

## Feedback and Actions related to Public Input from Open Houses

Thirty-two (32) written submissions were received (online feedback form, email, written feedback) following the Open House held on April 26<sup>th</sup>. Each submission was reviewed for key themes and implications and revisions to OP and bylaw were drafted for considerations, while other revisions were proposed to clarify intent. The following tables outline issues/concerns that did not lead to changes and the reasons, changes to the text of Official Plan, changes to the text of Bylaw, and changes to Zoning. Finally, a summary of next steps is outlined.

Larger Areas of Issue/Concern	Current Recommendation
<u>Private roads</u> – Submissions were received about the proposal to require public roads for all new subdivisions.	<i>The underlying policy intention in the proposed approach has not changed and no change is recommended.</i>
<u>Flood risk areas</u> – concerns about preventing development of residential uses in projected flood plain. Some requested that the provisions be removed, others asked for a waiver option or for existing property owners to be exempted.	<i>Flood risk standards include a range of objectives, not simply protecting property owners from damage to property. Building in a flood plain can result in public safety challenges during emergency situations, health and safety considerations as a result of mold and other flood damage, and environmental contamination considerations resulting from contaminated wells and compromised septic systems.</i>  <i>Planning is not based on ownership (current owners vs future owners) but rather on the use.</i>  <i>The current recommendation is to retain the current approach, although other options are being assessed.</i>
<u>Restrictions on number of lots in RA zone</u> – some submissions and comments were received about the proposed restrictions	<i>The underlying policy intention in the proposed approach has not changed and the option for property owners to seek a change in zoning remains. No change is recommended.</i>
<u>Written notification to surrounding uses before development</u> – one request that all adjoining property owners be notified in writing as part of the application for subdivision approval.	<i>Making the requested change would imply a level of influence for adjoining property owners that does not exist. It is also administratively burdensome. The purpose of the plan and zoning is to indicate potential accepted uses. So long as proposals for development fit within that plan, no public notice is required. The public process kicks in when a change in zoning is proposed and it is here that the public can weigh in and provide input to Council's decision on whether or not to permit the proposed development.</i>
<u>Parkland Dedication</u> – being subject to Council discretion on location and/or the requirement to provide at all, as well as questions regarding existing parkland and responsibility for their maintenance.	<i>While councils generally work with developers based on the intended design of a subdivision, it is important for councils to be able to say no when proposed parkland is in such a location or configuration as to be unusable as parkland.</i>  <i>Parkland is an important concept in terms of ensuring the preservation of open space networks and providing for the recreation needs of a growing community.</i>  <i>Existing parks approved under provincial jurisdiction are in most cases either continued in the ownership of the developer or held in common by the property owners in the subdivision. Unless those parks/open spaces are turned over to the municipality, their long term maintenance remains the responsibility of the owner of the open space.</i>

## Proposed Official Plan Changes

Section	Changes	Reason
Policy EN-1: Habitat Areas	Revised policy for Council to support efforts between the local watershed groups and landowners to identify and protect significant habitat areas and natural features in the Municipality.	Concerns that April wording implied intent to add 60 m buffer in future. Recommended more general wording and changes for Council to be supportive of activities rather than actively involved in habitat protection. Removed plan action to consider expanded watercourse and wetland buffers in significant habitat areas in future plans but retained the overall policy regarding habitat as Council has an obligation to consider environmental matters, including habitat areas, in its official plan.
General	A range of minor drafting edits are being identified to better reflect changes made for the April drafts, to ensure consistency with the draft land use bylaw, and for overall drafting clarity.	

## Proposed Bylaw Changes

Section	Change	Reason
3.9	Professional Design of Buildings – simplified wording	Intent was only to cover situations where signed and stamped drawings are required under provincial legislation, so wording was clarified.
4.1	Accessory Buildings and Structures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restricted in front yard setback from the property line, not full front yard</li> <li>Can be built without a main building</li> <li>Shipping containers permitted in all zones, but must be in the rear yard.</li> </ul>	Drafted regulations were too restrictive in a rural community context
4.13	Restricting number of Main Buildings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only in the RR zone</li> <li>Other standards for properties with multiple main buildings simplified</li> </ul>	Too restrictive in a rural area. The change will allow people to have a house and commercial operation with more than one building the same lot where permitted in the RA zone.
6.8	Intensive Livestock Operations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum distance separation for new livestock operations only</li> <li>All new residential subdivisions require a 305m (1000 ft.) setback from an existing intensive livestock operation.</li> </ul>	Removed application of standards for extensions to existing operations in order to protect existing agricultural uses.
7.6	Livestock in Rural Residential (RR) Zone <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added standard for horses (max 1 per ½ acre)</li> <li>Other animals not specifically listed would be up to Council, with criteria</li> </ul>	Comments were made about too limited an approach to regulating livestock on residential properties.

Section	Change	Reason
13.3	Road Standards to public standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Required for all new roads, exception for lands that are permanently set aside for conservation</li> </ul>	Permits an access to an internal (ie landlocked) parcel that was created and turned over for permanent conservation, where the parcel won't be further developed over time.
General	A range of minor drafting edits are being identified to better reflect changes made for the April drafts, to ensure consistency with the draft official plan, and for overall drafting clarity.	

## Zoning changes

Zone	Change	Reason
Rural Residential (RR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A couple of properties were identified where they were not in fact separate legal parcel and where their inclusion in the RR zone was due to a mapping error.</li> </ul>	In response to public comments regarding different approaches to zoning existing residential lots.
Existing private ROWs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some private rights-of-way are not individual properties and/or are not recognized by the regulating authority as rights-of-way – the zoning of those parcels was adjusted to match the surrounding zoning.</li> </ul>	In response to public comments regarding different approaches to zoning existing residential lots.
Cemeteries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified sites have been redesignated as Rural Area</li> </ul>	Some existing cemeteries were zoned Rural Residential – this was a mapping error based on parcel size. While institutional uses are permitted in the RR zone, it is clearer to designate them as RA.

## Next steps

- Drafts will be reviewed for drafting and form.
- Drafts submitted to Planning Board for approval to release drafts in preparation for the statutory public meeting.
- Statutory public meeting will be schedule and held – follow the project website, the municipality's website, the project social media accounts the Guardian for details
- Revisions made as appropriate based on comments from statutory public meeting and submission of drafts to Planning Board
- Final recommendation from Planning Board to send to Council
- Council meetings (requires 2 meetings on separate days)
- Submission of package to Province for ministerial approval.

For information on this project: [www.planrmwr.ca](http://www.planrmwr.ca) | [www.westriverpe.ca](http://www.westriverpe.ca) | Facebook: [www.facebook.com/planwestriver](https://www.facebook.com/planwestriver)

If internet access is a challenge for you, please contact the municipal office for other ways to get the information.

**Municipal Office:** 902 675 7000 | [admin@westriverpe.ca](mailto:admin@westriverpe.ca) | Afton Community Center, MacEwen Room, 1552-B Rte. 19, New Dominion, PE C0A 1H6