.C. model, this application would cost on average \$73,000 to process.

Fee Recommendations

- Impose base fee of \$22,846 plus:
  - Implement a declining block rate structure for the variable portion of both residential and non-residential application fees to reflect the decreasing marginal cost of processing applications;
- Revision fee to be calculated as 37% of the full application fee (\$8,959 minimum); and
- Decrease the Halton Region O.P.A. Town Review fee to \$3,366

#### Zoning By-law Amendment

Zoning By-law Amendment (Z.B.A.) applications are generally under recovering costs of processing. Smaller applications that would be charged the Minor and/or Technical fee have a lower level of cost recovery (17-25%) when compared to larger applications which would be imposed the full application fee (29-44%). Holding Removal applications are recovering 29% of costs, while Holding Removal applications charged the "special" fee are recovering only 3% of costs. Temporary Use fees are recovering between 18-28% of total costs.

As a result, the proposed fee structure proposed to maintain a similar entry point for smaller applications by maintaining the Minor and/or Technical fee and setting the base fee for full Z.B.A. applications at the same level as the current fee (\$19,746). Consistent with fee structures in Halton Region and throughout the G.T.A., the recommended fee structure includes declining block variable fees for residential and non-residential development.

#### Fee Recommendations

- Maintain fee for Minor and/or Technical application fee of \$11,365;
- Impose base fee of \$19,746 for full applications and introduce declining block rate structure for residential and non-residential applications;
- Change Z.B.A. Revision fees to 40% of full application fees (\$7,807 minimum);
- Maintain Holding Removal fees at current levels; and
- Increase the fee for Temporary Use or Deeming By-law to the same level as the Z.B.A. base fee (\$19,746)

#### Site Plan Applications

The Town currently charges three Site Plan Application (S.P.A.) fees: \$8,945 for minor applications, \$12,284 for applications less than 50 units or 100,000 sq.ft. or gross floor area G.F.A.), and \$43,625 for applications greater than 50 units or 100,000 sq.ft of G.F.A.). Consistent with industry best practices, the proposed fee structure includes base and declining block variable fees to provide the Town with a greater level of cost recovery while providing consideration for affordability and the decreasing marginal costs of processing.

#### Fee Recommendations

• Maintain fee for Minor applications fee of \$8,954;

Page 3-9

- Impose a base fee for all other S.P.A.s at the level of the current fee for applications of less than 50 units or 100,000 sq.ft of G.F.A. of \$12,284;
- For applications not defined as Minor, introduce declining block rate structure for residential and non-residential applications; and
- Change S.P.A. Revision fees to 20% of full application fees (\$5,127 minimum)

#### Plan of Subdivision

The current fees for Plan of Subdivision applications is \$24,224 for minor applications, \$43,739 for applications less than 50 buildable lots/block or units or 5 hectares of gross area, and \$62,107 for applications proposing to develop more than 50 buildable lots/block or units or 5 hectares of gross area. Consistent with the recommendations for other application types, the fee structure revisions for Subdivision applications have been designed to have consideration for affordability and the fee structures imposed in other Halton Region municipalities.

#### Fee Recommendations

- Impose base for all minor and non-minor applications of \$24,224;
- For non-minor applications, impose a declining per residential unit and per nonresidential hectare fee; and
- Charge one Subdivision revision fee of 23% of full application fees (\$2,526 minimum)

#### Plan of Condominium

The Town currently charges flat application fees for Draft Plan of Condominium, Condominium Conversion, and Condominium Common Element of between \$20,779 and \$43,510. Based on the A.B.C. results shown in Table 3-2, which indicate that the costs to process these different types of applications are similar, regardless of size, the recommended fee structure seeks to align the application fees among the different types of condominium applications for greater cost recover and administrative ease.

#### Fee Recommendations

- Impose fee of \$28,051 for Draft Plan of Condominium applications, Condominium Conversion applications, and Condominium Common Element Condominium applications; and
- Revise Condominium Revisions application fee to be 35% of full application fees (\$7,003 minimum)

#### Part Lot Control By-law

Part Lot Control By-law applications are recovering close to the full costs of processing (93%), and as such, only minor changes to the fee structure are proposed to improve cost recovery by sub-type. The fee structure recommendations include imposing one application fee in place of the disaggregated application fee for applications greater or less that 50 units and increasing the Extension fee from \$689 to \$1,340.

#### <u>Consent</u>

The Town currently charges Consent application fees for standard applications, Minor applications, Lot Line Adjustments and Easements, Revisions to Consent applications, and Post Approval Certification. With the exception of the fee for Post Approval Certification and Minor applications for which there is no increase recommended, Consent application fees are proposed to increase moderately.

#### Fee Recommendations

- Increase Consent application fee to \$10,000;
- Increased the Consent Revision fee to \$2,729; and
- Maintain minor application and Post Approval Certification fees at current rates

#### <u>Minor Variance</u>

The Minor Variance fees imposed by the Town currently are \$2,870 for minor residential applications and \$4,936 for all other Minor Variance applications. Minor Variance applications within the Town are recovering between 36-6% of the full costs of processing. Having regard for affordability and competitiveness, no changes have been recommended to the fee Minor Residential applications. The fee for other Minor Variance applications is recommended to increase from \$4,936 to \$5,750.

#### **Combined Applications**

In developing the recommended fee structure, the Town has also given consideration to total processing effort related reviewing Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Subdivision applications received concurrently. Compared to when these types of applications are received in separately, there are certain activities that only need to be undertaken once when received in combination (e.g. application intake and circulation). To recognize these processing efficiencies and the types of fee structures imposed in Halton Region area municipalities, the recommended fee structure includes reductions to the base application fees that would be imposed on these applications if received separately.

Fee Recommendations

- Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications received concurrently Full Official Plan Amendment application fee plus Zoning By-law Amendment application base fee;
- Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision applications received concurrently – Full Subdivision application fee plus 75% of Zoning By-law application base fee; and
- Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, and Subdivision applications received concurrently – Full Subdivision application fee plus Official Plan Amendment application base fee and 75% of Zoning By-law application base fee

# 4. Impact Analysis of Recommended Fee Structure

In order to understand the impacts of the recommended planning application fee structure recommendations, an impact analysis for sample developments has been prepared. Comparison graphs for planning application only, are provided in Appendix B.

#### 4.1 Impact Analysis

Three development types have been considered, including:

- Official Plan Amendment, Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for a residential subdivision of 100 single detached units;
- Site Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for a retail building of 1,000 sq.mt.; and
- Site Plan application for an industrial building of 30,000 sq.mt.

In addition to providing the fee impacts for the Tow of Halton Hills, Tables 4-1 through 4-3 provide development fee comparisons for selected municipalities, highlighting the positions of the Halton Region area municipalities. The development fee comparison includes planning application fees, building permit fees and development charges for each of the three development types. The comparison illustrates the impacts of the planning application fee structure recommendations in the context of the total development fees payable to provide a broader context for the fee considerations.

# 4.1.1 Residential Single Detached (100 units) – Official Plan Amendment, Plan of Subdivision, and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications (Table 4-1)

A 100-unit single detached residential subdivision in the Town of Halton Hills would pay \$360 per unit in Official Plan Amendment fees, \$975 per unit in Subdivision fees, and \$159 per unit in Zoning By-law Amendment fees under the Town's current fee structure.

Under the recommended fee structure, Official Plan Amendment fees would increase to \$440 per unit (+22%) Subdivision fees would increase to \$1,021 per unit (+5%). Zoning By-law Amendment fees would increase by 0.6% or \$1/unit because of the application of the Town's proposed fee policy for combined applications. Including building permit fees and development charges, total development fees for this type of applicant would increase by 0.2% from \$53,577/unit to \$53,702/unit. The Town of would maintain their

position at 7<sup>th</sup> out of the 16 municipalities surveyed, lower than the Town of Oakville and Town of Milton, yet higher than the City of Burlington.

Table 4-1Development Fee Impacts Survey for a Residential Subdivision (100 Single<br/>Detached Units

		Of	ficial Plan		Plan of	Zon	ing By-Law	E	Building	De	velopment		Planning Fees -
Rank	Municipality	Am	endment	Su	bdivision		• •		rmit Fees		Charges	Total	% of Total
1	Toronto, City of	\$	55,707	\$	245,510	\$	124,542	\$	324,052	\$	8,970,000	\$ 9,719,810	4.4%
2	Mississauga, City of	\$	48,986	\$	65,561	\$	121,750	\$	305,651	\$	8,526,608	\$ 9,068,557	2.6%
3	Brampton, City of	\$	30,888	\$	93,510	\$	9,571	\$	219,809	\$	8,536,465	\$ 8,890,242	1.5%
4	Oakville, Town of	\$	45,694	\$	72,262	\$	19,400	\$	307,509	\$	5,866,630	\$ 6,311,495	2.2%
5	Whitby, Town of	\$	53,711	\$	77,036	\$	10,869	\$	223,897	\$	5,305,700	\$ 5,671,212	2.5%
6	Milton, Town of	\$	39,754	\$	83,003	\$	14,310	\$	215,535	\$	5,243,430	\$ 5,596,032	2.4%
7	Halton Hills, Town of - Proposed	\$	43,965	\$	102,080	\$	15,779	\$	315,871	\$	4,892,530	\$ 5,370,224	3.0%
8	Halton Hills, Town of - Current	\$	36,026	\$	97,463	\$	15,876	\$	315,871	\$	4,892,530	\$ 5,357,766	2.8%
9	Oshawa, City of	\$	40,883	\$	25,911	\$	5,068	\$	242,291	\$	4,785,200	\$ 5,099,354	1.4%
10	Ajax, Town of	\$	68,447	\$	61,017	\$	24,947	\$	204,387	\$	4,718,200	\$ 5,076,997	3.0%
11	Pickering, City of	\$	52,333	\$	50,183	\$	16,583	\$	232,258	\$	4,544,400	\$ 4,895,758	2.4%
12	Burlington, City of	\$	35,902	\$	116,358	\$	14,903	\$	301,583	\$	4,219,930	\$ 4,688,676	3.6%
13	Hamilton, City of	\$	19,040	\$	44,183	\$	17,509	\$	279,267	\$	3,933,700	\$ 4,293,698	1.9%
14	Vaughan, City of	\$	95,061	\$	108,194	\$	39,931	\$	211,819	\$	3,750,600	\$ 4,205,605	5.8%
15	Markham, City of	\$	103,980	\$	303,470	\$	37,510	\$	294,317	\$	3,242,599	\$ 3,981,876	11.2%
16	Ottawa, City of	\$	18,227	\$	71,828	\$	15,215	\$	14,493	\$	3,536,400	\$ 3,656,163	2.9%
17	Richmond Hill, Town of	\$	103,257	\$	66,189	\$	14,182	\$	261,987	\$	3,034,900	\$ 3,480,515	5.3%

# 4.1.2 Retail Building (1,000 sq.mt.) - Site Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications (Table 4-2)

The current planning fees for this retail development would be \$38,801 (\$18,086 Site Plan and \$20,715 Zoning By-law Amendment). Imposing the recommended fee structure would increase the charge by 12% (\$4,347) to \$43,148 (\$21,183 Site Plan and \$21,965 Zoning By-law Amendment).

The impact of the recommended fee structure option on total development fees payable, including development charges and building permit fees, would result in a 1% increase. Planning fees currently comprise 8.6% of total development fees and would increase to 9.5% based on the recommended fee structure. The Town would maintain its competitive position in the mid range of the Halton Region area municipalities as well as the broader sample of municipalities.

	Development i ee		pacis	Oui	vey or	••	000 30	1	it ivetaii	<u>veiopii</u>	
Rank	Municipality	Site Plan		Zoning By-Law Amendment			uilding mit Fees		velopment Charges	Total	Planning Fees - % of Total
1	Markham, City of	\$	24,880	\$	37,510	\$	14,880	\$	572,150	\$ 649,420	9.6%
2	Richmond Hill, Town of	\$	18,849	\$	14,182	\$	15,100	\$	523,650	\$ 571,781	5.8%
3	Toronto, City of	\$	24,782	\$	45,250	\$	19,200	\$	459,158	\$ 548,390	12.8%
4	Vaughan, City of	\$	20,006	\$	10,492	\$	14,000	\$	498,300	\$ 542,798	5.6%
5	Oakville, Town of	\$	18,766	\$	26,134	\$	23,060	\$	450,859	\$ 518,819	8.7%
6	Burlington, City of	\$	8,698	\$	21,894	\$	22,650	\$	460,729	\$ 513,971	6.0%
7	Halton Hills, Town of - Proposed	\$	21,183	\$	21,965	\$	16,100	\$	396,139	\$ 455,387	9.5%
8	Halton Hills, Town of - Current	\$	18,086	\$	20,715	\$	16,100	\$	396,139	\$ 451,040	8.6%
9	Milton, Town of	\$	9,567	\$	15,600	\$	10,620	\$	412,759	\$ 448,546	5.6%
10	Mississauga, City of	\$	25,801	\$	54,350	\$	17,240	\$	328,626	\$ 426,017	18.8%
11	Brampton, City of	\$	6,080	\$	10,297	\$	16,320	\$	325,460	\$ 358,157	4.6%
12	Whitby, Town of	\$	16,747	\$	15,661	\$	13,920	\$	252,689	\$ 299,017	10.8%
13	Oshawa, City of	\$	5,854	\$	10,506	\$	15,070	\$	244,709	\$ 276,139	5.9%
14	Hamilton, City of	\$	11,515	\$	23,345	\$	16,470	\$	222,488	\$ 273,818	12.7%
15	Ottawa, City of	\$	19,358	\$	15,215	\$	830	\$	236,160	\$ 271,563	12.7%
16	Ajax, Town of	\$	9,108	\$	24,980	\$	13,000	\$	207,419	\$ 254,507	13.4%
17	Pickering, City of	\$	7,650	\$	16,625	\$	10,000	\$	185,785	\$ 220,060	11.0%

Table 4-2Development Fee Impacts Survey of 1,000 sq.mt Retail Development

#### 4.1.3 Industrial Building (30,000 sq.mt.) - Site Plan Application (Table 4-3)

The current planning fees for an industrial site plan of 30,000 sq.mt. would be \$49,427. Imposing the recommended fee structure would result in a fee of \$77,593 or an increase of \$28,166 (+58%). Measuring the impact including building permit fees and development charges, the total input development application costs would increase by 0.7%. Moreover, planning application fees as percentage of total development fees payable would increase from 1.2% to 1.8%. Under this recommendation the Town's position relative to the comparator municipalities would remain unchanged at 13<sup>th</sup> out of 16 municipalities. For this development type, the Town's total development fees would be less than that in all Halton Region area municipalities.

	Developilient Fee Ini	pa		maust	iiu	Dununi	0,000 34	
Rank	Municipality	Site Plan		uilding mit Fees		evelopment Charges	Total	Planning Fees - % of Total
1	Markham, City of	\$	131,310	\$ 364,800	\$	10,201,976	\$ 10,698,086	1.2%
2	Richmond Hill, Town of	\$	18,849	\$ 414,000	\$	8,056,496	\$ 8,489,345	0.2%
3	Mississauga, City of	\$	69,990	\$ 376,000	\$	7,825,278	\$ 8,271,268	0.8%
4	Vaughan, City of	\$	21,029	\$ 285,000	\$	7,847,996	\$ 8,154,025	0.3%
5	Oakville, Town of	\$	197,696	\$ 432,850	\$	6,678,630	\$ 7,309,176	2.7%
6	Brampton, City of	\$	6,258	\$ 337,800	\$	6,039,300	\$ 6,383,358	0.1%
7	Burlington, City of	\$	47,268	\$ 206,157	\$	5,634,330	\$ 5,887,755	0.8%
8	Whitby, Town of	\$	64,613	\$ 299,700	\$	5,308,170	\$ 5,672,483	1.1%
9	Ajax, Town of	\$	32,988	\$ 270,000	\$	5,360,370	\$ 5,663,358	0.6%
10	Pickering, City of	\$	15,550	\$ 255,000	\$	4,711,364	\$ 4,981,914	0.3%
11	Milton, Town of	\$	38,067	\$ 212,400	\$	4,295,730	\$ 4,546,197	0.8%
12	Hamilton, City of	\$	11,515	\$ 346,800	\$	4,162,404	\$ 4,520,719	0.3%
13	Halton Hills, Town of - Proposed	\$	77,593	\$ 294,090	\$	3,830,430	\$ 4,202,113	1.8%
14	Halton Hills, Town of - Current	\$	49,427	\$ 294,090	\$	3,830,430	\$ 4,173,947	1.2%
15	Oshawa, City of	\$	5,854	\$ 262,796	\$	3,749,070	\$ 4,017,720	0.1%
16	Ottawa, City of	\$	21,509	\$ 19,500	\$	3,374,486	\$ 3,415,495	0.6%
17	Toronto, City of	\$	229,232	\$ 430,500	\$	303,542	\$ 963,275	23.8%

 Table 4-3

 Development Fee Impacts for an Industrial Building (30,000 sq.mt.)

#### 4.2 Impact Analysis Summary

Based on the survey results, the recommended fees produce development fees greater than those provided under the current fee structure. However, the Town's ranking amongst the municipal comparators remains unchanged, and for the most part below that of the other Halton Region area municipalities. Finally, while the total planning impacts are significant in the case of the industrial development type surveyed, for each development type when measured on a total development cost basis, including building permits and development charges, the overall cost impacts are nominal (0.2% to 1% crease).

## 5. Conclusions

#### 5.1 Conclusions

Summarized in this technical report is the legislative context for the planning application fees review, the methodology undertaken, A.B.C. results and full cost of service, and fee structure recommendations. In developing the recommended fee structure, careful consideration was given affordability, market competitiveness, and to the recent trends pertaining to planning fees, including recent comments of the O.M.B. concerning planning application fees.

The recommendations of the planning application fees review have been designed to provide the Town with a recommended fee structure for Council's consideration to increase the planning application cost recovery levels by recovering the service costs from benefiting parties. The municipality will ultimately determine the level of cost recovery and phasing strategy that is suitable for their objectives.

## **Appendix A – Recommended Fee Structure**

#### Town of Halton Hills Planning Fees Review Study Recommended Fee Schedule

Full OPA application fee r												
Full OPA application fee r	Full ORA application fee plus ZRA application base fee											
Full OPA application fee plus ZBA application base fee												
Full SUB application fee plus 75% of ZBA application base fee												
												Full SLIB application fee plus ODA application base fee and 75% of 704 application base fee
Full SUB application lee plus OPA application base lee and 75% of ZBA application base fee												
			Recommen	ded Fees								
	le Fee											
-		Per Reside	ential Unit	Varias	r	ential Hecta	are					
Base Fee	0-25	26-100		201-1.000	0-1	1-10	10-20					
						-						
22,846	120	100	80	70	6,000	3,000	1,500	750				
					,	,	,					
4,707												
270/ of full on all action												
iees (\$8,959 minimum)												
3,365												
2 356												
2,330												
Recommended Fees												
	Variable Fee											
		Per Reside	ential Unit		Per	are						
Base Fee	0-25	26-100	101-200	201-1,000	0-1	1-10	10-20	20-40				
19,746	500	300	200	100	5,000	3,000	2,000	500				
11,365												
40% of full application												
fees (\$7,807 minimum)												
5,500												
2,870												
574												
19,746												
5,396												
			Recommen	ded Fees								
					le Fee							
		Per Reside	ential Unit		Per	Non-Reside	ntial Sq.M.	GFA				
						5,001-	20,001-	45,001-				
Base Fee	0-25	26-100	101-200	201-1,000	0-5,000	20,000	45,000	100,000				
5,114												
12,284	400	200	125	90	2.69	2.15	1.34	0.67				
8,954												
8,954 20% of full application fees (\$5,127 minimum)												
	Full SUB application fee p         Base Fee         22,846         12,858         4,707         37% of full application fees (\$8,959 minimum)         3,365         2,356         Base Fee         19,746         11,365         40% of full application fees (\$7,807 minimum)         5,500         2,870         5,396         Base Fee         Base Fee         5,396	Full SUB application fee plus OPA ap         Base Fee         0-25         22,846         120         22,846         120         22,846         120         37% of full application fees (\$8,959 minimum)         37% of full application fees (\$8,959 minimum)         Base Fee         0-25         19,746         500         19,746         5,500         2,870         5,500         2,870         5,74         19,746         5,396         Base Fee         0-25         5,114	Full SUB application fee plus OPA application ba         Per Reside         Base Fee       O-25       26-100         Der Reside         Base Fee       O-25       26-100         22,846       120       100         12,858	Full SUB application fee plus OPA application base fee and 1           Recomment           Per Residential Unit           Base Fee         O-25         26-100         101-200           22,846         120         100         80           22,846         120         100         80           26-100         101-200           37% of full application fees (\$8,959 minimum)         Secomment           37% of full application fees (\$8,959 minimum)         Secomment           Base Fee         O-25         26-100         101-200           19,746         500         200           19,746         500         200           19,746         5,500         26-100         101-200           40% of full application fees (\$7,807 minimum)         Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Colspan="2"Sign colspan="2"Sign colspan="2"Sign colspan="2"Sign colspan="2"Sign colspan="2"Sign colspan="2"Sign colspan="2"Sign colspan="2"Sign colspa	Full SUB application fee plus OPA application base fee and 75% of ZBA application           Recommended Fees           Variat           Per Residential Unit           Data of Colspan="2">Variat           Per Residential Unit           Data of Colspan="2">Variat           Per Residential Unit           Qata of Colspan="2">Qata of Colspan="2">Qata of Colspan="2">Qata of Colspan="2">Qata of Colspan="2">Variat           Base Fee         O -25         26-100         101-200         201-1,000           Per Residential Unit         Variat           Per Residential Unit         Variat           Base Fee         O -25         26-100         101-200         201-1,000           19,746         SO         200         100           10,000         20,00         100           10,000         20,00         100           10,000         20,00         10,000							

					Recommen									
	Current		Variable Fee											
Subdivision (SUB)	2018				ential Unit			Per Non-Residential Hectare						
	Fee	Base Fee	0-25	26-100	101-200	201-1,000	0-1	1-10	10-20	20-40				
SUB Agreement	6,314	6,314												
SUB Application Fee														
Average Cost Fee	62,107 / 43,739	24,224	500	400	350	300	5,000	4,500	3,500	3,00				
Minor fee	24,224	24,224												
SUB Final Approval Fee	16,991	16,991												
SUB Final Approval Fee - Administrative	2,870	2,870												
SUB Revision	2,526 / 12,169 / 28,856	23% of full application fees (\$2,526 Minimum												
SUB Ext. of Draft Approval (Council)	4,133	3,671												
SUB Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff)	1,033	917												
	Current	Recommended Fees												
<u>Condominium (CDM)</u>	2018 Fee	Base Fee												
CDM Agreement	6,314	6,314												
CDM Application Fee	24,452 / 43,510	28,051												
CDM Final Approval Fee - Primary	17,909	17,909												
CDM Final Approval Fee - Secondary	5,740	5,740												
CDM Revision	22,386 / 7,003	35% of full application fees (\$7,003 minimum)												
CDM Ext. of Draft Approval (Council)	4,133	3,344												
CDM Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff)	919	744												
CDM Conversion or Exemption Fee	20,779	28,051												
	Current	Recommended Fees												
Part Lot Control By-Law (PLCB).	2018 Fee	Base Fee												
Part Lot Control Exemption By-Law Preparation and														
Registration	1,837	1,800												
Part Lot Control Exemption By-Law Preparation and	1,837	1,800												
Registration - Extension Request PLCB Application Fee	5,970 / 6,774	6,663												
PLCB Application Fee PLCB Application Fee - Extension	5,970 / 6,774	1,340												
Deeming By-law	2,296	4,012												
Consent	Current 2018 Fee	Recommended Fees Base Fee												
Consent Application	9,758	10,000												
Consent Minor Application Fee (Lot Line Adjustment, Easement)	4,707	4,707												
Consent Revision	1,891	2,729												
Consent Post Approval (Certification)	2,755	2,755												
	Current	Recommended Fees												
Minor Variance	2018 Fee	Base Fee												
Minor Variance Application Fee	4,936	5,750												
	4,530	3,750												
Minor Variance - Minor Residential Application fee	2,870	2,870												

### Appendix B - Planning Application Fee Survey





#### Page B-4


#### Town of Halton Hills Planning Fees Review Study Recommended Fee Schedule

Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications       Full OPA application fee plus ZBA application base fee         Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Applications received       Full SUB application fee plus 75% of ZBA application base fee         Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of       Subdivision Applications received concurrently         Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of       Full SUB application fee plus OPA application base fee and 75% of ZBA application base fee         Subdivision Applications received concurrently       Full SUB application fee plus OPA application base fee and 75% of ZBA application base fee	
received concurrently       Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Applications received concurrently       Full SUB application fee plus 75% of ZBA application base fee         Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Applications received concurrently       Full SUB application fee plus OPA application base fee and 75% of ZBA application base fee	
concurrently       Full SUB application fee plus 75% of ZBA application base fee         Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of       Subdivision Applications received concurrently         Full SUB application fee plus OPA application base fee and 75% of ZBA application base fee	
concurrently       Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of         Subdivision Applications received concurrently       Full SUB application fee plus OPA application base fee and 75% of ZBA application base fee	
Subdivision Applications received concurrently Full SUB application fee plus OPA application base fee and 75% of ZBA application base fee	
Subdivision Applications received concurrently	
Recommended Fees	
Current Variable Fee	
Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 2018 Per Residential Unit Per Non-Residential He	are
Fee         Base Fee         0-25         26-100         101-200         201-1,000         0-1         1-10         10-20	20-40
OPA - Processing Fee	
Average Cost Fee         22,846         22,846         120         100         80         70         6,000         3,000         1,50	750
Minor and/or Technical         12,858         12,858         Image: Control of the second se	
OPA Deferral Removal Fee - Town         4,707         4,707         Image: Comparison of the second	
OPA Revision Fee 19,057 / 8,959 37% of full application fees (\$8,959 minimum)	
rees (58,559 minimum)	
Halton Region OPA - Town Review Fee         9,070         3,365	
Halton Region OPA when filed with consolidated Town 2,356 2,356	
OPA/ZBA 6,349 2,550 0 0 0	
Recommended Fees	
Current Variable Fee	
Zoning By-Law Amendment (ZBA) 2018 Per Residential Unit Per Non-Residential He	are
Fee         Base Fee         0-25         26-100         101-200         201-1,000         0-1         1-10         10-20	20-40
ZBA Fee	
Average Cost Fee         19,746         19,746         500         300         200         100         5,000         3,000         2,00	500
Minor and/or Technical         11,365         11,365	
ZBA Revision 16,187 / 7,807 40% of full application	
10,107 / fees (\$7,807 minimum)	
Holding By-Law Amendment Removal - Major 5,166 5,500	
Holding By-Law Amendment Removal - Minor 2,870 2,870	
Holding By-Law Amendment Removal - Special 574 574	
Temporary Use 12,284 19,746	
Council Extensition of a Temporary Use By-law 5,396 5,396 5,396	
Recommended Fees	
Current Variable Fee	
Site Plan Application (SDA) 2018 Per Residential Unit Per Non-Residential Sq. N	. GFA
Site Plan Application (SPA) 5,001- 20,001-	45,001-
Fee         Base Fee         0-25         26-100         101-200         201-1,000         0-5,000         20,000         45,000	100,000
Site Plan Agreement 4,707 5,114	
Site Plan Application Fee	
Average Cost Fee         12,284 / 43,625         12,284         400         200         125         90         2.69         2.15         1.3	0.67
	1
Minor Application Fee         8,954         8,954         Image: Control of the second secon	
Minor Application Fee         8,954         8,954         Image: Constraint of the system         Constraint of the system <th< td=""><td></td></th<>	

SUB Agreement         6,314         6,314         6,314         0 <th0< th="">         0<th><b>Il Hectare</b> <b>20 20 4</b> <b>3</b>,500 <b>3</b>,0</th></th0<>	<b>Il Hectare</b> <b>20 20 4</b> <b>3</b> ,500 <b>3</b> ,0
Fee         Base Fee         0-25         26-100         101-200         201-1,000         0-1         1-10         10           SUB Agreement         6,314	0-20 20-4
SUB Agreement         6,314         6,314         6,314         0         1 <th1< th="">         1<th></th></th1<>	
SUB Application Fee         62,107 / 43,739         24,224         500         400         350         300         5,000         4,500           Minor fee         24,224         24,224         24,224         1         1         1           SUB Final Approval Fee         16,991         16,991         1         1         1         1           SUB Final Approval Fee - Administrative         2,870         2,870         1         1         1           SUB Revision         2,526 / 12,169 / 28,856         23% of full application fees (\$2,526 Minimum fees (\$2,526 M	3 500 3 0
Average Cost Fee       62,107 / 43,739       24,224       500       400       350       300       5,000       4,500         Minor fee       24,224       24,224	3 500 3 0
Minor fee       24,224       24,224       24,224       0 </td <td>3,500 3,0</td>	3,500 3,0
SUB Final Approval Fee       16,991       16,991       0       0       0         SUB Final Approval Fee - Administrative       2,870       2,870       0       0       0       0         SUB Revision       2,526 / 12,169 / 28,856       23% of full application fees (\$2,526 Minimum       23% of full application fees (\$2,526 Minimum       0	5,500 5,0
SUB Final Approval Fee - Administrative       2,870       0	
SUB Revision       2,526 / 12,169 / 23% of full application fees (\$2,526 Minimum         SUB Ext. of Draft Approval (Council)       4,133       3,671         SUB Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff)       1,033       917         Condominium (CDM)       Current 2018 Fee       Recommended Fees         CDM Agreement       6,314       6,314         CDM Application Fee       24,452 / 43,510       28,051         CDM Final Approval Fee - Primary       17,909       17,909         CDM Final Approval Fee - Secondary       5,740       5,740         CDM Revision       22 386 / 7 003       35% of full application	
SUB Revision       28,856       fees (\$2,526 Minimum       Image: Sub Ext. of Draft Approval (Council)       4,133       3,671       Image: Sub Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff)       1,033       917       Image: Sub Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff)       1,033       917       Image: Sub Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff)       Image: Sub Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff)       1,033       917       Image: Sub Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff)       Image: Sub Ext. of Draft Approval Staff)       Image: Sub Ex	
SUB Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff)       1,033       917         Condominium (CDM)       Current 2018 Fee       Recommended Fees         CDM Agreement       6,314       6,314         CDM Application Fee       24,452 / 43,510       28,051         CDM Final Approval Fee - Primary       17,909       17,909         CDM Final Approval Fee - Secondary       5,740       5,740         CDM Revision       22 386 / 7 003       35% of full application	
SUB Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff)       1,033       917       Image: Subscript of the stress of t	
Condominium (CDM)     Current 2018 Fee     Recommended Fees Base Fee       CDM Agreement     6,314     6,314       CDM Application Fee     24,452 / 43,510     28,051       CDM Final Approval Fee - Primary     17,909     17,909       CDM Final Approval Fee - Secondary     5,740     5,740       CDM Revision     22,386 / 7,003     35% of full application	
Condominium (CDM)2018 FeeCDM Agreement6,314CDM Agreement24,452 / 43,510CDM Application Fee24,452 / 43,510CDM Final Approval Fee - Primary17,909CDM Final Approval Fee - Secondary5,740CDM Revision22,386 / 7.00335% of full application	I
CDM Agreement         6,314         6,314           CDM Application Fee         24,452 / 43,510         28,051           CDM Final Approval Fee - Primary         17,909         17,909           CDM Final Approval Fee - Secondary         5,740         5,740           CDM Revision         22,386 / 7,003         35% of full application	
CDM Application Fee         24,452 / 43,510         28,051           CDM Final Approval Fee - Primary         17,909         17,909           CDM Final Approval Fee - Secondary         5,740         5,740	
CDM Application Fee     Primary       CDM Final Approval Fee - Primary     17,909       CDM Final Approval Fee - Secondary     5,740       Score Final Approval Fee - Secondary     35% of full application	
CDM Final Approval Fee - Secondary     5,740     5,740       CDM Revision     22,386 / 7,003     35% of full application	
CDM Revision 22 386 / 7 003 35% of full application	
CDM Revision 22 386 / 7 003	
fees (\$7,003 minimum)	
CDM Ext. of Draft Approval (Council) 4,133 3,344	
CDM Ext. of Draft Approval (Staff) 919 744	
CDM Conversion or Exemption Fee 20,779 28,051	
Current Recommended Fees	
Part Lot Control By-Law (PLCB). 2018 Fee Base Fee	
Part Lot Control Exemption By-Law Preparation and Registration 1,837 1,800	
Dat Lat Control Examption Dy Law Propagation and	
Registration - Extension Request 1,837 1,800	
PLCB Application Fee 5,970 / 6,774 6,663	
PLCB Application Fee - Extension 689 1,340	
Deeming By-law 2,296 4,012	
Consent     Current     Recommended Fees       2018 Fee     Base Fee	
Consent Application 9,758 10,000	
Consent Minor Application Fee (Lot Line Adjustment, 4,707 4,707 Easement)	
Consent Revision 1,891 2,729	
Consent Post Approval (Certification) 2,755 2,755	
Current Recommended Fees	
Minor Variance 2018 Fee Base Fee	
Minor Variance Application Fee 4,936 5,750	
Minor Variance - Minor Residential Application fee     2,870     2,870	



# REPORT

REPORT TO:	Chair and Members of the Planning, Public Works and Transportation Committee

- **REPORT FROM:** Jeff Markowiak, Manager (Acting) of Development Review
- **DATE:** May 16, 2018
- **REPORT NO.:** PLS-2018-0047
- RE: Conditional water allocation for 167-171 Mountainview Road North (8 SDE from the Georgetown residential infill pool)

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Report No. PLS-2018-0047, dated May 16, 2018, regarding the "Conditional water allocation for 167-171 Mountainview Road North (8 SDE from the Georgetown residential infill pool)" be received;

AND FURTHER THAT 8 single detached equivalents (SDE) of water system capacity be allocated from the Georgetown residential infill pool to 167-171 Mountainview Road North (Site Plan D11SPA17.003) conditional on the issuance of building permits within 18 months of the date of Council approval of this report, failing which, Council may, at its discretion, withdraw the respective water allocation.

# **BACKGROUND:**

The property municipally known as 167-171 Mountainview Road North is currently the subject of Site Plan application D11SPA17.003 for a 9-unit bungaloft townhouse development; see the site plan attached as **SCHEDULE 1**. In July 2016 Council approved a site specific Zoning By-law amendment to permit the townhouse development. Staff is currently reviewing the third Site Plan submission for the project, which is expected to resolve the few minor outstanding issues that remain.

The site is subject to a Holding (H1) Provision, which may be lifted once Council is satisfied that:

- an appropriate Site Plan agreement has been executed; and
- the allocation of servicing has been approved by the Region of Halton.

Staff anticipates the Site Plan agreement to be finalized next month (June 2018). This report recommends allocation of the necessary 8 SDEs for the Region of Halton to clear the servicing condition.

# COMMENTS:

Town staff is targeting the July 9, 2018, Council meeting to bring forward a report recommending the removal of the Holding (H1) Provision in order to allow work on the townhouse development to commence during the summer.

This report recommends that 8 single detached equivalents (SDE) of water system capacity be allocated from the Georgetown residential infill pool to 167-171 Mountainview Road, conditional on the issuance of building permits for the townhouse development within 18 months of the date of Council approval of this report. Should building permits not be issued within the 18 month period Council may, at its discretion, withdraw the respective water allocation. The allocation of the 8 SDEs will allow the Region of Halton to clear the servicing condition of the Holding (H1) Provision prior to the July 9, 2018, Council meeting targeted for the Holding Removal report.

If Council approves the allocation of 8 SDE to 167-171 Mountainview Road North the following amounts will be left remaining in the respective Georgetown water allocation pools:

- 362 SDE in the residential infill pool; and
- 113 SDE in the non-residential pool.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This report supports the following strategic directions outlined in Council's 2014-2018 Strategic Action Plan:

## Achieve Sustainable Growth:

• To ensure that growth is managed so as to ensure a balanced, sustainable, well planned community that meets the needs of its residents and businesses.

## Provide Sustainable Infrastructure & Services:

• To maintain and enhance community infrastructure and services that support our quality of life.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Water allocation is required to allow projects to advance through the land and building approvals process. Development triggers collection of various monies throughout the approvals process and ultimately results in the expansion of the Town's assessment base.

## CONSULTATION:

Planning staff have consulted with the appropriate Town departments and the Region of Halton in preparation of this report.

## **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:**

No public notification or engagement is required for the allocation of water system capacity.

## SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

The Town is committed to implementing our Community Sustainability Strategy, Imagine Halton Hills. Doing so will lead to a higher quality of life.

The recommendations outlined in this report are not applicable to the Strategy's implementation.

## COMMUNICATIONS:

A copy of this report and Council's decision will be forwarded to the Applicant and the Region of Halton.

# **CONCLUSION:**

This report recommends that 8 single detached equivalents (SDE) of water system capacity be allocated from the Georgetown residential infill pool to the 9-unit bungaloft townhouse development at 167-171 Mountainview Road, conditional on the issuance of building permits for the development within 18 months of the date of Council approval of this report.

Reviewed and Approved by,

John Linhardt, Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability

enthans

Brent Marshall, CAO





# REPORT

REPORT TO:	Chair and Members of the Planning, Public Works and Transportation Committee
REPORT FROM:	Teri Hoey, Supervisor of Construction
DATE:	May 14, 2018
REPORT NO.:	TPW-2018-0010
RE:	Award of Tender T-015-18 for 22 Side Road Reconstruction, Limehouse

# **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Report No. TPW-2018-0010, dated May 14, 2018, regarding Award of Tender T-015-18 for 22 Side Road Reconstruction, Limehouse, be received;

AND FURTHER THAT Council awards to Pacific Paving Limited, 5845 Luke Road, Suite 201, Mississauga, Ontario, L4W 2K5, be awarded Contract No. T-015-18, 22 Side Road Reconstruction, at a total amount of \$675,325.00 (plus applicable taxes);

AND FURTHER THAT Council authorizes the Mayor and Clerk to execute the necessary contract documents for this project.

# BACKGROUND:

In the 2018 Capital Budget, funds were allocated and approved for the 22 Side Road Reconstruction, Limehouse, with the Corporate Ranking of #24.

The original limits for this project were from Fifth Line to Highway 7 and during detailed design multiple alternatives including differing active transportation options, the limits were adjusted. In 2018, Fifth Line to 50m east of Elizabeth Street (urban section) will be reconstructed, and in 2019 staff will budget to complete the remainder (rural section) to Highway 7. This will allow for active transportation components to be included. Refer to Attachment A. Hydro relocations will be required as part of the altered design in both the urban and rural sections. In addition, this will allow the Town to apply for additional Ontario Commuter Cycling funding.

This year's 22 Side Road Reconstruction, Limehouse is comprised of asphalt removal and replacement, new curb, storm sewer, multi-use path, concrete sidewalk and associated restoration. The Town of Halton Hills is working with the Halton District School Board (HDSB) to reconfigure the Limehouse Public School parking lot to a format that was agreed upon as part of this project. Also, a community parking lot will be built at Tolton Park. Refer to Attachment B.

## COMMENTS:

Staff issued Tender T-015-18, 22 Side Road Reconstruction, Limehouse on March 28, 2018. The bids were posted on the Town's website and advertised on the bids and tenders.ca website and on www.biddingo.com.

Twenty-seven (27) bids were downloaded and nine (9) bids were received. The tenders closed on April 18, 2018. Bids were received as follows:

Contractor	Subtotal	HST	Total
Pacific Paving Ltd.	\$675,325.00	\$87,792.25	\$763,117.25
Gedco Excavating Ltd.	\$770,625.53	\$100,181.32	\$870,806.85
Royal Ready Construction Limited	\$893,800.75	\$116,194.10	\$1,009,994.85
Graham Bros. Construction Limited	\$923,657.90	\$120,075.54	\$1,043,733.44
Ashland Paving Ltd.	\$938,905.88	\$122,057.77	\$1,060,963.65
Ambler & Co. Inc.	\$951,554.00	\$123,702.02	\$1,075,256.02
Associated Paving & Materials Ltd.	\$1,082,276.55	\$140,695.95	\$1,222,972.50
Aecon Construction and Materials Limited	\$1,102,973.63	\$143,386.57	\$1,246,360.20
Coco Paving Inc.	\$1,176,404.11	\$152,932.53	\$1,329,336.64

## **RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

Under the strategic priority for Infrastructure (Old and New), this report is relevant to achieving priority G - Provide Sustainable Infrastructure and Services:

G.1 To provide infrastructure and services that meets the needs of our community in an efficient, effective and environmentally sustainable manner.

# FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The approved 22 Side Road budget for construction is \$1,000,000.00. The total bid amount is \$687,210.72; therefore, is under budget.

The following summarizes the financial impact for 22 Side Road, Limehouse:

Budget	\$1,000,000.00
HDSB portion	\$30,000.00
· · · ·	
Less:	
Tendered Amount	(\$41,823.36)
(Miscellaneous)	. ,
Tendered Amount (Road Works)	(\$500,616.46)
Tendered Amount (HDSB	(\$88,556.64)
parking lot)	
Tendered Amount (Community	(\$56,214.26)
parking lot, Tolton Park)	
CCTV of Storm Sewer	(\$1,500.00)
Utility Relocations	(\$40,000.00)
Material Testing	(\$75,000.00)
Contingency	(\$70,000.00)
Anticipated Surplus	\$156,289.28

The Town of Halton Hills will enter into an agreement with HDSB regarding their commitment to a \$30,000.00 share of the costs to reconfigure and resurface the Limehouse Public School parking lot. Refer to Attachment C.

The 2018 Budget includes funding to replace the fencing and install an interpretive kiosk for Tolton Park. The 22 Side Road works provide an opportunity to implement community parking adjacent to the park in an efficient manner and coordinated with the road works. Based on the tender results, there are sufficient funds to complete the works as part of this project. The fencing and kiosk will be implemented upon completion of the road project.

Any remaining funds from Phase 1 will be utilized for Phase 2, and the 2019 Capital budget will be revised accordingly.

## **CONSULTATION:**

22 Side Road has been identified through the Cycling Master Plan for a proposed paved shoulder. Through consultation with Council, paved shoulders were determined to be the preferred alternative. Within the village of Limehouse, a multi-use path will be constructed on the north side from Fifth Line to Wolseley Street. This will allow for connectivity to the paved shoulder, which will run from Wolseley Street to Highway 7 upon completion in 2019.

The Manager of Purchasing is in agreement with this recommendation.

The Manager of Accounting and Town Treasurer is in agreement with this recommendation.

The Manager of Parks and Open Space is aware of the project.

The Manager of Transportation is aware of the project.

## **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:**

Staff held a Public Information Centre (PIC) on February 28, 2018, which included a presentation. The PIC was well-attended with thirty-nine (39) people. The general consensus from the PIC was positive, with the plans as presented. A summary of comments received to date is attached as Attachment D.

Through comment forms and at the PIC, questions regarding traffic in the village of Limehouse were brought forward. Following the completion of the 22 Side Road project, Transportation staff will undertake a review of operating speeds in the transition zone between rural and urban areas on 22 Side Road. In 2018, the Town will deploy speed radar message boards to Limehouse and organize speed enforcement blitzes with the Halton Regional Police Service.

Based on the results of operating speed review, additional traffic calming devices may be considered.

## SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

The Town is committed to implementing our Community Sustainability Strategy, Imagine Halton Hills. Doing so will lead to a higher quality of life. The relationship between this report and the Strategy is summarized below:

Do the report's recommendations advance the Strategy's implementation?

Yes.

Which pillar(s) of sustainability does this report support?

Economic Prosperity and Social Well-being - To provide infrastructure and services that meet the needs of our community in an efficient, effective and environmentally sustainable manner.

In Summary, the Sustainability Implications of this report are as follows:

Overall, the alignment of this report with the Community Sustainability Strategy is:

Good.

# **COMMUNICATIONS:**

The ROADS 2018 Information Package was provided to the Mayor and Members of Council and the Senior Management Team on February 26, 2018. This package illustrates the 2018 works, and includes the specific areas slated for road renewal, plans for notifying residents of the scheduled works, and customer service protocol. Notice of Construction letters will be hand-delivered to affected residents. Door knockers will be provided on site regarding access restrictions and specific construction activities.

Staff discussions with Pacific Paving Limited will occur as to the scheduling and the Town's expectations toward customer service, additional notices will be sent to residents prior to work on 22 Side Road. As per recent years, the Mayor will be invited to the initial start-up meeting. Town staff will work closely with Pacific Paving Limited to ensure the work is carried out in accordance with the contract document and with as little disruption to the local community and public traffic, as possible.

22 Side Road will be open to one lane of traffic at all times during construction. All emergency services will be notified.

## **CONCLUSION:**

The bid document submitted by Pacific Paving Limited meets or exceeds our specifications in all regards. Staff recommends Council Award Tender T-015-18, to Pacific Paving Limited for the 22 Side Road Reconstruction, Limehouse.

Reviewed and Approved by,

Dick Spear, Superintendent of Public Works

Chris Mills, Commissioner of Transportation and Public Works

rentharska

Brent Marshall, CAO





## LIMEHOUSE PUBLIC SCHOOL PARKING LOT RECONSTRUCTION

#### **BETWEEN:**

**THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF HALTON HILLS** (hereinafter referred to as the "Municipality")

and

### THE HALTON DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

(hereinafter referred to as the "School Board)

**WHEREAS** the School Board wishes to work with the Municipality for Parking Lot Reconstruction on the Limehouse Public School Property;

**AND WHEREAS** the School Board and the Municipality acknowledge and recognize the benefits to be derived from the Parking Lot Reconstruction on the School Property;

**NOW THEREFORE**, in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements herein and other good and valuable consideration, the sufficiency of which is hereby confirmed and acknowledged, the parties agree as follows:

1. Definitions. For the purpose hereof:

- a) "Approved Plans" shall mean the plans approved by the School Board and the Municipality for the installation and construction of the Parking Lot Reconstruction on the School Property, which plans are listed on Concept "1" attached hereto.
- b) "Parking Lot Reconstruction" shall mean the Parking Lot Reconstruction to be completed on the School Property as described and authorized in the Proposal and the Approved Plans.
- c) "Proposal" shall mean the proposal approved by the School Board and the Municipality providing a written scope of work and authorization for reconstruction of Parking Lot on the School Property, which is listed on Schedule "A" attached hereto.
- d) "School Property" shall mean the lands owned by the School Board, known as Limehouse Public School and located at 22 Sideroad, Limehouse, ON LOP 1H0.

2. The School Board and the Municipality hereby agree to cooperate in the parking lot reconstruction on the School Property in accordance with the Proposal attached hereto as Schedule "A" and in accordance with the Approved Plans listed on Concept "1" attached hereto. The School Board and the Municipality shall have responsibility with respect to the Parking Lot Reconstruction, to the extent authorized by each party in the Proposal attached hereto.

3. The Parking Lot Reconstruction shall immediately become the property of the School Board upon its completion on the School Property, and the Town will provide all drawings and documentation to the school board.

4. The Municipality shall, at its expense, maintain comprehensive general liability insurance against claims for personal injury, death or property damage arising out of or in connection with the obligations that are undertaken or performed by the Municipality pursuant to this Agreement, in amounts of not less than **Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000.00)** per occurrence. Such insurance policy shall include the School Board as an additional named insured. If required by the School Board, the Municipality shall provide an original duplicate of the certificate of insurance as prepared by the insurer and confirmation that the insurance is in full force and effect.

5. The Municipality agrees to indemnify and forever save harmless the School Board, its officers, trustees, employees and agents, from any action, claim or demand of any kind against the School Board, its officers, trustees, employees and agents, by any other party, arising out of or in connection with the obligations undertaken or performed by the Municipality pursuant to this Agreement.

6. The School Board shall, at its expense, maintain comprehensive general liability insurance against claims for personal injury, death or property damage arising out of or in connection with the Parking Lot Reconstruction or its use, (except to the extent insurance coverage is provided by the Municipality pursuant to paragraph 7 above), in amounts of not less than **Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000.00)** per occurrence. Such insurance policy shall include the Municipality as an additional named insured. If required by the Municipality, the School Board shall provide an original duplicate of the certificate of insurance as prepared by the insurer and confirmation that the insurance is in full force and effect.

7. The School Board agrees to indemnify and forever save harmless the Municipality, its officers, Council members, employees, and agents, from any action, claim or demand of any kind against the Municipality, its officers, Council members, employees and agents, by any other party, arising out of or in connection with the Parking Lot Reconstruction or its use, except any action, claim or demand arising out of or in connection with the obligations undertaken or performed by the Municipality pursuant to this Agreement.

8. All notices, demands or other communications required to be made or given pursuant to the terms of this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be delivered personally, by courier, by prepaid first class post or facsimile transmission, to the parties at their respective addresses set forth as follows:

- TO: The Corporation of the Town of Halton Hills 1 Halton Hills Drive Halton Hills, ON L7G 5G2 Attention: Matthew Roj Teri Hoey 77 Facsimile No.: 905-873-1587-
- TO: Halton District School Board 2050 Guelph Line Burlington, ON L7P 5A8 Attention: Terry DeMedeiros Facsimile No.: 905-315-8930

or such other addresses as the Parties may subsequently advise in writing. Any notice, demand or other communication shall be deemed to be received:

- a) if mailed, on the fifth (5th) business day following the date of mailing;
- b) if delivered personally, on the actual day of delivery; and
- c) if delivered by facsimile transmission or by courier, on the business day following the date the same was delivered.

In the event that postal services shall be disrupted due to strike, lockout or otherwise, all notices, demands or other communication shall be delivered personally, by courier or facsimile transmission.

10. This Agreement shall ensure to the benefit of and bind the parties and their respective successors and permitted assigns.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have signed this document.

Signed this 10th day of May at the Town of Halton Hills ) THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN 2018 ) OF HALTON HILLS in the Province of Ontario ) ) ) ) fion Su Signed this Sth day of May, 2018 at the <u>City</u> of <u>Burlington</u> in the Province of Ontario ) THE HALTON DISTRICT SCHOOL ) BOARD Per Vecman. tendent of Business d Treasurer ) Name: Superir ) Per: Name: ) ) We have authority to ) bind the corporation. )

1		arking Lot (Provisional)	Unit	Est. Quantity	School Portion	Town Portion	Price	School Cost	Town Cos
	Spec. No. SP	Description Remove Asphalt Pavement - Full	sqm	1730	1010	720	THUC	0031	
C-01	OPSS 180/510	Depth @ 60mm Average	34 m				\$4.00	\$4,040.00	\$2,880.0
C-02	SP OPSS 180/510	Remove and Dispose of Concrete Curb	m	60	34	26	\$20.00	\$680.00	\$520.0
C-03	SP OPSS 180/510	Remove and Dispose of Existing Storm Sewer (various)	m	32		32	\$90.00	\$0.00	\$2,880.0
C-04	SP OPSS 180 OPSS MUNI. 206	Earth Excavation, Grading (Meeting Table 1,2) (Provisional)	m³	120	60	60	\$40.00	\$2,400.00	\$2,400.0
C-05	SP OPSS 353 OPSD 600.110	Supply and Place Concrete Barrier Curb	m	150	27	123	\$70.00	\$1,890.00	\$8,610.0
C-06	SP OPSS 351 OPSD 310.010, 310.020, 310.030, 310.033, 310.039, 310.040, INF-004	Supply & Place Raised Concrete Sidewalk	sq m	135	95	40	\$80.00	\$7,600.00	\$3,200.0
C-07	SP OPSS 351 OPSD 310.010, 310.020, 310.030, 310.033, 310.039, 310.040,	Supply & Place Concrete Slab for Community Mailbox	sq m	35		35	\$100.00	\$0.00	\$3,500.0
C-08	SP OPSS 510	Remove and Replace Catchbasin Frame and Grate	each	1		1	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$400.0
C-09	OPSD 400.020 SP OPSS 408	Rebrick Existing Catchbasins	v/m	0.1		0.1	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$100.0
C-10	OPSD 704.010 SP OPSS 314	Supply and Place 19mm Granular "A" Crusher Run Limestone (Provisional)	tonne	215	129	86	\$19.00	\$2,451.00	\$1,634.0
C-11	SP	Supply and Place 50mm Crusher Run Limestone (Provisional)	tonne	50		50	\$20.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.0
C-12	OPSS 314 SP	Supply, Place & Compact 40 mm HL8 Hot Mix Asphalt	tonne	175	105	70	\$90.00	\$9,450.00	\$6,300.0
C-13	OPSS 310 SP OPSS 310	Supply, Place & Compact 40 mm HL3 Hot Mix Asphalt Incl. Tack Coat	tonne	175	105	70	\$96.00	\$10.080.00	\$6,720.
C-14	SP	Cold Plane Existing Asphalt -	sq m	9	6	3	\$10.00	\$60.00	\$30.
C-14	OPSS 180/510 SP	500mm x 40mm Supply & Place Topsoil and Sod	sq m	45	30	15	\$20.00	\$600.00	\$300.
C-16	OPSS 802/804 SP OPSS 710	(Provisional) Supply and Apply Pavement Markings (Durable) 100 mm Wide	m	480	303	177	\$4.40	\$1,333.20	\$778.
C-17	OPSS 1713 SP OPSS 710	(White) Supply and Apply Pavement Markings (Durable) 600 mm Wide	m	36	25.5	10.5	\$33.00	\$841.50	0 \$346.
C-18	OPSS 1713 SP OPSS 710	(White) Supply and Apply Pavement Markings (Durable) Aarow	each	8	3	5	\$160.00	\$480.0	0 \$800
C-19	OPSS 1713 SP OPSS 710	Supply and Apply Pavement Markings (Durable) Handicap	each	1	1	0	\$160.00	\$160.0	0 \$0
C-20	OPSS 1713 SP OPSS 710	Symbol Supply and Apply Pavement Markings (Durable) Buses Only	each	3	3	D	\$220.00	\$660.0	0 50
C-21	OPSS 1713 SP Terrafix Geotextiles	Symbol Supply & Place Terrafix 270R Geotextile Fabric to Bridge Soft	sqm	50		50	\$10.00	50.0	00 \$500
C-22	Brochure	Spots (Provisional) Supply & Place Parking Lot Wheel	each	7	7	0	\$200.00	\$1,400.0	0 \$42,899
U-22		Chocks				H	SB portion	\$30,000.0	0 \$87,025 n: \$57,025



# **COMMENT FORM**

#### 22 Side Road Reconstruction (Fifth Line – 50m East of Elizabeth Street)

Public comments regarding this project are invited. All comments will be maintained on file for use during Final Design and Construction.

Address: //	100	22"		FRONT	
	l'elephone N	umber	Er	nail	
COMMENTS:					
THE	RUND	15 C	KRENTLY	DANC	SERO
PUE T	to E	x CESSIVE	SPEE	OING-	t
DIS RÉSPE	ECT	For	TRAFFIC	Ruce	5
F 15	IM PC	ERIFIVE	THAT	TVEAF	FIC
CACMING		1 EASYRES		Put	1~
PLACE	Th	AVOID	FATAL	ITIES	

(USE REVERSE SIDE IF REQUIRED FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS)

Completed forms can be delivered or mailed to: **Mrs. Teri Hoey, C.E.T.** Supervisor of Construction Town of Halton Hills 1 Halton Hills Drive Halton Hills ON L7G 5G2 Tel: 905-873-2601 ext. 2309 Fax: 905-873-3036 Email: terih@haltonhills.ca From:Georgelown Chevrolet Buick

To:9058733036

03/13/2018 00:30

#498 P.001/009

## COMMENT FORM

22 Side Road Reconstruction (Fifth Line - 50m East of Elizabeth Street)

Public comments regarding this project are invited. All comments will be maintained on file for use during Final Design and Construction.

STRICK & DIANNE NOIAN Name: 22 Sidie Rong himallouse Address: 11348 I CICIONOME INCOMO Emall COMMENTS: Our WELL 15 NOT ATTACHED TO DIDE BUT 15 SPAINS FRD ( BRICEND WALL DRIPA NIA) RECEIPSTING 17 The CO det My 1251 Te Sie Dere DIEFERE AFTER PLANNER CONSTRUCT NAA FORMAS TEXPENSIE 5 Diesign sources Good And 15 NICESSA BUT WHAT DEOUT GAS INTO MANT WHEN TO THE VILLAGE + INTERNET (USE REVERSE SIDE IF REQUIRED FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS) EXPECT (OVER)

Completed forms can be delivered or mailed to: Mrs. Teri Hoey, C.E.T. Supervisor of Construction Town of Halton Hills **1 Halton Hills Drive** Halton Hills ON L7G 5G2 Tel: 905-873-2601 ext. 2309 Fax: 905-873-3036 Email: terih@haltonhills.ca

WOULD TOWN WATER & CABLE BE CONISIDERED AT SOME POINT? (3 WAY. STOP AT WOLSELEY STICK FELIZABETH WOULD HERP TO SLOW FRANKE THAU ULLASE) & ALLOW PROJESTAINUS A SAFER CROSSING

NOTE

ARE THE LARGE GRAVEL TRUCKS GOING TO BE COMING THROUGH THE VILLAGE AGAIN? THERE IS A BIG INCREASE IN TRUCK TRAFFIC LATELY. THEY COME INTO THE CLOSED QUARRY ONTHE STH LINE & CROSS THROUGH IT TO. THE 4TH LINE QUARRY. TO SAVE GOING VIN #7

DR GRUBISA

## **COMMENT FORM**

#### 22 Side Road Reconstruction (Fifth Line – 50m East of Elizabeth Street)

Public comments regarding this project are invited. All comments will be maintained on file for use during Final Design and Construction.

Fah 6 Julie Name: UD. 2nd Sideroad 11290 Address: ſ″ Telephone Number Emair 107 COMMENTS: 0 0 910 Dositives bere Road Reconstruction project. Side OUL Diggest CONCENA 190 emaining tho 274 straightening + 11 ste IAC MCCI30 OWG ani Considera tion Dum Shim

(USE REVERSE SIDE IF REQUIRED FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS)

Completed forms can be delivered or mailed to: Mrs. Teri Hoey, C.E.T. Supervisor of Construction Town of Halton Hills 1 Halton Hills Drive Halton Hills ON L7G 5G2 Tel: 905-873-2601 ext. 2309 Fax: 905-873-3036 Email: terih@haltonhills.ca

#### Teri Hoey

From: Sent: To: Subject: Dick Spear March 12, 2018 12:50 PM Teri Hoey; Aaron Brown FW: Resurfacing of 22nd Sideroad

Dick

From: Clark Somerville Sent: Monday, March 12, 2018 12:48 PM To: Chris Brackley; Chris Mills; Dick Spear Cc: Ted Brown; Bryan Lewis Subject: Re: Resurfacing of 22nd Sideroad

Chris

A lot of good technical questions. I have copied Chris Mills and Dick Spear from the town who can get answers for you. Regards

Clark Somerville Sent from my iPad

On Mar 12, 2018, at 12:44, Chris Brackley

Hello all,

I was away for the meeting about the resurfacing of 22nd Sideroad, but I am generally quite pleased with the plans I'm seeing around the changes to our road. I do have a number of questions however:

- 1. I see that the water line is certainly on the list of concerns (someone shared a pdf of the presentation with me). I would like to know what (if any) info you need from us about the waterline. I don't know how much I can share with you as I don't know a whole lot about what's underground but clearly I'd like to help as much as I can especially to ensure that the pipe is not damaged. I wonder too if the pipe can be upgraded in any way within this process (in terms of replacing the section that gets exposed, burying it deeper, and/or insulating it in some way).
- 2. I am glad to see the sidewalks and curbs planned for the redo but do have concerns about the loss of the trees on the island out front of my house (11228 22nd Sideroad - or Newton Street as you've signed our little laneway (not Delaware St. as it's written on the plan BTW)). I wonder what involvement we can have in the saving of any of the trees that are currently there (we've finally got a bit of a visual block from the road - and I fear we're going to lose this), and/or input we can have about what goes back in after construction.

- 3. I am curious what phase two may look like? Is the sidewalk only planed for this little section of 22nd or might it extend further East along 22nd in the next phase?
- 4. The location of the crosswalk is also kind of goofy for us folks East of the School. Currently there are many kids coming from this side of town on foot to school and to be honest with the crosswalk at the Western side of the parking lot none of the kids really use it. They cross over at the Eastern edge of the school parking lot. Any chance a crosswalk at *this* end could be considered?

Many thanks, and I look forward to learning more about how I can help this project succeed, Chris

Teri	Hoey
------	------

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Attachments: Lizon Mick March 16, 2018 2:06 PM Teri Hoey Ted Brown; Bryan Lewis Re: Limehouse - 22nd Side Road Reconstruction Limehouse phase 1.pdf

Good afternoon,

Our family shares water with the line that runs across 22nd sideroad. Enclosed is where the pipe for water line is and size of pipe.

Would it be possible to be on site when construction crew reach the area highlighted in enclosed attachment? We could help locate and inspect what is under the road. We also would like assurances that our line will be repaired should it be damaged. How far is the 1st phase going to reach? Is it going to be passed Elizabeth St. or before Elizabeth St. ?

Will this new construction in village stop the truck traffic on bridge and road?

Will there be another community meeting answering everyone's questions? I believe there should be another meeting prior to your final design and construction .

It is very refreshing to see some changes are going to be made around the school and road in our village.

Delaware St is mentioned below 22nd sideroad is this not Newton St?

Thank you for your prompt response.

Sincerely Lizon Mick

On Thu, Mar 1, 2018 at 4:01 PM, Lizon	Mick wrote:
Good afternoon Mrs. Hoey,	

After last evening's presentation we discussed the spring water line which runs across 22nd sideroad and Elizabeth area.

Would you kindly forward the drawings which I can then forward to the neighbour's and to my son. They will be able to show where the water line runs.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely, Lizon Mick

#### Teri Hoey

From:Irene Westerveld<sup>1</sup>Sent:March 2, 2018 11:11 AMTo:Teri HoeySubject:Limehouse 22nd Sdrd reconstruction - open house

Hi Teri,

Thank you for hosting the Community Open House in Limehouse. I think the residents appreciate being kept informed and included in the construction planning and process.

Could you please email a copy of the presentation to me?

In future, i think having a longer Q & A time would be beneficial and worthwhile.

Would you consider providing us with a copy of the presentation (perhaps, with a slide with your contact information/comment form) for the Limehouse Memorial Hall website? We would link it to the event descripton on the Events page. <u>limehousemh.wixsite.com/hall</u> Thank you.

Irene Westerveld President, Limehouse Memorial Hall Board



# REPORT

- **REPORT TO:** Chair and Members of the Planning, Public Works and Transportation Committee
- **REPORT FROM:** Aaron Brown, Project Manager, Municipal Infrastructure
- **DATE:** April, 18, 2018
- **REPORT NO.:** TPW-2018-0020
- RE: Award of Engineering Services for the Design of Armstrong Avenue Phase 2

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Report No. TPW-2018-0020, dated April 18, 2018, regarding the Award of Engineering Services for the Design of Armstrong Avenue Phase 2, be received;

AND FURTHER THAT Council approves the Engineering Services for the Design of the Armstrong Avenue Phase 2 contract award to R. V. Anderson Associates Ltd., 2001 Sheppard Avenue East, Suite 300, Toronto, ON, M2J 4Z8, in the amount of \$203,525.00 (plus HST);

AND FURTHER THAT staff be authorized to transfer \$96,500 of unused Capital Replacement Reserve funds from the Armstrong Avenue Reconstruction Phase 1 project to the Armstrong Avenue Reconstruction Phase 2 project;

AND FURTHER THAT the Manager of Purchasing be authorized to issue a purchase order to R. V. Anderson Associates Ltd., 2001 Sheppard Avenue East, Suite 300, Toronto, ON, M2J 4Z8, in the amount of \$94,725.00 (plus HST), for the design portion only of Armstrong Avenue Phase 2;

AND FURTHER THAT remaining funding required for the Armstrong Avenue Reconstruction Phase 2 project be referred to Budget Committee;

AND FURTHER THAT the Manager of Purchasing be authorized to issue a purchase order to R. V. Anderson Associates Ltd., 2001 Sheppard Avenue East, Suite 300, Toronto, ON, M2J 4Z8 in the amount of \$108,800.00 (plus HST) for the contract administration and inspection services for the Armstrong Avenue Phase 2 Reconstruction project, should funding be approved as part of the 2019 Budget Committee deliberations;

## **BACKGROUND:**

In the 2017 Capital Budget, Council approved the Armstrong Avenue Phase 1 project. In order to complete the engineering design of Armstrong Avenue Phase 2 in time for a 2019 construction date, the need arose to hire the expertise of a qualified Engineering Consulting Firm. The firm will be required to complete the engineering design for the Armstrong Avenue Phase 2 Reconstruction project comprising of all engineering design related issues, including storm water management, pavement design, as well as, acquiring all necessary permit approvals for Credit Valley Conservation (CVC) and the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC).

## **COMMENTS:**

A Request for Proposal (RFP) P-092-18 for Engineering Services was issued on April 10, 2018. The bid was posted on the Town's website and advertised on the bidsandtenders.ca website.

Fifteen (15) firms downloaded the document. The RFP closed on May 1, 2018 and seven (7) bid submissions were received as follows:

Vendor	Location
Chisholm Fleming & Associates	Markham, ON
Cole Engineering Group Ltd.	Markham, ON
exp Services Inc.	Cambridge, ON
GM Blueplan Engineering Limited	Cambridge, ON
IBI Group Professional Services (Canada) Inc.	Toronto, ON
MTE Consultants Inc.	Kitchener, ON
R. V. Anderson Associates Limited	Toronto, ON

The bids were evaluated by a staff team based on experience, methodology and price. R. V. Anderson Associates Ltd. was determined to be the highest ranking proponent.

R. V. Anderson Associates Ltd. is a Canadian provider of professional, technical and management support services. Their Niagara office will be supporting this proposal.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The following objectives within the Town's Strategic Plan are directly related to the Armstrong Avenue Phase 2 Reconstruction project:

- C.9 To promote the establishment of more viable live/work relationships to reduce commuting.
- H.1 To provide infrastructure and services that meets the needs of our community in an efficient, effective and environmentally sustainable manner.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT:

### Armstrong Avenue Phase 2 Reconstruction – Engineering

The engineering design and contract administration fee breakdown is as follows:

Part 1 Engineering Design Services	\$ 94,725.00
Part 2 Contract Administration and Inspection Services	<u>\$ 108,800.00</u>
Sub Total	\$ 203,525.00

There is \$832,156 remaining in the Capital Budget for Armstrong Avenue Phase 1 and staff are requesting that a portion of these remaining monies be used for the Engineering Design Services portion of Armstrong Avenue Phase 2. The monies required for the Contract Administration and Inspection Services will be requested as part of the 2019 Capital Budget for the reconstruction of Armstrong Avenue Phase 2.

## **CONSULTATION:**

Staff consulted with the Manager of Purchasing and the Manager of Accounting in the preparation of this report. They are in agreement with the recommendations.

## **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:**

Through the design phase, key stakeholder groups will be engaged to ensure a comprehensive design. These stakeholders include the Active Transportation Committee, Bell Canada, Halton Hills Hydro, Union Gas, as well as, all local businesses and residents. Engagement will include the CVC and the MOECC. A Public Information Centre will be held to inform residents of the Town's proposed construction plans.

## SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

The Town is committed to implementing our Community Sustainability Strategy, Imagine Halton Hills. Doing so will lead to a higher quality of life.

The recommendation outlined in this report (advances, does not advance, is not applicable to) the Strategy's implementation.

This report supports the (choose one or more) pillar(s) of Sustainability and in summary the alignment of this report with the Community Sustainability Strategy is (Good, Excellent). *If paragraph 2 is not applicable then remove this paragraph.* 

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

The engineering consultant, R. V. Anderson Associates Ltd. will be notified upon Council's approval.

The key stakeholders, businesses and residents will be contacted regarding the Public Information Centre.

## **CONCLUSION:**

The proposal document submitted by R. V. Anderson Associates Ltd. is the highest ranking proposal. Staff recommends the Manager of Purchasing issue a purchase order to R. V. Anderson Associates Ltd. in the amount of \$94,725 (plus HST) for professional engineering design services for the Armstrong Avenue Phase 2 Reconstruction project and an additional purchase order, subject to 2019 budget approval in the amount of \$108,800 plus HST for the contract administration portion of the project

Reviewed and Approved by:

Dick Spear, Superintendent of Public Works

Chris Mills, Commissioner of Transportation and Public Works

rentalpuska

Brent Marshall, CAO



# REPORT

REPORT TO:	Chair and Members of the Planning, Public Works and Transportation Committee
<b>REPORT FROM:</b>	Matt Roj, Traffic Coordinator

**DATE:** May 11, 2018

**REPORT NO.:** TPW-2018-0023

RE: Award of the Proposal P-014-18 for Engineering Services for Turn Lane Modifications

# **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Report No. TPW-2018-0023, dated May 11, 2018, regarding the Award of the Proposal P-014-18 for Engineering Services for Turn Lane Modifications, be received;

AND FURTHER THAT Council approves the Engineering Services for Turn Lane Modifications contract award to BT Engineering Inc., 100 Craig Henry Drive, Suite 201, Ottawa ON K2G 5W3, for the engineering services of the Maple Avenue and Guelph Street, and Maple Avenue and Main Street projects in the amount of \$127,473.00 (plus HST);

AND FURTHER THAT the Manager of Purchasing be authorized to issue a purchase order to BT Engineering Inc. for the engineering services of the Maple Avenue and Guelph Street, and Maple Avenue and Main Street projects in the amount of \$127,473.00 (plus HST);

AND FURTHER THAT the Manager of Purchasing be authorized to issue a purchase order to BT Engineering Inc. for the contract administration for Maple Avenue and Guelph Street, and Maple Avenue and Main Street projects in the amount of \$51,840.00 (plus HST), subject to approval in the 2019 Capital Budget;

AND FURTHER THAT Council authorizes the Treasurer to transfer \$11,749.00 from the Maple Avenue and Guelph Street Turn Lane Capital Project 6200-16-1807 to Maple Avenue and Main Street Turn Lane Capital Project 6200-16-1808.

## **BACKGROUND:**

In the 2018 Capital Budget, monies were allocated and approved for the design of turn lanes at Maple Avenue and Main Street, corporate rating #67. The scope of the Maple Avenue and Main Street project is the engineering design only of a northbound right turn lane to improve the intersection's level of service. The construction cost of the northbound right turn lane at Maple Avenue and Main Street is identified in the proposed 2019 Capital Forecast Summary.

In the 2018 Capital Budget, monies were also allocated and approved for the design and construction of a southbound right turn lane at Maple Avenue and Guelph Street, corporate rating #71.

## COMMENTS:

A Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Engineering Services for Turn Lane Modifications was issued on March 13, 2018. The bid was posted on the Town's website and advertised on the bidsandtenders.ca website and on www.biddingo.com. Five (5) firms downloaded the document. The RFP closed on April 4, 2018 and three (3) submissions were received as follows:

Vendor	Location
BT Engineering Inc.	London, ON
Prenix Associates International Limited	Mississauga, ON
SNC-Lavalin Inc.	Toronto, ON

Bids were evaluated by a staff team based on experience, price, methodology, project approach and understanding, and work schedule. BT Engineering Inc. was determined to be the highest ranking proponent.

Staff recommend to complete the detailed engineering designs of both intersections in 2018, and to undertake the construction of turn lanes at both intersections in 2019. Staff is of the opinion that undertaking the construction within the same year for both intersections should reduce the cost of construction zone deployment.

To complete the proposed engineering design work, staff recommend the transfer of funds from the Maple Avenue and Guelph Street Turn Lane Capital Project 6200-16-1807 to Maple Avenue and Main Street Turn Lane Capital Project 6200-16-1808 in the amount of \$11,749.00.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The turn lane modification projects are operational matters.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The cost contained in this report will have no further impact on the Town's financial resources. The associated costs were budgeted for the Maple Avenue and Main Street Turn Lane Capital Project 6200-16-1808 at \$50,000 and Maple Avenue and Guelph Street Turn Lane Capital Project 6200-16-1807 at \$250,000.

The cost to undertake the proposed design work for the Maple Avenue and Main Street, and Maple Avenue and Guelph Street projects is \$61,749.00 and \$65,724.00, respectively. Staff recommend the transfer of funds from the Maple Avenue and Guelph Street Turn Lane Project 6200-16-1807 to Maple Avenue and Main Street 6200-16-1808 in the amount of \$11,749.00. The total cost of the engineering services for both projects is \$127,473.00 (plus HST).

## **CONSULTATION:**

Staff worked in conjunction with Town Purchasing staff and Accounting staff from the Corporate Services Department and they are in agreement with this recommendation.

## **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:**

There is no public engagement required at this stage.

## SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

The Town is committed to implementing our Community Sustainability Strategy, Imagine Halton Hills. Doing so will lead to a higher quality of life.

The recommendation outlined in this report advances the Strategy's implementation.

This report supports the Social Well-being pillar of Sustainability and in summary the alignment of this report with the Community Sustainability Strategy is good.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

Local businesses affected by the proposed projects will be notified.

## CONCLUSION:

Staff recommend the award of the contract for Engineering Services for Turn Lane Modifications to BT Engineering Inc. and that the Manager of Purchasing issue a purchase order to BT Engineering Inc. in the amount of \$127,473.00, plus HST, for the design of the turn lanes and an additional purchase order, subject to budget approval, in the amount of \$51,840.00, plus HST, for the contract administration portion of the project.

Reviewed and Approved by,

Dick Spear, Superintendent of Public Works

Chris Mills, Commissioner of Transportation and Public Works

Drentharshall

Brent Marshall, CAO



# **MEMORANDUM**

то:	Chair and Members of the Planning, Public Works and Transportation Committee
FROM:	Matt Roj, Traffic Coordinator
DATE:	May 15, 2018
MEMORANDUM NO.:	MEM-TPW-2018-0006
RE:	Transportation Update

# PURPOSE OF THE MEMORANDUM:

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an updated list of Traffic and Transportation related matters.

# BACKGROUND:

The memorandum deals with Traffic and Transportation related matters dealt with by staff.

# COMMENTS:

The attached list provides details and a status update of the traffic and transportation issues since the April 10, 2018 Committee meeting. This includes the following:

- Wallace Street, heavy truck cut-through and speeding issues On May 2, 2018, Councillor Albano identified concerns raised by a resident with regards to the heavy truck cut-through and speeding issues on Wallace Street. On May 16, 2018, staff will undertake an onsite meeting with the resident to further discuss his concerns and provide an update. (Item #1)
- Third Line/Glen Lawson Road, road safety improvements On April 10, 2018, Councillor Somerville requested an onsite meeting to discuss road safety improvements on Third Line and Glen Lawson Road between Churchill Road South and Fourth Line. The Town is undertaking an Environmental Assessment (EA) of Third Line and Glen Lawson Road, which will consider short-term and long-term road safety improvements. On April 30, 2018, Ward 1 Councillors, Councillor Fogal, the Glen Lawson EA consultant (Cole Engineering) and staff

met onsite to discuss potential road improvements. To prepare the cost estimate of the proposed road improvements, the consultant is collecting additional information on Third Line and Glen Lawson Road. The proposed road improvements will be identified in the 2019 Capital Budget and Business Plan. (Item #2)

- Chetholme Place, street safety concerns On April 23, 2018, Councillor Lawlor identified concerns raised by a resident with regards to the street safety concerns on Chetholme Place. On May 3, 2018, staff recorded a phone message for the resident to further discuss the concerns. (Item #3)
- John Street (Georgetown), speeding issues On April 11, 2018, Councillor Kentner identified concerns raised by residents with regards to the speeding issues on John Street between Mountainview Road North and Victoria Street. On April 4, 2018, staff conducted speed studies on John Street to quantify the vehicle operating speeds. On April 30, 2018, Mayor, Ward 3 Councillors and staff met with the John Street residents to discuss the speed study results and proposed next steps. Due to the high operating speeds (69 km/h) on John Street, this spring and summer staff will undertake a number of traffic safety improvements to slow down the vehicular traffic. To review the effectiveness of the traffic calming, staff will conduct follow up speed studies in September 2018. In October 2018, staff will organize another meeting with the residents to provide an update with regards to the study results. (Item #4)

## **CONCLUSION:**

Staff will continue to work on the existing traffic and transportation matters as identified in the attached Excel spreadsheet. New traffic issues will be added to the spreadsheet for the Committee's consideration.

Reviewed and Approved by,

Dick Spear, Superintendent of Public Works

Chris Mills, Commissioner of Transportation and Public Works

DrentHarshal

Brent Marshall, CAO

00
5
2
ŝ
2
S

2		
1 of .	ite	leted
	Ő	d d

Date Completed	Ongoing	Ongoing	05/15/18	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	05/15/18
Recommendation	Following the onsite meeting, staff will provide further comments.	Cole Engineering will prepare the cost estimate of the proposed road improvements that will be included in the 2019 Capital Budget and Business Plan.	No further actions are recommended.	Due to the high operating speeds (69 km/h) on John Street, this spring and summer staff will undertake a number of traffic safety improvements to slow down the vehicular traffic.	Staff is in the process of acquiring an Encroachment Permit from MTO to install a Vehicle Activated Traffic Calming Sign in spring 2018. Staff will also discuss with MTO the use of oversize speed signs on Guelph Street W. (Hwy 7).	Staff will undertake a pilot project at the Main/Mill traffic signal in Georgetown and update the Committee in fall 2018.	No further actions are recommended.
Actions Taken	On May 11, 2018 staff contacted the Following the onsite meeting, staff resident and organized an onsite will provide further comments. meeting on May 16, 2018.	On April 30, 2018 Ward 1 Councillors, Councillor Fogal, the Glen Lawson EA consultant (Cole Engineering) and staff met onsite to discuss potential road improvements.	On May 3, 2018 staff recorder a phone message for the resident to further discuss the safety concerns.	On April 4, 2018, staff conducted speed studies on John Street to quantify the vehicle operating speeds. On April 30, 2018, Mayor, Ward 3 Councillors and staff met with the John Street residents to discuss the speed study results and the next steps.	The Vehicle Activated Traffic Calming sign was ordered for the Highway 7/Lakeview Avenue location. The sign installation is expected in spring/summer 2018.	On December 22, 2017, staff sent a response to the resident with regards to the traffic signal operations.	HDSB and HSTS both reviewed the resident's concerns. The route to school was deemed safe and a reasonable distance from the school
Traffic/ Transportation Concern	Councillor Albano has identified concerns raised by a resident with regards to the heavy truck cut- through and speeding issues.	Councillor Somerville requested an onsite meeting to discuss road safety improvements on Third Line and Glen Lawson Road between Churchill Rd. S. and Fourth Line.	Councillor Lawlor has identified concerns raised by a resident with regards to the street safety concerns on Chetholme Place.	Councillor Kentner identified concerns raised by residents with regards to the speeding issues on John Street between Victoria Street and Mountainview Road North.	Councillor Hurst has identified The Vehicle Activated Traffic resident's concerns with speeding on Calming sign was ordered for the Guelph Street West (Hwy 7). Highway 7/Lakeview Avenue location. The sign installation is expected in spring/summer 2018.	Councillor Fogal has identified resident's concerns with the pedestrian signals not being displayed concurrently with traffic signal displays.	Councillor Somerville has identified concerns raised by a resident with regard to the proposed bus service Pedestrian Safety cancellation from/to Robert Little Public School, along the resident's bus route.
Category	Speeding	Road Safety	Road Safety	Speeding	Speeding	Traffic Control Signals	Pedestrian Safety
Ward	-	-	4	<b>с</b> п	-	3 & 4	-
Date Received	05/02/18	04/10/18	04/23/18	04/1,1/18	11/27/17	12/04/17	09/28/17
ltem #		5	e	4	2	Q	2

00
5
2
23/
2

2	
÷	
0	
2	

ltem #	Date Received	Ward	Category	Traffic/ Transportation Concern	Actions Taken	Recommendation	Date Completed
	10/29/17	2	Speeding	Councillor Somerville has identified concerns raised by a resident with regard speeding on Wellington Road 42/32 Side Road (Boundary Road).	At the January 15 Council meeting, a In September 2018, staff will Citizen Petition was submitted to reduce the posted speed limit to 60 32 Side Road between Third km/h on 32 Side Road from Winston Churchill Blvd. (Reg. Rd. 19) to Regional Road 25.	In September 2018, staff will undertake an operational review of 32 Side Road between Third Line and Trafalgar Road.	Ongoing
	09/13/17	2	Road Safety	Mayor, Ward 2 Councillors and staff met with Norval residents on September 13, 2017 to discuss transportation issues.	Councillors and staff On November 28, 2017, staff have residents on completed the signage 2017 to discuss improvements on Green Street and Ssues. King Street.	In 2018, staff engaged with other road authorities to discuss the transportation issues in the Hamlet. Peel/Halton Region will be leading the required traffic studies and providing an update in the future.	Ongoing
	08/14/17	-	Speeding/Sight line concerns	Councillor Hurst has identified a In June 2018, staff will engagnumber of traffic concerns with Church Street East residents speeding on Church Street East and review their support for traffic sight line concerns on Bower Street.	e the to	In spring/summer 2018, staff will evaluate Church Street East between Elgin Street South and Frederick Street South with regard to the traffic calming.	Ongoing
	05/05/17	2	Road Safety	uer ver	Staff have reviewed the Motor Vehicle Collision history of the intersection and undertook onsite review.	Additional traffic operation studies will be scheduled in fall 2018 at the River Drive and Tenth Line intersection. Currently, River Drive bridge is under construction.	Ongoing
	09/28/15	4	Intersection Safety	Guelph St. (Hwy 7) @ Hall Staff informed the Menkes develo Road/MacFarlane Drive intersection to proceed with the update to the safety issues were identified. Traffic Impact Study. A turning movement count to be undertaker April or May, 2018. On May 15, 2018, staff sent a second remind to the developer.	per er	The resident has requested an onsite meeting with Councillor Inglis and staff to further discuss the issues in early 2018.	Ongoing