

From: The Carleys [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2025 9:45 AM
To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman <clerk@merrickville-wolford.ca>
Cc: Michael Cameron <mayor@Merrickville-wolford.ca>
Subject: Thompson ZBA

To Julia McCaugherty-Jansman

Re: Thompson ZBA

The following summarizes our review and comments of the proposed zoning amendment.

We understand that the lots in question are as presented on the draft plan of subdivision (attached). The drawings land use schedule is copied below.

DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION – SHEET DP-100, ISSUE 4 LANDUSE SCHEDULE

Lots/Blocks	Land Use	Area (ha)
1-31	Residential – Single Detailed	13.250
32	SWM Ditch	0.604
33	Pedestrian Walkway	0.047
Street A-B	Right of Way	2.141
Total Site Area		16.042

The letter referred to Bylaw 23-08, we reference the Town's website to access the relevant sections to better understand the proposal:

REFERENCES

Official Plan Schedule A-1 Land Use Plan (May 2021) – Area indicated as **Hamlet**

Zoning By-Law No. 23-08, Schedule A – Rural Area – Area zones as **Hamlet**

Bylaw 23-08 (November 2008, Consolidated in September 2024) – Section 10 **Hamlet Zone** – Residential Uses and Zone Provisions:

Residential uses in accordance with Residential Type 2 (R2) Zone (Section 6.2)

Proposed Amendments:

Reduces lot frontage for three (3) lots:

Per Sheet DP-100			Bylaw 23-08 (November 2008) Single Detached Partial or Private Services Minimum Requirements	
Lot	Lot Frontage (m)	Lot Area (ha)	Lot Frontage (m)	Lot Area (ha)
20	24.52	0.52	30	0.50
21	14.45	0.40	30	0.50
22	18.68	0.42	30	0.50

Based on the review of the Sheet DP-100 and Bylaw 23-08 (November 2008), the three proposed lots appear to have less than the required frontage, and two of the lots have less than the required lot area. Lot 21 has less frontage than required for a semi-detached building.

Based on the review of the proposed lot areas shown on Sheet DP-100, the majority (all but two) are less than the minimum required lot area shown in the Bylaw 23-08 (November 2008) for Single Detailed Partial or Private Services. This deviation results in a higher density than would be originally intended by the by-law.

Additional Residential Units on 12 lots be prohibited on the remaining:

Given that the majority of the proposed lot sizes are less than 0.50ha, the proposed lot sizes do not seem suitable for additional residential units on any of the lots.

The proposed amendment does not appear to benefit the neighbourhood. This has the potential for a precedent of higher densities in rural / hamlet areas on private services.

We are not in favour of the proposed amendments. **Please see attached drawings.**

Ian & Lorna Carley

