

April 2, 2025

Village of Merrickville-Wolford
317 Brock Street West
P.O. Box 340
Merrickville, ON K0G 1N0

Attention: Darlene Plumley, CAO

Dear Ms. Plumley:

Re: Recommended Changes to Redline Discussion Draft – New Zoning By-law

Darlene, following the Open House, formal Public Meeting and circulation to agencies, we have received a number of comments on the Redline Discussion Draft of the New Zoning By-law that require Council's consideration. All comments received are attached to this report. The comments have been redacted to delete personal information. The following report summarizes the comments received and makes a series of recommendations for Council's consideration on changes to the Redline Discussion Draft.

Staff/Agency Comments on Redline Discussion Draft and Recommended Action

1. Comments from MW CBO:

Clarification of Section 3.1.4 lot coverage for accessory structures.

Response: edit Section 3.1.4 (1) to read "in the case of a building or structure accessory to a residential dwelling, the lot coverage for the accessory structure, within a Residential zone, shall not exceed 10% of the lot area or 140m² (1,507 ft²), whichever is the lesser, and shall be included in the calculation of the maximum lot coverage permitted in the ~~zone in which the~~ residential zone. ~~is located.~~

Make Section 3.12 consistent with Fence By-law.

Response: change Section 3.12 (1) to read "No fence shall be constructed at a height greater than ~~1.9 meters~~ 1.22 metres in the front or exterior side yard and no greater than 1.88 m in all other yards on a lot in a residential zone.

Clarify zone that Section 3.26.11 applies to.

Response: change wording to read "In any **residential** zone ~~in which a residential dwelling house is permitted as a principal use~~, a temporary car shelter...."

Clarify Lot Coverage in Section 12.2 applies to all buildings and structures

Response: No change needed, definition for Lot Coverage has been updated in the Redline Discussion Draft to apply to all buildings and structures.

Clarify terms related to Settlement Area and Urban boundary.



Response: Modify Schedule A Legend to change “Settlement Area” to “Hamlet” – Keep “Urban Boundary”. Modify Schedule B Legend to include “Urban Boundary”.

2. Enbridge:

Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. This response does not signify an approval for the site/development.

Response: No changes required.

3. RVCA:

Definitions: Remove definition of “Fill Line”, Update definitions for “Flood Line”, Flood Plain”, and “Waterbody”.

Response: Agreed - changes to definitions should be made to reflect changes to Conservation Act etc.

Section 3.7.8, remove reference to “cliff”.

Response: Agreed - term is not used in document and has no relevance.

Section 4.9 should recognize that some forms of development activities no longer are subject to RVCA approval.

Response: Agreed – ZB should reflect the current jurisdiction of RVCA which has been changed by province.

Mapping of the EP zone is not clearly delimited.

Response: Agreed – change delimitation of EP on Zoning Schedules so the boundary is clearly identified.

Public Comments on Redline Discussion Draft and Recommended Action

1. One submission by Planning P2 Concepts Inc. re: 2159 CR #16:

Revise Parking Standard for “community centre” from 1 space per 12m² gross floor area to 1 space for every four persons occupancy based on the Ontario Fire Code/Ontario Building Code occupancy regulations.

Response: Agreed – the current standard requires an unrealistically high number of parking spaces and is out of sync with industry standards. The proposed 1:4 ratio based on design occupancy provides for a much more realistic number of parking spaces for the proposed development.

2. Four separate submissions from Yves Grandmaitre:

Disagree with removal of minimum dwelling unit size for residential zones – leads to decrease in taxation and devalue neighbouring properties.



Response: *Planners in Ontario have been provided direction from the Ontario Professional Planning Institute for the last 20 years to ensure that municipal zoning by-laws are revised to remove barriers to the establishment of affordable housing. One of the areas of concern is zoning by-laws which establish minimum dwelling unit sizes as a means of prohibiting “tiny homes”. The trend has been for planners to recommend to Councils and Communities that their Zoning By-laws have minimum dwelling unit size provisions removed. The understanding is that the Ontario Building Code is sufficient to regulate the size of a “dwelling” and that this matter is not appropriate for municipal zoning by-laws.*

There should be a limit on the number of rental units on a property.

Response: *a limit on the number of rental units per property is beyond the scope of Section 34 of the Planning Act that regulates the content of zoning by-laws. The Planning Act allows for the regulation of the use of the lands (i.e. residential vs commercial) however the distinction between rental and ownership of residential uses is generally not within the scope of a Zoning By-law. A significant element of the housing crisis is the lack of affordable rental accommodation. Council should take every opportunity to promote more rental accommodation within the Village.*

Parking for additional units is not clear in proposed Zoning By-law.

Response: *Section 3.2(10) of the Discussion Draft ZB clearly requires the establishment of 1 parking space per ARU. This is prescribed under Section 35.1 (1.1) of the Planning Act.*

Do not support decrease in minimum lot sizes for residential development – leads to more development and decrease heritage nature of the community.

Response: *Over the past two decades there has been a gradual reduction in minimum lot sizes expressed in Zoning By-laws in efforts to promote more compact, efficient forms of residential development. The proposed minimum lot sizes are consistent with other similar communities and industry standards. This change is to promote the efficient use of land, encourage more development on the finite amount of serviced development lands and reduces the amount of red tape that those wishing to invest in the community are required to go through.*

The Discussion Draft is missing development standards for 3-plexes and 4-plexes.

Response: *Agreed with oversight and this matter should be addressed prior to passage of by-law by Council.*

Require all 3-plexes and 4-plexes to have a minimum of 1 affordable unit. Require multi-residential buildings to have affordable units.

Response: *Generally, Section 34 of the Planning Act does not speak to affordability. The one exception is where the Official Plan has policies related to inclusionary zoning which (under Section 35.2 (2) of PA) can be prescriptive about the supply of affordable housing units. The Village Official Plan would need to be updated to provide for inclusionary zoning. Currently staff attempt to work with those proposing new residential development which require various approvals to address the affordable housing provisions of the Official Plan, with varying degrees of success.*



Desire to have zoning provisions which are related to the specific design of new builds to be more in keeping with the heritage nature of the community.

Response: *Section 34 of the Planning Act provides for local zoning by-laws to regulate the area, density and height of development but does not allow the regulation of “design”. The Planning Act was modified to reduce the use of site plan control which historically dealt with design. The revised Planning Act has also changed the scope of site plan control to reduce the opportunities to regulate design of buildings. Design is not something the ZB should address above and beyond area, density and height.*

Wish to know what is prescribed by the Province and what is recommended by the Planner.

Response: *All of the changes proposed in the Discussion Draft are recommended by the Planner. There are a few items such as additional residential units for urban services areas which are prescribed by province and limitations set out in the Planning Act. The Scope of the Zoning By-law is prescribed by Section 34 of the Planning Act. The proposed Redline Discussion Draft is intended to be consistent with Section 34 of the Planning Act.*

No single large apartment unit should be permitted.

Response: *This is contrary to the Official Plan which permits a full range and mix of residential uses within the Residential designation. It is also contrary to good planning and the recognition that there is a need for more rental accommodation within the Village. Apartment buildings (3-4 storey) are considered to have the potential to provide the highest number of affordable rental accommodations in new build developments.*

You should reverse the decrease in lot coverage.

Response: *The original Village zoning by-law did not use “maximum lot coverage” as a tool to regulate density of development. It is recommended that this provision be included in the new ZB to assist with regulating the density of development and ensure that building footprints are consistent with the nature of existing development.*

Development should be required to submit standard studies related to impacts on all municipal services.

Response: *The Zoning By-law does not identify studies to be done – that is the job of the Official Plan. Section 9.6 of the Official Plan identifies the full range of specific studies that may be required for new development that is required to go through a Planning Act approval process. Servicing Feasibility studies, stormwater management studies and transportation impact studies are all identified in the OP and typically required for subdivisions and site plan control applications.*

Why has there been a change in hobby farm minimum lot size?

Response: *The current zoning approach to hobby farms requires a minimum of 10 ac which is somewhat at odds with the idea of backyard chickens and a rural lifestyle. It is generally felt that people moving into the rural area of the Village should have the option of growing their own food. The approach recommended permits livestock on most rural properties, while regulating the number and type of livestock based on the size of property. This is felt to be a more inclusive approach to rural land use and has been utilized quite effectively in neighbouring municipalities..*



Why has the rural lot size changed?

Response: *The Village Council changed the minimum lot size for severed lots when it updated the Village Official Plan in 2022, from 1 ha (2.4 ac) to 0.4 ha (1 ac). Generally, the Official Plan and Zoning By-law should be consistent, especially in regard to matters such as minimum lot sizes. Thus, the reduction in the minimum lot size in the Rural Area from 1 ha (2.4 ac) to 0.4 ha (1 ac).*

Why eliminate the R1 zone?

Response: *With the changes made to the Planning Act through Bill 23 and the proclamation by the Province that all serviced residential lands can now support up to three residential units per property, R1 zoning in Ontario is no longer limited to single detached dwellings. There is essentially no such thing as single detached residential zoning anymore and therefore the elimination of the R1 zone.*

Why 5 units per property on private services under the R3 zoning?

Response: *MECP guidelines allow up to five units to be permitted on a single well and septic system. This is an existing provision and is not being changed but it is assumed that the limit of 5 units is related to private servicing regulations.*

Play areas should be required to meet accessibility standards.

Response: *The question of accessibility is addressed through the Ontario Building Code.*

Please prohibit modern looking housing.

Response: *Please see previous comments on ability of the Village to regulate design – we do not have the tools under Section 34 of the Planning Act to regulate design.*

Why four units permitted in R2 zone when province has only prescribed 3 units?

Response: *The question of three versus four residential units have had serious discussions at all senior levels of government. Several federal funding streams related to housing are based on the minimum four units threshold and it was felt that the four units would be more appropriate over the long run. Jurisdictions such as the City of Ottawa are moving to have four units as the minimum density of residential development, consistent with the approach recommended. Council does have the discretion to limit the R2 to three units and have the four units within the R3, although a more progressive approach would be to maintain the four units within the new R2 zone.*

3. Comments from Travis Troughton, Development Manager, Park View Homes

Zoning and subzoning for townhouses is missing.

Response: *One of the more significant oversights with the “Discussion Draft” document was that townhouse zoning provisions which currently reside in the “Residential Type Two (R2) zone were not transferred to the R3 zone provisions. Townhouses are recommended to be moved from R2 to R3 in the Discussion Draft however, the specific zoning provisions for townhouses were overlooked. The proposal is to bring the current R2 townhouse zone provisions forward to the R3 zone to address this oversight. In doing so it will also be necessary to move the R2 exemption zones for townhouse development to the R3 exemption zones (i.e. R2-1,*



R2-3). No changes to the current townhouse provisions are recommended as they move from the R2 to the R3 zones.

Clarify the changes and implications to the R2/R3 zoning.

Response: Perhaps the most significant change to the Discussion Draft is the elimination of the “Residential Type One (R1)” zoning based on the recognition that the province has decreed that residential areas within fully serviced communities shall have a minimum density of three units per property, essentially causing redundancy of the R1 zone which was exclusively single detached residential.

With the elimination of the R1 zone, the Discussion Draft identifies a number of changes to the R2 and R3 zones including:

- Relocating townhouses from the R2 zone to the R3 zone
- Addition of triplexes, fourplexes, bed and breakfast, type A group homes, additional residential units as permitted uses within the R2 zone. The reason for including four-plexes is that many federal government housing funding programs have a requirement for zoning to permit four units in an effort to address the housing crisis.
- Decrease in the minimum lot frontage for the R2 zone from 18 m to 15 m (50 ft) in order to recognize industry trends for smaller lot frontages and promote infill and intensification.
- Reduced minimum lot area from 270 m² (2906 ft²) to 230 m² (2476 m²) for semi-detached dwellings in order to recognize industry trends for increased density through decreased lot area.
- Reduced minimum lot area from 540 m² (5813 ft²) to 465 m² (5005 m²) for duplex dwellings in order to recognize industry trends for increased density through decreased lot area.
- Elimination of minimum dwelling unit area for all residential development – this is consistent with the direction provided to planners from bodies such as OPPI for removal of affordable housing barriers in zoning – minimum dwelling unit areas is one of the main barriers that has historically been identified – the Ontario Building Code should be the only body that determines the minimum dwelling unit area.
- Removal of vertical roof line provisions
- Introduction of zone provisions for triplex and four-plex dwellings
- R3 zone permitted uses have added triplex and fourplex dwellings and additional residential units, removed planned unit townhouse dwellings
- Clarification of maximum density for multiple residential dwellings in R3 zone

4. Comments from Martin Smith

Section 3.32.2, Temporary Use Provisions has no content

Response: Section 3.32.2 is a place holder, very similar to the “exemption zones” in each zoning category and it is where you put any proposals which trigger a temporary zoning amendment. Currently there are no temporary uses established in the Village and therefore this section has no content.

Section 19.10, Existing By-laws: the actual number of bylaws being replaced is not specified.

Response: Council has the option of creating a new zoning bylaw, in which case the “blank” would be populated with “Zoning By-law #23-08” (the current ZB) which would be repealed with the approval of the new zoning by-law. Council also has the option of a major update to the zoning by-law in which case there would be no by-law repealed.



5. Comments from Dr. Paul Marriott

Given the omissions and errors found in the section of my personal interest (Section 5), the public can have no confidence that equivalent errors and omissions are not present throughout the document. Consequently, it is strongly recommended that the whole document undergo a detailed review and edit and an updated version of the document be provided to the public for further review (28 days) before any formal consideration by Council. Public review of the updated document is particularly relevant as details need to be added (such as townhouse zoning provisions) which the public has not had the opportunity to evaluate in the current version.

Response: *The purpose of preparing a Discussion Draft document for public and agency review is to have “fresh eyes” review the document to identify oversights – this is part of the normal process of planning policy/regulation development. Council does have the option to trigger a second round of public review and hold a second public meeting if they feel the changes to the Discussion Draft are “substantial” as per the Planning Act (Section 34(17) of Planning Act):*

“34(17) Where a change is made in a proposed by-law after the holding of the public meeting mentioned in subclause (12) (a) (ii), the council shall determine whether any further notice is to be given in respect of the proposed by-law and the determination of the council as to the giving of further notice is final and not subject to review in any court irrespective of the extent of the change made in the proposed by-law. R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, s. 34 (17); 2006, c. 23, s. 15 (9).”

Council can determine if there is a need for an additional public meeting based on the scope of changes to the Discussion Draft.

Schedule B: The map incorrectly shows St John Street as open to vehicular traffic from Sophie Lane to Main Street West. However, the section between Wallace Street and Bruce Street is a pedestrian only walkway.

Response: *The road connection information for Merrickville should be updated to accurately reflect the lack of through-fare of St. John Street.*

Section 5: Residential Zones - Street townhouses have been deleted as permitted use (5.1.1) and all associated zone provisions have also been deleted making it impossible to comment on them. Planned unit townhouses have been deleted as a permitted use in section (5.2.1) all associated zone provisions have also been deleted making it impossible to comment on them.

Response: *This matter is addressed above and is recommended to be addressed in a future draft of the new Zoning By-law.*

General: The overall quality of the document is disappointing and does not reflect well on those involved in its development.

Response: *Efforts will be made to address all of the identified deficiencies of the Discussion Draft document.*

6. Comments from Pam Marriott

In response to the request for comments regarding the by-law document, I would like to offer just one comment. I found this 132-page document very difficult to read with its various colors and strikethroughs.



I would have appreciated a more completed version (even though I understand that this is a draft document) with significant changes noted separately.

Response: *It is understood that zoning by-laws are not easy documents to review and understand. Efforts were made with the Discussion Draft to present the changes to the document in a format that highlighted sections being deleted and those being added.*

7. Comments from Monique Perras

I absolutely support the idea of including a section about Illumination in the new Zoning By Law. **It should indeed be applicable to the entire Municipality, including the "rural" areas.** And without any exemptions. It should be applicable to all residential, and non-residential, farms, etc.

Exterior lights should be deflected or designed as to deflect away from adjacent lots and streets, so that the positioning of lighting does not impair the use or enjoyment of neighbouring properties.

Light pollution or "overuse of artificial light" should also be considered too. Nobody moves to the country, especially in a rural area, to look at spotlights or flashing lights all night long (!) But rather to enjoy dark starry nights and enjoy skywatching. The overuse of artificial light at night can disrupt natural patterns of darkness; it can harm the ecosystem, wildlife and human health, and it is totally undesirable.

Response: *Section 3.19, Illumination, requires waterfront lighting and laneway lighting should be full cut off and not create light pollution. There is benefit in clarifying that full cut off/non-trespassing lighting be required throughout the Village.*

8. Comments from Patrick Dawson

I am writing to indicate my support for the inclusion of a section on illumination in the Property Standards bylaw scheduled for discussion in the upcoming council meeting.

Response: *Illumination changes to the by-law are addressed above.*

9. Comments from Peter Szmids & Donna Ross

As the Village continues its review of By-Laws, we wish to offer our encouragement of such reviews and, specifically to support the ongoing inclusion of a section on illumination in the Zoning By-Law (23-08) as well as the Property Standards By-Law (22-03). Specifically, the By-Laws state that lighting "shall be installed with the light directed and deflected away from adjacent lots and streets" (23-08, Section 3.16) and "the lighting shall not be positioned so as to cause any impairment of the use or enjoyment of neighboring properties" (22-03, Section 3.76).

Response: *Illumination changes to the by-law are addressed above.*

10. Comments from Robert Lockwood

Part 1: Initial considerations having to do with select definitions;

* hunt camp/fishing camp - confusing or lack of clear distinction in the description of what kind of structures are permitted, the latter part of the description comes across as contradictory to that



used in the aforementioned part, should somehow make reference that included in the description "...shall not include a single detached dwelling...", including travel trailers/motor homes (common practice) ?

* park, private - current description infers it's the same as parameter of "park, public" only privately owned...is that the only intended distinction ?

* derelict vehicle - since the 1st line references/delineates vehicle, boat, trailer, the 2nd line/last line only refers to a vehicle being repaired by owner, it is suggested that last reference should also include boat & trailer?

Response: *clarification of the definition of hunt camp/fishing camp has merits to address the identified issues of what kind of structure is considered a "camp".*

Part 2: Considerations applying to section 12, Rural (RU) Zone; Past editions of the Township Zoning Regulations referenced that 'rural zone' was not intended for recreational development involving private campgrounds/trailer parks (inc. rental trailers) & even went as far as indicating how many travel trailers were permitted on said property, as well as the limits of frequency & max. length of stay, given the new format of this document which now references what can be done in this regard how do those aspects get addressed ? Furthermore, I do not agree with all of the inclusions under "12.1, Permitted Uses", in particular, "hunting/fishing camp" or "private park", the definitions of which are very broad, vague & once established become precedent setting & difficult to have removed when in conflict with neighbouring properties, not to mention how the activities affect; privacy, tranquility, increased traffic & noise. Not all rural properties are equal, some inland, others waterfront & others involving various kinds of farms, as such it seems appropriate to consider which uses are permissible based on the 'nature' of the rural property.

Response: *Both the Mobile Home Park (MHP) zone and the Tourist Commercial (C4) zones permit recreational vehicles/modular homes. The application of these zones is done on a site specific basis and subject to site plan control which ensures that the development is consistent with the required zoning performance provisions.*

The permitted uses for the Rural (RU) have not changed and hunting/fishing camp and private park have been permitted uses since 2008 and have not appeared to create conflicts or issues that staff are aware of.

Next Steps

Once Council has had an opportunity to consider the agency and public comments on the "Discussion Draft of the Village of Merrickville Wolford's Updated Zoning By-law", it is requested that Council:

1. Provide direction to staff on the changes they wish to see to the Discussion Draft;
2. Provide direction to staff on whether they wish to approve a new zoning by-law or update the current zoning by-law with the recommended change; and,
3. Determine whether there is a need to hold an additional public meeting to get comments on the "Revised Discussion Draft" or if sufficient public notice and consultation has been achieved and no further public meeting are necessary.

Based on Council's direction, the Planner will update the Discussion Draft and present the revised document to Council for their consideration. Council can then proceed to a second public meeting or move directly to making a decision on the revised Discussion Draft.



Once approved by Council, a notice of decision will be provided to all those who submitted comments, plus a posting on the Village website, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the Planning Act. It is worth noting that specified persons, public agencies and property owners will have appeal rights on Council's changes to the Zoning By-law, as per the Planning Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Sincerely,
Jp2g Consultants Inc.
ENGINEERS ▪ PLANNERS ▪ PROJECT MANAGERS

Forbes Symon, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner



Ottawa
1150 Morrison Dr., #410
Ottawa, ON, K2H 8S9
T: 613-828-7800
Ottawa@jp2g.com

Pembroke
12 International Dr.
Pembroke, ON, K8A 6W5
T: 613-735-2507
Pembroke@jp2g.com

Arnprior
16 Edward St. S., #53B
Arnprior, ON, K7S 3W4
T: 613-828-7800
Arnprior@jp2g.com



APPENDIX A – STAFF, AGENCY AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

Hi Forbes.

As discussed earlier.

3.1.4 Lot Coverage : The lot coverage of 10% or 140m² for accessory to a residential dwelling which ever is less... Does this apply to Hamlet and Urban area only and the 10% for all other uses applies to Rural, Commercial, etc ?

3.12(1) Fences : Proposed fence height of 1.9m(6.2ft) in front and exterior side yard...our Fence By-law limits the height to 1.22m(4ft) in the Front yard and 1.88m on all other yards.

3.26.11 Temporary shelters : can we specify that this applies to certain zones as people in the rural areas often use these shelters to store equipment year round and there is no definition of Temporary Shelter.

12.2 Rural : Is the 20% lot coverage for all structures or just accessories to a dwelling ?

Also, should we identify that the Urban Core area(no definition) is not Hamlet ?, and we should change the name of the proposed Zoning By-law to Village of Merrickville-Wolford and not Drummond North Elmsley.

That's all I have for now.

Thank you.

Dan Halladay

Chief Building Official, BCIN 104362

Village of Merrickville-Wolford



From: Municipal Planning

Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 10:08 AM

To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman

Subject: RE: Notice of New Zoning By-law - Request for Comments

Thank you for your circulation.

Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions.

Please always call before you dig, see web link for additional details: <https://www.enbridgegas.com/safety/digging-safety-for-contractors>

Please continue to forward all municipal circulations and clearance letter requests electronically to MunicipalPlanning@Enbridge.com.

Thank you,

Casey O'Neil (she/her)

Sr Analyst Municipal Planning

Engineering

—

ENBRIDGE

500 Consumers Rd, North York, ON M2J1P8



Conservation Partners Partenaires en conservation



March 27, 2025

SENT BY EMAIL (clerk@merrickville-wolford.ca)

Julia McCaugherty-Jansman, Clerk
Village of Merrickville-Wolford
P.O. Box 340
Merrickville, ON K0G 1N0

Re: **New Zoning By-law – Discussion Draft
Village of Merrickville-Wolford**

This letter acknowledges receipt of the above-noted circulation by the Village of Merrickville-Wolford. The materials were received by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) on February 25, 2025.

RVCA staff have reviewed this application in accordance with the *Conservation Authorities Act*, which requires RVCA to provide programs and services related to the risk of natural hazards within its jurisdiction. With respect to *Planning Act* matters, conservation authorities have a role to ensure that decisions under the *Planning Act* are consistent with the natural hazard policies (Section 5.2) of the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS), 2024.

In addition, RVCA staff have also reviewed this application in accordance with Section 28.1 of the *Conservation Authorities Act*. Where development activity is proposed within a regulated area, a permit is required to ensure that it conforms to the applicable tests for implementation of the Act.

Purpose of the Application

The purpose of the application is to provide comments on draft amendments to the municipal zoning by-law, under Section 34(15) of the *Planning Act*.

Application-Specific Comments

The RVCA offers the following comments:

Section 2. Definitions

1. Fill Line:

The definition of Fill line does not appear anywhere else in the Zoning By-law, and appears to define an antiquated term now referred to as the regulation limit, used under the Conservation Authorities Act (not the zoning). It is recommended that this definition be removed from the Zoning By-law.

T 613-692-3571 | 1-800-267-3504 | F 613-692-0813 | www.rvca.ca



2. Flood Line:

The flood line definition is recommended to be updated for consistency as follows:

“FLOOD LINE: means the line representing the continuous delineation of the horizontal extent inland of a regulated flood plain.”

3. Flood Plain:

The definition of flood plain makes reference to an RVCA policy document that (external to the municipality) that has been since replaced. It is recommended that this definition be updated as follows:

“FLOOD PLAIN: shall mean the area, usually low lands adjoining a watercourse, which has been or may be covered by flood water and is below the regional flood event as defined by the local Conservation Authority”

4. Waterbody:

The definition of waterbody includes the extents of a flood plain, which does not appear to be intended or applied in practice. This definition should be revised to reflect the shoreline, banks or boundary of the captured feature.

Section 3.7.8 Yard Exceptions for Waterbodies, Watercourse, Embankments and Cliffs

5. The term Cliff is not included in the definitions, nor applicable elsewhere in the zoning by-law. It is recommended that this section be modernized to reflect standard wording such as “stable top of slope, or limit of hazard” in lieu of the term cliff.

Section 4.9 Flood Plain Zones

6. Through changes to applicable legislation and policies, some forms of development activities would no longer be subject to written approval from the RVCA. These include, but not limited to, a small building or structure (under 15m² in area), maintenance works, demolition, fencing, and reconstruction of non-habitable garages. The municipality may need to review in greater detail if there is any uses that may be permitted, or not, in cases where the Conservation Authorities Act does not apply.

Mapping

7. The hatching of EP zones and flood plain in mapping does not clearly delineate the boundaries of the flood plain. It is recommended that hatched areas be outlined for greater clarity.



Conclusion

The RVCA expresses its appreciation in being circulated for review and commenting on the draft New Zoning By-law.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read 'E. Lalande', is positioned below the text 'Respectfully,'.

Eric Lalande, MCIP RPP
Senior Planner
Rideau Valley Conservation Authority
eric.lalande@rvca.ca
613-692-3571 ext. 1137



From: Planning P2 Concepts Inc
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2025 11:47 AM
To: Forbes Symon
Cc: Patrick Rutherford; Brian K Clark; Sabbi Kalsi
Subject: 2159 County Rd 16 - Parking Calculation

Hello Forbes,

Thank you for meeting with us yesterday on the Merrickville Sportsplex. As discussed, please see the attached breakdown of our required and provided parking.

We evaluated all parking space rates in this section of the zoning (3.25.1) such as bench space, GFA, and fixed seats but we are required to take the greater rate listed which is GFA in our case. As you'll see in the first page of the attached document, we've calculated our proposed parking based on design capacity - which in our opinion is a more realistic expectation for the use of the parking lot.

What we'd like to request is that the parking space rate for our project be adjusted to 1 parking space per 4m of bench space OR 1 parking space per 66.4 m2 GFA OR something equivalent through a special exception clause or even an adjustment to the parking space rate table. We are also looking for some flexibility to adjust the exact internal uses of the existing school as the client is still working to line up tenants for those spaces.

Feel free to reach out to discuss if needed.

Regards,

Jasmine Paoloni



From: Yves Grandmaitre (#1)
Sent: Saturday, February 1, 2025 4:40 PM
To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman
Cc: Darlene Plumley
Subject: Planning bylaw

Hi Julia

I have comments and concerns regarding the planning bylaw amendments. My first concern is that the open house took place on the 28th, and the comments had to be submitted by the 28th. This does not sufficient time to residents to respond after having gone to the public meeting.

My comments as follows:

1) I disagree with the removal of all minimum dwelling unit areas have been from the zoning by-laws. E.g. the removal that a permanent dwelling must be minimum 1200sq ft. This change is NOT reflected in the tracked changes. Although the building code has been revised to allow "tiny homes" (roughly 100 sq. ft). There are some restrictions about what needs to be in a one bedroom, two bedroom etc i.e. think tiny home. The unintended consequence is that people could be building these things in their back yards and renting them out as Air BnBs or buying a lot and putting a tiny home on it. This change opens the possibility of an individual buying a lot in town or close to, including if someone has a double lot and put a tiny home on this lot. Taxation revenu, and water/waste water revenu (if they don't hook up to a meter) would be substantially less than if a 1200sq.ft. residence was built. Also the development charges would be impacted as they are attached to the monetary value of the build. In addition, this could devalue surrounding homes and would certainly not reflect what the adopted strategic plan has defined as goals for the community. nor reflect statements made around the Council table regarding preserving the historical nature/appearance of the Village. Research has shown that some municipalities have kept minimum dwelling unit areas in their zoning by-laws. If wording would be so that a property owner can apply for a residence of less than 1200sq.ft., anywhere in the Municipality, this would recognize the value of smaller dwellings, while making sure that their location is such that all factors are taken into consideration.

2) The bylaw should limit the number of rental units including air BnB's on a lot, unless the building was specifically designed as such (a house with multiple rooms or adjacent buildings to let vs a multi unit apartment building).

3) In regards to the additionnal buildings, parking requirements are not clearly defined. Residential units have a minimum number of parking spots required per unit. Since a residence is now permitted to have additional units, how are the parking requirements being met? Particularly as within the urban area, in the winter, no overnight parking is permitted and there are no permanent public spaces available (all public parking lots are not owned by the Village as best I know).

4) Last is the reduced size of building lots. Again, Council and HPAC has mentionned many times about the importance of the historical nature and feel of the Village and the importance of maintaining its unique character. The reduction of lot size (beyond what the province mandates) thus allowance of more units, as part of the bylaw, opens to door to more development in all areas. I would propose that either specific geographic areas permit this change, or as is done now, an application is submitted and this would be applied to all developments regardless of where they are located. Leaving this as is will inevitably change the Village character and needs to be reviewed.



Many Thanks for allowing for this input.

Yves Grandmaitre

From: Yves Grandmaitre (#2)
Sent: Wednesday, February 5, 2025 4:10 PM
To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman
Subject: planning bylaw

Hi Julia,

Following up on the Monday meeting, here are the areas of concern regarding the zoning bylaw

- missing references to triplexes and fourplexes in section 3 (see 3.27.1), unless these are addressed under "other residential uses"
- lot size reduction. Lot size reductions are not consistent with the Village average lot size and not reflective of wanting to keep to the historical nature of the Village
- reduced lot sizes not compatible with larger buildings (triplex and fourplex), particularly if parking is 1.5 vehicles per unit. The difference in the minimum lot size for a fourplex over a single family home is less than 1000sqft, barely allowing for three more cars where the 1.5 car per unit standard would not only not be accommodated, there would be hardly any green space on the lot as seen on the triplex on Drummond. (where is the 30% greenspace?)
- pay in lieu of parking
- given that the province now allows multiple dwellings on the same lot alongside a primary residence, there is no need to embed triplexes and fourplexes within the bylaw, unless these were either affordable housing units and/or fully accessible housing units. Reflecting the intent of the Official Plan and also addressing the PPS statement regarding affordable units
- At a minimum, triplexes and fourplexes should have one affordable unit
- there should be a specific section mandating affordable units in a multi residential subdivision
- multi residential units should be kept out of the downtown core
- why the elimination of minimum residential building size? Is this mandated by the PPS?
- bylaw should have specific provisions regarding the design of new builds, so that they reflect what is stipulated in the Official Plan.
- the redline version of the zoning bylaw should show what is clearly mandated by the Province vs what is recommended by the planner. This would help to identify those areas where public input can have an impact
- no single large apartment unit should be permitted in the urban area as part of the zoning bylaw.
- lot coverage percentage reductions should be reversed to original numbers. No resident has asked for this, the Province does not mandate this.
- developments should have as a standard studies covering impact on all services, traffic pattern studies done over three days including a weekend, at three different periods of the year, including mid summer.
- why has the minimum lot size for a hobby farm of 9.9ac been eliminated?
- why have the rural lot sizes been reduced in area?
- what is the justification for the elimination of the R1 zoning
- Does the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing not require a minimum lot size of 2.22acres to be on septic/private services? If this is the case why the reduction from 2.5acres in the zoning bylaw? even if it is not, why the need for the reduced lot size?

- section 5.2.2 Multiple Residential Dwelling and Apartment Dwelling on private services refers to a maximum of 5 units per 1 acre lot. a) bylaw refers to fourplexes, where does 5 units come in, and given the earlier point, 1 acre lot with 5 units? is this permissible?
- where community play areas must be provided, the play area must meet Ontario accessibility standards including the structure.

As brought forth by most attendees, a revised document and a repeat of the public meetings should occur before this goes to Council for approval.

Many Thanks
Yves Grandmaitre

From: Yves Grandmaitre (#3)
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 11:34 AM
To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman
Subject: zoning bylaw

Hi Julia

An additional question regarding the proposed zoning bylaw. Does the bylaw have provisions that would either prevent or limit the building of this style of house (picture attached, shown as a realtor listing for the Lewis street lot) within the downtown core given the historical nature of the Village? This style of house would definitely not be consistent with its neighbors nor the overall area.

Many Thanks
Yves Grandmaitre





From: Yves Grandmaitre (#4)
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2025 4:51 PM
To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman
Subject: Zoning bylaw

Julia

An additional question for the Planner regarding the new zoning by-laws.

Given that the province is not mandating fourplexes in residential areas, why have these been added to the proposed zoning bylaw?

Many thanks
Yves Grandmaitre



Travis Troughton
To: Forbes Symon
Cc: Ken Shelley
Wed 1/29/2025 10:10 AM

Good Morning Forbes,

Just following up to yesterday - you asked we send a following e-mail in regards to the zoning and subzoning for townhomes and further just more overall clarity of the changes and implications to the R2/R3 zoning.

Thank you for your time,
TT

Travis Troughton
Development Manager | Park View Homes
park-view-homes.ca



From: Martin Smith
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2025 8:53 AM
To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman
Subject: Comments on Draft Zoning Bylaw

Good morning.

All of my questions on the draft bylaw were answered, but I did notice a couple of possible anomalies.

Section 3.32.2, Temporary Use Provisions: This section has no content.

Section 19.10, Existing By-laws: The actual number of the bylaw being replaced is not specified.

Thank you.

Martin



7 February 2025

Feedback on draft Merrickville-Wolford Zoning By-law

I would like to formally submit the following comments in response to the draft Zoning By-law document:

Summary:

Given the omissions and errors found in the section of my personal interest (Section 5), the public can have no confidence that equivalent errors and omissions are not present throughout the document. Consequently, it is strongly recommended that the whole document undergo a detailed review and edit and an updated version of the document be provided to the public for further review (28 days) before any formal consideration by Council. Public review of the updated document is particularly relevant as details need to be added (such as townhouse zoning provisions) which the public has not had the opportunity to evaluate in the current version.

Details:

Schedule B:

The map incorrectly shows St John Street as open to vehicular traffic from Sophie Lane to Main Street West. However, the section between Wallace Street and Bruce Street has a pedestrian only walkway.

Section 5: Residential Zones

Street townhouses have been deleted as permitted use (5.1.1) and all associated zone provisions have also been deleted making it impossible to comment on them.

Planned unit townhouses have been deleted as a permitted use in section (5.2.1) all associated zone provisions have also been deleted making it impossible to comment on them.

General:

The overall quality of the document is disappointing and does not reflect well on those involved in its development.

Dr. Paul Marriott

127 Margaret Street, Merrickville-Wolford



From: Pam Marriott

Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 12:04 PM

To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman

Subject: Zoning by-law document

Hello,

In response to the request for comments regarding the by-law document, I would like to offer just one comment. I found this 132-page document very difficult to read with its various colors and strikethroughs.

I would have appreciated a more completed version (even though I understand that this is a draft document) with significant changes noted separately.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback.

Pam Marriott

425 County Road 41

Wolford



From: Monique Perras
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 3:52 PM
To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman
Subject: Fwd: About the Illumination By-Law

To the Municipal Clerk- Municipality of Merrickville;

Open for discussion at the next Council meeting.

Ref. Illumination provision of the Zoning Bylaw /section 3.19

I absolutely support the idea of including a section about Illumination in the new Zoning By Law.

It should indeed be applicable to the entire Municipality, including the "rural" areas.

And without any exemptions. It should be applicable to all residential, and non-residential, farms, etc.

Exterior lights should be deflected or designed as to deflect away from adjacent lots and streets, so that the positioning of lighting does not impair the use or enjoyment of neighbouring properties.

Light pollution or "overuse of artificial light" should also be considered too.

Nobody moves to the country, especially in a rural area, to look at spotlights or flashing lights all night long (!) But rather to enjoy dark starry nights and enjoy skywatching. The overuse of artificial light at night can disrupt natural patterns of darkness; it can harm the ecosystem, wildlife and human health, and it is totally undesirable.

Thank you for discussing those aspects at the next Council meeting and for your consideration!

Monique Perras

#438 Cr23, Merrickville.



From: Patrick Dawson

Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 2:46 PM

To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman

Subject: Support for inclusion of Illumination in Property Standards bylaw

I am writing to indicate my support for the inclusion of a section on illumination in the Property Standards bylaw scheduled for discussion in the upcoming council meeting.

The bylaw should address situations in which the projection or reflection of light on to roadways or adjacent properties (particularly residential properties) is dangerous or an unwarranted, unwanted nuisance. The value of "dark sky" zones should be incorporated into the rationale for such a bylaw. The measurement of the illumination's intensity, duration, frequency and proximity to traffic and the property of others (neighbours) must be a factor when determining a breach of the bylaw.

Intensity measured in lumens at the area affected.

Proximity measured in linear distance from the source to the area affected.

Duration measured in minutes or hours per night

Frequency in cycles per night, where timers or motion detection is employed.

Respectfully,

Patrick Dawson

438 CR23

Merrickville-Wolford



From: Peter Szmids & Donna Ross

Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 1:24 PM

To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman

Cc: Donna Ross

Subject: By-Law reviews and illumination

Julia:

My wife, Donna Ross and I wish to submit the following comments regarding lights and illumination for the Planner to consider when updating the current Zoning Bylaw. As well, we request that these comments also be considered when municipal staff brings the Property Standards bylaw back to the Council for discussion.

As the Village continues its review of By-Laws, we wish to offer our encouragement of such reviews and, specifically to support the ongoing inclusion of a section on illumination in the Zoning By-Law (23-08) as well as the Property Standards By-Law (22-03). Specifically, the By-Laws state that lighting "shall be installed with the light directed and deflected away from adjacent lots and streets" (23-08, Section 3.16) and "the lighting shall not be positioned so as to cause any impairment of the use or enjoyment of neighboring properties" (22-03, Section 3.76).

One of the reasons we moved to the rural part of this municipality was to get away from the light pollution of the urban spaces that we have lived in all our working years and to enjoy the dark skies that that the rural area provides.

We further encourage Council and staff to ensure that such expectations as those mentioned above are applicable throughout the municipality. While the historical loosening of restrictions in areas designated "Rural" once made sense, the significant increase in residential homes along corridors such as County Road 23, blurs the distinction between "Rural" and "Urban".

Thank you,

Peter Szmids & Donna Ross

437 County Road 23



From: Robert Lockwood
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 11:45 PM
To: Julia McCaugherty-Jansman
Subject: Zoning Bylaw Redline Review

Submitted electronically to: Clerk, Merrickville-Wolford, Fri. Feb. 28/25, by Mr. Robert Lockwood, resident of Wolford

Part 1: Initial considerations having to do with select definitions;

* hunt camp/fishing camp - confusing or lack of clear distinction in the description of what kind of structures are permitted, the latter part of the description comes across as contradictory to that used in the aforementioned part, should somehow make reference that included in the description "...shall not include a single detached dwelling...", including travel trailers/motor homes (common practice) ?

* park, private - current description infers it's the same as parameter of "park, public" only privately owned...is that the only intended distinction ?

* derelict vehicle - since the 1st line references/delineates vehicle, boat, trailer, the 2nd line/last line only refers to a vehicle being repaired by owner, it is suggested that last reference should also include boat & trailer ?

Part 2: Considerations applying to section 12, Rural (RU) Zone; Past editions of the Township Zoning Regulations referenced that 'rural zone' was not intended for recreational development involving private campgrounds/trailer parks (inc. rental trailers) & even went as far as indicating how many travel trailers were permitted on said property, as well as the limits of frequency & max. length of stay, given the new format of this document which now references what can be done in this regard how do those aspects get addressed ?

Furthermore, I do not agree with all of the inclusions under "12.1, Permitted Uses", in particular, "hunting/fishing camp" or "private park", the definitions of which are very broad, vague & once established become precedent setting & difficult to have removed when in conflict with neighbouring properties, not to mention how the activities affect; privacy, tranquility, increased traffic & noise. Not all rural properties are equal, some inland, others waterfront & others involving various kinds of farms, as such it seems appropriate to consider which uses are permissible based on the 'nature' of the rural property.

Thank you for this opportunity for the public to share their thoughts on this important review.