

MINUTES
PUBLIC MEETING

Thursday, September 16, 2021, 6:00 PM
Cardinal Legion Branch 105
105 Legion Way
Cardinal, ON K0E 1E0

PRESENT: Mayor Pat Sayeau
Deputy Mayor Tory Deschamps
Councillor Hugh Cameron
Councillor Stephen Dillabough
Councillor John Hunter

STAFF: Dave Grant, CAO
Rebecca Williams, Clerk
Wendy Van Keulen, Community Development Coordinator
Candise Newcombe, Deputy Clerk

PUBLIC: Corey Lockwood
Chelsea Baker
Tracy Zander
Cheryl Churchill
Dan Adams
Debbie Adams
Tim Kavanaugh
Gloria Kavanaugh
Daniel Tucker
Robin Crawford
Anne Menard Crites
Tami Britskey
Christine Windsor
Michelle Riddell
Makayla Markell
Brian Brown
Margaret Anne Gaylord
Yvonne Thompson
Ron Korejwo
Dave Simpson
Brenda Simpson

1. Call Meeting to Order

The Community Development Coordinator called the meeting to order at 6:13 p.m.

2. Welcome and Introductions

The Community Development Coordinator welcomed those present and introduced the subject of the meeting. It was noted that this is a combined Public Meeting regarding a proposed revision to a plan of subdivision and an application for a Zoning Bylaw Amendment.

The Community Development Coordinator noted that the Township welcomes comments on the two related applications and that it's important to note that, although related, the 2 applications have different approval processes.

First, the proposed revised plan of subdivision under section 51 of the Planning act for approximately 9 hectares of land in the Village of Cardinal:

- The purpose of this application is to revise the current draft plan approval related to the Meadowlands residential plan of subdivision.
- The revised draft plan proposes a total of 146 residential units comprised of semi-detached and townhouse dwellings.
- This application was made under the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville (UCLG), who is the approval authority. The UCLG has requested that the Township host this public meeting, in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act and the minutes of this meeting will be shared with the UCLG.
- Any written feedback on this application should be sent to Cherie Mills, Manager of Planning Services with the UCLG at the address provided on the Notice of Public Meeting.
- Municipal Council will provide a formal recommendation to the UCLG in advance of their decision, but the UCLG is the approval authority. If the public wishes to be notified of the UCLG decision, you must make a written request to the UCLG.

Second, this meeting is held under the authority of section 34 of the Planning Act for a proposed site-specific amendment to the Township's Zoning Bylaw for the same 9 hectares of land in the Village of Cardinal.

- The purpose of the amendment is to change the zoning on the subject lands from "Residential First Density Special Exception 3" and "Residential Second Density Special Exception 2" to "Residential Third Density Special Exception".
- The amendment would permit the lands to be developed with a combination of semi-detached and townhouse dwellings.
- The effect of this amendment would be to accommodate the revised plan of subdivision consisting of 80 semi-detached and 66 townhouse dwelling units.

- The Township of Edwardsburgh Cardinal is the approval authority for this application.
- Written feedback on this application is welcome and should be sent to the Community Development Coordinator as per the meeting notice.
- If the public wishes to be notified of Council's decision, you must make a written request to the Township as indicated in the notice of public meeting, also available in your agenda package.

This application was made to the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville, who is the approval authority. The Counties has requested that the Township host this public meeting, in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act and the minutes of tonight's meeting will be shared with the Counties. Any written feedback on this application should be sent to Cherie Mills, Manager of Planning Services with the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville at the address provided on the Notice of Public Meeting. Our Council will provide a formal recommendation to the Counties in advance of their decision, but the Counties is the approval authority. If you wish to be notified of the Counties decision, you must make a written request to the Counties.

This meeting was advertised in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act. It has been advertised in the Recorder and Times and mailed to the prescribed agencies as well as property owners within 120m of the subject lands.

Anyone who wishes to speak in favour of, or in opposition to the proposed amendment will be given the opportunity to do so. It was noted that Municipal Council is present to take into consideration all comments for when they are making a recommendation to the UCLG on the revised plan of subdivision and when making a decision on the proposed zoning amendment.

The applicant will be provided time to provide everyone present an overview of the proposal. Following the overview, those present can speak in favour, in opposition, or provide general comments. It was noted that the applicant would be provided an opportunity to address any concerns that were raised. The Community Development Coordinator highlighted that all comments must be related to the applications. Because the 2 applications are related, it will be assumed that you are commenting on both the proposed revision to the subdivision and the proposed zoning amendment unless you tell us otherwise.

It was noted that staff will not be engaging in a question and answer period. The Community Development Coordinator informed the public that concerns may be raised tonight that can't be answered right away. A final report will be prepared for Council to address all written and oral comments that are received, in relation to the applications.

The Community Development Coordinator informed attendees that anyone who wishes to speak about this issue will be given the opportunity. It was noted that the applicant's planner will give an overview, individuals will be given a chance to

speak first in favour, then in opposition and then an opportunity for general comments.

While there is no public appeal opportunity under the Planning Act respecting the plan of subdivision, all oral and written submissions received prior to the decision will be considered by the granting authority.

3. Proposal Details

Ms. Zander owner of Zanderplan, noted that her company was retained by Lockwood Brothers Construction to assist in the Meadowlands Subdivision Development. She highlighted the importance of the public process for the development of the Meadowlands subdivision.

Ms. Zander outlined a brief history of the draft plan of the subdivision. The original draft plan included 49 single-family dwellings and was amended in 2016/17 to include 106 units of mixed semi and single-family dwellings. The new proposed plan now uses the same network as the 2017 draft plan; however, the density has been increased to meet current market and housing demands. The new plan includes; 40 blocks for 80 semi-detached units, 12 blocks for 66 townhouse units; and two blocks for future road connections, totaling 146 units. It was noted that the increase of density created greater flexibility for the developer to offer a variety of dwelling types to meet market demands, and housing affordability demands.

Ms. Zander identified the main entrance of the proposed 9 hectares parcel as being located on St. Lawrence St. located on the south side of the subdivision with Gill St. identified as the second entranceway. The development process will be completed in 3 phases. Phase 1 includes the construction of the St. Lawrence St. entrance; Phase 2 consists of the construction of the west side (Gill St. entrance) and Phase 3 will include the remainder of the east side of the subdivision.

Ms. Zander highlighted alignments with Provincial Policy Statements which includes: Its location in a settlement area, logical extension of streets, residential zoning, no natural heritage features and no triggers for archaeological significance. It was noted that the proposed application was in accordance with all Provincial Policy Statements, and subsequently in accordance with the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville as well as the Townships Official Plan, all of which encourage growing development within the settlement area.

Ms. Zander noted that the developer's intent with the addition of townhouses and semi-detached dwellings is to give an option for a more affordable unit noting that another option is to incorporate a secondary dwelling unit into the primary dwelling. These dwellings offer income subsidies through the rental of the secondary unit. Ms. Zander noted that the target market for these economical units is seniors and first time home buyers.

Ms. Zander noted the completion and public accessibility of the following reports: the servicing and stormwater report, the noise and vibration report, the traffic study, and the planning report.

Ms. Zander thanked the public for listening and encouraged written questions to be sent to ZanderPlan Inc.

4. Public Comment

The Community Development Coordinator opened the floor for questions or comments;

In Favour: No comments.

In Opposition:

Mr. Daniel Adams referred to the initial zoning bylaw amendment meeting he attended in 2017. He noted that there was some discussion regarding the increase of vehicle traffic on roads, highlighting the increased risk to pedestrians with no sidewalks present. Mr. Adams inquired about the increased water demand and if a pumping station would be required. He inquired if the services had not changed, how do you expect to add more houses than the initial 2017 application.

Ms. Tammy Britskey noted that she is not necessarily in opposition to the development, she simply had some questions. Ms. Britskey noted that the traffic report indicated an approximation of 89 vehicles/hour in the morning, and 116/hour during peak times. She commented that Cardinal never experiences that much traffic and would notice a large influx. She noted her biggest concern is the children's safety near the public park on St. Lawrence St. Ms. Britskey inquired why the proposed single-family dwellings on lots 59 & 60 were changed to townhouses. She noted her concerns that the townhouses positioned on the exterior of the subdivision may cause traffic congestion. Ms. Britskey inquired if an open space and walkway were considered the same. She noted her concern with the possible influx of pedestrian traffic due to the proposed walkways into the parkland.

Mr. Daniel Tucker inquired if a pump house would be required as initially anticipated and if the taxpayer would be responsible for financing the improvements. Mr. Tucker inquired about the proximity of the proposed development to Saw Mill creek, noting that some fish species spawn in the creek. He inquired if the South Nation Conservation had been consulted. He inquired about who will be cleaning up Gill St. which has been improperly used over the years as a dumping location and is a part of the proposed development.

Ms. Ann Menard-Crites noted that she was not sure that she was opposed. She inquired about the proposed route for water drainage to the wastewater treatment facility, the proposed storm drain and dry pond locations and noted the existing Mill Creek mentioned by Mr. Tucker.

Ms. Margaret-Ann Gaylord noted that when she initially moved to her current residence there were few children in the area, however over the past 7 years, the number of kids playing in the area has grown substantially. She noted her concerns to pedestrians with an increased flow in traffic and no existing or planned sidewalks in the area.

General Comments:

Mr. Daniel Adams inquired of the CAO if the current water and sewer systems will accommodate the influx of 146 houses.

The CAO noted that the serviceability report indicated that it could accommodate the increased number of proposed units.

Mr. Robin Crawford noted the need for sidewalks in the existing area. He noted that the area needs more housing, however current issues like the need for safety barriers and the absence of sidewalks or the excessive speed of traffic in the area should be addressed first.

Ms. Yvonne Thompson noted that she was in attendance to better inform herself of the proposed development. She noted her concern with a single entranceway into the subdivision, highlighting the fact that this would contribute to congestion. She commented that her concern is for the safety of the children in the area.

Ms. Tammy Britskey noted that she is not opposed to developmental growth however, the proposed revision is substantial from the original application. She pointed out that the proximity of the open space to lots 59 and 60. Ms. Britskey noted originally 49 houses were proposed as zoned R1, while the current revision proposed special zoning of R3-x for all 146 dwellings. She suggested a mix of R1, R2 and R3 zoning across the subdivision. Ms. Britskey noted that Cardinal has a mandate for 20% growth intensification, indicating that she is concerned that this proposal is a 100% intensification of growth.

Mr. Daniel Tucker commented that a zone change to an R3 would result in development similar to an urban centre such as Barrhaven or Stittsville. He felt that this type of development takes away from the beauty of Cardinal, noting that increasing the housing only increases problems. Mr. Tucker noted that he believed the bottom line to this project is money in someone else's pocket and increased taxes for the Township.

Applicant/Planners Comments:

Mr. Corey Lockwood introduced himself and addressed first the question of why he wants to intensify the plan for development. He noted that over the last 2 years there has been a substantial increase in development costs. Mr. Lockwood pointed out that the cost to deliver services to the site remains the same whether there are 100 or 140 homes built. He noted that the increase in the number of dwellings allows the cost of \$8000.00-\$10,000.00 per unit to be reduced for potential buyers. Mr. Lockwood highlighted his 20 years of experience as a contractor, noting that affordable housing issues have been an ongoing problem

he has had to address. He noted that the townhouses and semi-detached dwellings offer a more affordable option for seniors or first time home buyers.

Mr. Lockwood addressed the concerns raised with the stormwater drainage and clarified how the grass swales would aid with drainage. He noted that the swales aid in directing water in a controlled manner to the storm pond where it will slowly drain to the creek, which he noted already drains naturally in this manner. He noted that due to the elevation of the proposed development an additional pumping station would not be required as it will be gravity fed. He noted that any further expansion to the proposed development would require the installation of a pump station. Mr. Lockwood noted that any expense incurred due to the construction of the subdivision would not fall to taxpayers but instead would be the responsibility of Lockwood Bros Construction development.

Mr. Daniel Adams noted that the proposed open space used to be 150 feet, noting the outlined 100 feet in the proposed plan for open space and highlighting that the area is being reduced.

Mr. Lockwood noted that the original draft plan approval had 30m, noting that the proposed size of the open space has not changed. He noted the 100 feet by 600 feet proposed park space, highlighting the ample available area for children to play.

Mr. Lockwood addressed concerns about the use of the grass swales in stormwater drainage. He noted that the swales are consistent with the current storm drain system in the area. He pointed out the use of grass swales as opposed to a storm sewer system decreases the costs significantly, which directly affects the future sale price of each dwelling.

Mr. Lockwood commented on the current state of the Gill St. site, noting that they would have that area cleaned up in anticipation of development.

Ms. Tracey Zander noted that she did not feel comfortable commenting on the engineer's traffic report, but noted that the engineer that prepared the report has determined that the proposal is in accordance with provincial guidelines and deemed to be able to accommodate the proposed influx in traffic. She noted that the intention is to have 2 access points to the completed subdivision, one on St. Lawrence St. and one on Gill St.

There was some confusion that there was a claim of no watercourses on the proposed site. Ms. Zander clarified that she had noted no natural heritage features and noted a natural watercourse on the site, highlighting that it is outside of the area to be developed.

5. Adjournment

The Community Development Coordinator thanked everyone in attendance. It was noted that In regards to the proposed revision to the plan of subdivision, Council will consider the application at an upcoming open meeting of Council. Council will make a formal recommendation to the United Counties of Leeds and

Grenville, who is the approval authority for this application. If you wish to be notified of the decision of the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville in respect to the proposed revisions, you must make a written request to Cherie Mills, Manager of Planning Services. The mailing address is provided in the Notice of Public Meeting, available in the agenda package.

In regards to the proposed amendment to the Township Zoning Bylaw, Council will consider the proposed amendment at an open meeting of Council following the Counties decision on the revised subdivision. Once the decision is made by Council and notification provided, there will be a 20 day appeal period. If you wish to be notified of Council's decision, you must make a written request to the Township of Edwardsburgh Cardinal. The address is provided in the notice of public meeting, available in the agenda package.

The Community Development Coordinator adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m.



Deputy Clerk