



October 18, 2021

Corporation of the County of Prince Edward
Development Services
322 Picton Main Street
Picton, ON
K0K 2T0

**Attention: Michael Michaud, Manager of Planning
James Griffin, Planner**

Dear Mr. Michaud and Mr. Griffin,

**Re: Resubmission – Zoning By-law Amendment and
Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications
4-74 Nery Avenue and 27-81 Inkerman Avenue, Hallowell**

On behalf of FLC Group Inc., SvN Architects + Planners are pleased to submit the enclosed revised materials in support of a zoning by-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision for the lands bounded by Nery Avenue and Inkerman Avenue, in the Ward of Hallowell. The lands are known by their municipal addresses 2-74 Nery Avenue and 27-81 Inkerman Avenue.

FLC Group Inc. propose to develop a new, vibrant residential community comprised of 525 residential units planned around publicly accessible streets, an improved “Village Green”, and a network of pedestrian walkways and open spaces. The community is planned to complement adjacent residential uses and natural areas through context-sensitive development that provides sustainable densities in the form of low-rise buildings.

Prince Edward County (“the County”) is experiencing a critical shortage of affordable housing. The revised proposal’s varied tenures, unit sizes and dwelling types will provide significant relief to this crisis with more than 50% of the units considered attainable or affordable.



This is the application's third submission. It is made with the request that a final decision on the Zoning By-Law Amendment Application is heard at a Council meeting this calendar year. The second submission was made in August 2021 however it is our understanding it was not circulated to all departments. This submission includes updates to the site plan drawing and various supporting materials. No new civil engineering materials are being submitted until the technical peer reviewer (RV Anderson) and County staff provide comments on the materials submitted with the August 2021 submission. No new materials in support of the Draft Plan of Subdivision application are provided.

Once comments on the August 2021 engineering materials have been received and there is consensus on the proposed servicing strategy, revised engineering drawings and reports can be provided to the County. It is requested the Draft Plan of Subdivision application be heard at a council meeting following a decision on the Zoning By-Law Amendment application. Supporting materials for that application will be provided following the council decision on the Zoning By-Law Amendment.

This letter includes a summary of application milestones to date, and a description of specific revisions which address concerns and comments provided on the first and second submissions. A detailed response to the comments from County Planning is included as an attachment to this letter. Responses to the technical comments from the first submission are provided in a comment matrix with this submission.

I. PROPOSAL HISTORY

The zoning by-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision applications and supporting materials were first submitted on September 10, 2020. Staff and agency comments were received in February 2021, and the engineering peer review comments were received in April 2021. A socially distanced public open house was held on September 24, 2020, and a Statutory Public Meeting was held virtually at the County's Planning Committee Meeting on February 17, 2021. A presentation to the Prince Edward County Heritage Advisory Committee (PEHAC) occurred on April 14, 2021.

As mentioned, a full second submission was made on August 11, 2021. It is our understanding that the submission materials were not circulated due to concerns from Planning Staff regarding built form and access.



Changes to the Proposal & Revisions to Submission Materials

The August 2021 submission proposed a new recreation centre as shared amenity for the new condominium community. This replaced the retained church from the original submission to provide better quality purpose-built space. An additional detached dwelling was proposed to be retained and repurposed for community space for the rental units. The three dwellings have been retained in order to address comments from PEHAC regarding the historical significance of the property to the history of Picton. The site was home to military officers and their families from the 1940s to the 1960s, and functioned as a residential institution for individuals with developmental disabilities from 1970 to 1999. It has been privately owned operated as rental housing for the past 22 years.

The second submission also made change to the proposal dwelling offerings and unit types. These have been further revised with this third submission. The revised proposal consists of 525 residential units, in a diverse range of unit types:

- 177 three-storey flat roof stacked b2b units (33%)
- 54 two-storey flat roof b2b units (10%)
- 117 three-storey pitched roof stacked b2b units (22%)
- 72 three-storey street townhouses (14%)
- 16 semi-detached units (3%)
- 3 single detached units (<1%)
- 2 refurbished single detached units (<1%)
- 84 three-storey rental apartment units (16%)

This change to the overall unit mix and tenure was made in response to concerns raised by planning staff regarding housing diversity and the loss of existing rental housing. It is intended that one new rental building will be delivered with each phase of the condominium development to maintain a balance of rental and ownership housing and provide existing tenants the opportunity to move into the newly constructed rental buildings.

The draft zoning by-law has been revised to permit additional uses within the R3-xx zone, namely single detached dwellings, open space uses, private park, and stormwater management facility. Minimum parking requirements were added to the by-law. They are consistent with the requirements in by-law 1816-2006, save and except for the apartment dwellings (stacked back-to-back townhouses) which have been assigned a rate of 1.5 spaces per unit, which is consistent with the rate for Picton ward. In our opinion, this rate is appropriate given the site proximity to Picton, and it is consistent with the transportation demand management



objectives of the Official Plan. The by-law submitted with this third submission provides updates to the draft by-law to be consistent with the aforementioned changes to the proposal.

The revised Heritage Impact Assessment, provided in August 2021 and resubmitted with this third submission, prepared by Common Bond Collective, provides some additional details that were requested by the Peer Reviewer. CBC's opinion with regard to the significance of the property and its buildings with regard to Ontario Regulation 9/06 is unchanged. The site does not meet any of the Regulation's criteria related to design, historic or contextual value, and as such they do not find the site to have heritage significance. In spite of this finding, Common Bond acknowledge that the site has a legacy that is important to many residents of Prince Edward County, and as such they have made recommendations for commemorative opportunities throughout the site, which will be incorporated through the site plan approval process for various phases.

A full comment-response matrix is provided with this submission and includes responses to comments on the first submission, with notes on where to find the information in the revised consultant materials. A detailed response to the planning comments is included as an attachment to this letter.

II. SUBMISSION DETAILS

The following materials are submitted in support of the zoning by-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision applications:

Item Name

1. Draft Zoning By-law prepared by SvN Architects + Planners and dated October 15, 2021;
2. Zoning Compliance Table prepared by SvN Architects + Planners and dated October 15, 2021;
3. Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by Common Bond Inc and dated February 2021;
4. Heritage Response to Comments, prepared by Common Bond Inc and dated February 2021;
5. Transportation Addendum prepared by RJ Burnside and dated October 15 2021;
6. Stormwater Management Report prepared by Greck Engineering and dated August 10 2021;



7. Stormwater Due Diligence Letter prepared by Greck Engineering and dated October 15, 2021;
8. Functional Servicing Report prepared by John Towle Engineers and dated July 2021;
9. Civil Engineer's Letter prepared by John Towle Engineers and dated October 15, 2021;
10. Architectural Site Plan (drawing no. RZ01) prepared by Kirkor Architects and dated October 18 2021;
11. Façade and Materials Package prepared by Kirkor Architects and dated April 15, 2021;
12. Affordable housing package prepared by FLC Group and dated May 25, 2021, including the following:
 - a) Affordability proposal description;
 - b) Presentation to Prince Edward County Council dated May 24, 2021.
13. Comment-response matrix prepared by SvN Architects + Planners and dated August 6, 2021.

A digital submission is being provided via email with a download link. Hard copies can be provided upon request.

We trust the above materials provide the information required to facilitate the preparation of a staff report to Planning Committee and Council this fall. We look forward to continuing our work with the County, as well as external agencies and stakeholders, to deliver this exciting project.

Sincerely,

Anthony Greenberg, MPI, MCIP, RPP
Associate, Development Planning Lead

Kelly Graham, MPI, RPP
Planner

c. Fred Heller, FLC Group



Attachments: Response to County Planning comments



Attachment 1: Response to County Planning Comments (first submission, February 26, 2021)

Comment #1 & 2:

The proposal is 'intensification' as per section 2.4.1.5 of the Secondary plan as the redevelopment of underutilized lands rather than the extension of an existing neighbourhood. Section 2.4.3 of the Picton Urban Centre Secondary Plan defines intensification as: *The development of a property, site, or area at a higher density or intensity than currently exists. Intensification generally occurs by means of redevelopment, development, of vacant and/or underutilized lots within built up areas, or expansion or conversion of existing buildings.*

The preferred density for 'Intensification' is 25 units/per net hectare and not 37 units per net hectare as noted in the Planning rationale. The proposal is for a 44.6 units/ per net hectare please reduce the density to be closer to the preferred density target.

While we recognize that technically the proposal is defined as intensification according to Section 2.4.3, this project is unlike typical intensification projects due to the size and location of the subject site, and scale of the proposal. Intensification is described in the Picton Secondary Plan as “minor infilling on existing lots of record” (S2.4.3.2). It is typically understood as the redevelopment of a single property or collection of a small number of properties within an established area such as Downtown Picton, where the intensification site directly abuts one or more neighbours who will be directly impacted by the proposed intensification due to the potential for shadow and privacy impacts, noise, or increased traffic.

This site is on the outskirts of Picton, where there are only a small number of immediate neighbours. New development will be situated a considerable distance from the existing homes on Inkerman Avenue and Diverbelt Avenue, so there will be no shadowing or overlook. The transportation study by RJ Burnside demonstrates that there will be minimal impacts on the surrounding road network due to the limited traffic generated by the proposal.

The development criteria for residential intensification are found in Section 2.4.3.5 of the Secondary Plan. In our opinion, the proposal meets all of these criteria. It is consistent with the policies of the Town Residential Area (a), the site is suitable for intensification (b), and it can be supported by the existing servicing and road network (c & d). As part of this resubmission,



the functional servicing report proposes a new servicing solution for water supply which initially will be funded by the Applicant and could support the future development of adjacent properties. The revised proposal is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood (e) provides adequate privacy, sunlight, and views to the sky for new and existing residents (f), and is consistent with the Town Design policies of Section 4.1, as demonstrated in the Planning and Urban Design Rationale provided with the first submission.

The site is located on the edge of town and is underutilized relative to its potential to accommodate a significant number and variety of housing units. Notwithstanding the definition of intensification in the Secondary Plan, it is more appropriate to use the density thresholds for “*new neighbourhoods*”, which permits a density of 37 units/net hectare (S2.4.2.3).

The revised proposal consists of a reduction in the total number of units from 560 to 525, resulting in a net density of 42.4 units per hectare (uph). This is a reduction from the 44.6 uph in the original proposal. With typical intensification proposals, the development sites are smaller in area and therefore cannot accommodate a significant number of units in a form that is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. In the case of the proposal, the site is sufficiently large to accommodate a density of 42.3 uph while covering only 18% of the site and retaining 56% as landscaped open space. The landscaped areas provide breathing room for the denser built forms, and there are amenity spaces immediately adjacent to nearly every building. These semi-private “yards” are complemented by a larger private park at the centre of the community, known as the Village Green.

In our opinion the proposed density is appropriate for the site, given its site, location, and surrounding context. The proposal meets all of the criteria for residential intensification under Section 2.4.3.5 of the Secondary Plan. While it is noted that 24 units per net hectare is the preferred density target, an amendment to the Official Plan is not required to permit higher densities in exchange for the provision of community benefits. The proposed community benefits to be provided as part of this proposal include:

- Provision of attainable ownership housing, with downpayment assistance available for qualified buyers for a portion of the units;
- Potential for provision of affordable rental housing, subject to the participation of the County or PELASS;
- Retention and reuse of 3 existing homes, allowing for the historical role of the site as housing for military personnel to be preserved; and,



- Creation of new private park and connections to the trail network in the Macaulay Mountain Conservation Area.

Comment #3:

As a means of creating a complete neighbourhood, Section 2.4.3.1 of the Secondary plan encourages the provision of broader mix of everyday uses (i.e.: mix of housing types, small commercial plaza etc.) in close proximity to intensification proposals. There are no commercial uses proposed on or near the redevelopment. Please provide a design which includes a more complete community by including commercial uses and mixture of housing types.

It is not feasible to provide commercial uses on the subject site. It does not have frontage on a major street, and the population in the proposed development and the surrounding neighbourhood would not be enough to sustain a small store or cafe. There is not enough through traffic to drive economic success, so it would be challenging to find a willing tenant. Furthermore, the incursion of delivery trucks into a quiet residential neighbourhood would not be desirable. In our opinion, the lands along London Avenue are more appropriate for commercial development. A store on London Avenue would be in walking distance for residents of Picton Heights, and would also attract people passing by on their way in or out of town.

At the current time there is not sufficient density in Picton Heights, even with the 525 units in the revised proposal, to support a mix of everyday uses in close proximity. However, it is noted that the Heights Development Area to the south is planned to accommodate a mix of uses which will complement the proposed development and provide a complete neighbourhood with places to live, shop, work, and play.

The revised proposal conforms to policy 2.4.3.1. It creates a complete residential neighbourhood with a range of housing and amenities, and encourages active modes of transportation with new pathways and a connection into the trail network in the Conservation Area. The revised proposal includes a greater mix of housing, including 72 rental units. In addition, the revised proposal introduces several different designs for the 3-storey back-to-back townhouses, giving the appearance of greater diversity.



Comment #4 & 5:

The secondary plan encourages intensification in the town residential area be compatible with the existing built form and character of the existing and surrounding neighbourhoods. How is this development maintaining & enhancing the existing built form of the surrounding community? Please submit a design which is more compatible with the existing built form and character of the surrounding area.

Elements of compatibility to be considered include: a) Siting, scale, and design of new development in relation to the characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood, such as: scale, massing, setbacks, access, landscape treatment, building materials, exterior design elements, and lighting; b) Protection and enhancement of cultural and natural heritage features by means of siting, building design, and landscape design; and c) Architectural style, street pattern, and site arrangement where such style or arrangement represents a defining component of the surrounding neighbourhood or the historic or cultural significance of the area.

The Secondary Plan intends to maintain and enhance already established neighbourhoods by encouraging compatible infill development and extension to these neighbourhoods. Compatibility does not mean “the same”. It is not desirable or appropriate to replicate the Permanent Married Quarters (PMQs) as these were built as temporary housing for the war effort, and do not optimize the use of the land. Their design and form prioritized functionality and speed of construction to meet an immediate need, and they were not built to last. The revised proposal enhances the established neighbourhood of Picton Heights by introducing new housing options and replenishing the supply of rental housing. The subject site has been allowed to fall into disrepair and is sorely in need of upgrades to both the housing stock and the public realm to preserve and enhance the quality of place.

In the surrounding community, the homes are set back quite a distance from the street, with driveways in the front yard. The revised proposal consolidates parking, and the new buildings are sited in a manner that will serve to activate street edges, with all buildings having direct access from the street.

In the surrounding community, the homes are primarily single and semi-detached dwellings, with pitched roofs and wood or vinyl siding. The revised proposal introduces a distinct built



character with 3-storey townhouse buildings in brick and stucco. Nonetheless, these buildings are complementary and do not negatively impact the character of the surrounding neighbourhood.

The surrounding neighbourhood has a significant amount of landscaped open space, but very few fences. This is replicated in the revised proposal with landscaped courtyards framed by buildings, curvilinear streets, and no fences. The central open space that is a characteristic of military housing developments across Canada has been retained and will be landscaped and programmed with spaces for active and passive recreation.

Since the first submission, Kirkor Architects have conducted a review of building types and architectural styles in Picton and across the County and have incorporated their learnings into the design of the buildings. The revised proposal includes 8 distinct building types, as described above.

The Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Common Bond Collective states that the former PMQs on the subject site “*represent standard plans designed for cost-effective construction and maintenance over time*” adding, “*Ultimately they constitute generic domestic designs with simple details and little obvious architectural value.*” The design of the revised proposal responds to many of the site planning features of PMQ neighbourhoods including the street pattern and open space, but does not attempt to replicate the architectural style.

The revised proposal includes several placemaking initiatives that carry forward the site’s history for future generations:

- Retention of 3 existing heritage properties
- Re-imagination of the central open space as a shared amenity for passive and active recreation
- Use of historical plaques to convey the narrative of the former PMQs and the site’s heritage

In our engagement with the public we heard that people like to go for walks through Picton Heights and access the trails in the Conservation Area. Many noted that they were looking forward to the new walkways and amenity areas shown in the landscape plan.

Comment #6:



Planning staff supports utilizing the existing homes on site into an area to promote affordable housing either through a co-op/condo/freehold development.

Unfortunately, the majority of the existing homes have fallen into disrepair and are not suitable for re-use. At the time of construction, these buildings were low cost solutions to meet an immediate need – they were not built to last. The revised proposal includes the retention of 3 existing dwellings which will be refurbished and maintained as rental units and community space.

Comment #7 & 8:

The Secondary Plan directs Council to work toward meeting a target of 33% of new housing to be developed as affordable housing (Section 4.3.5). The section outlines affordable as the most affordable of the following two options:

- a. Housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for households with incomes in the lowest 60 percent of the income distribution for the County; or
- b. Housing for which the purchase price is at least 10 percent below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the County;

Please outline which option will be followed and how the project is working to achieve this target.

Section 4.3.16. of the Secondary Plan discourages the conversion of rental housing stock to condominium tenure if such conversion results in a reduction in the amount of comparable rental housing available to a level less than three percent as established by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Notwithstanding the current vacancy rate. Please describe how the proposed development is consistent with this policy.

The revised proposal makes a significant contribution to the County’s supply of affordable housing. The project consists of unit types that are not found elsewhere in the County, and has been designed to be “attainable” to people who currently live and work in the County. At least 33% of the project will be defined as “affordable” as per 4.3.5b, with a purchase price at least 10% below the average resale price in the County. An additional 15% of the units in the revised proposal are rental, replenishing the rental housing supply in Picton and providing homes for workers in the tourism and hospitality industry.



FLC Group is committed to offering downpayment assistance to 5% of purchasers who qualify based on household income. FLC Group has engaged in discussions with various levels of government regarding additional subsidies for both ownership and rental units, and these conversations are still ongoing.

At minimum, approximately 50% of the units in the proposed development are affordable or attainable. This significant contribution is only financially feasible to the Applicant at the density being sought. The revised proposal conforms to the Official Plan and the Secondary Plan and supports Council's strategic objectives including financial sustainability, a stable and diversified economy, and a liveable community.

The housing crisis is a significant risk to the tourism and hospitality industry in Prince Edward County. The tourism industry is the second largest employer in the County, with a large number of seasonal workers. Increasingly, employers in this sector are finding it difficult to attract and retain workers due to the high cost and limited availability of housing. The impacts are not limited to seasonal workers. Even long-standing local families are struggling to finding housing options, particularly young people who want to settle down in the community they grew up in and that they love. The revised proposal couldn't come at a better time, with 526 units of what can be considered "workforce housing" in a beautiful new community in Picton Heights.