

Additional Dwelling Units – Public Comments

Comments received up to and including September 9, 2021

The following documents were received from the public regarding the proposed Municipally-initiated Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw Amendments to increase permissions for Additional Dwelling Units (ADUs).

If you require any of this information in an alternate format, please contact the Planning and Development Services Department at planning@clarington.net or 905-623-3379 ext. 2405

Jull, Mark

From: [REDACTED]@outlook.com
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2021 9:54 AM
To: Jull, Mark
Cc: Pingle, Julia
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Meeting for Additional Dwelling Units

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

Hello Mark,

Thank you for speaking with me regarding this initiative.

I was originally excited, but now I am disappointed to learn that my property and many others will not qualify as they are within the Natural Heritage map area.

I do have the following question for the team,

Please let me know your thoughts,
Regan Trolly

[REDACTED]

Question:

Why can a Dwelling that is already approved by the Environmental Regulator, with appropriately sized utilities to prevent "site alteration" not have a secondary unit in the basement?

Comparison Tables of Draft Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments Additional Dwelling Units (ADUs)

Current Official Plan policies	Proposed changes to Official Plan policies	Explanatory comment
e) The <i>accessory apartment</i> is registered with the Municipality.		
6.3.6 An <i>accessory apartment</i> is permitted outside of Urban Areas within a detached dwelling or above or within a detached accessory building, subject to the following: a) That the accessory building use is maintained; b) That the <i>accessory apartment</i> complies with the development criteria of Section 6.3.5; and c) That in the case of an <i>accessory apartment</i> above or within an accessory building, the accessory building is in close proximity to the dwelling and is clearly secondary to the principal dwelling.	6.3.6 Notwithstanding 6.3.5, within the Oak Ridges Moraine, as shown on Map H of this Plan: a) within the Natural Core and Natural Linkage Areas, <i>additional dwelling units</i> are not permitted; and b) within the Countryside and Settlement Areas, a maximum of one <i>additional dwelling unit</i> is permitted on a lot and only within a <i>single detached dwelling</i> .	Required to be in conformity with the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). In 2017, the ORMCP was amended with a revised definition of "single dwelling" that limits where ADUs may be permitted.
	6.3.7 Notwithstanding 6.3.5, within the Natural Heritage System as identified on Map D this Official Plan, <i>additional dwelling units are not permitted</i> .	Conforms with policy 3.4.8 of the Official Plan.
	6.3.8 Notwithstanding 6.3.5, within the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan, but outside of the Natural Heritage System as identified on Map D of this Official Plan, <i>additional dwelling units</i> are only permitted within <i>single detached dwellings</i> and accessory buildings that existed on (or building permits were issued prior to) July 1, 2017.	Required to conform to Section 4.5.3 of the Greenbelt Plan. The revised Greenbelt Plan came into effect on July 1, 2017.

Clarington Official Plan

3.4.8 Development and site alteration with respect to land within a natural heritage feature and/or a hydrologically sensitive feature or within its vegetation protection zone is prohibited, except the following:

- a) Forest, fish and wildlife management;
- b) Conservation and flood or erosion control projects, but only if they have been demonstrated to be necessary in the public interest after all alternatives have been considered;
- c) Transportation, infrastructure and utilities, but only if the need for the project has been demonstrated by an Environmental Assessment, there is no reasonable alternative, and it is supported by a project specific Environmental Impact Study; and
- d) Low intensity recreation.

From: Jull, Mark <MJull@clarington.net>
Sent: August 18, 2021 2:20 PM
To: Jull, Mark <MJull@clarington.net>
Cc: Pingle, Julia <JPingle@clarington.net>
Subject: Notice of Public Meeting for Additional Dwelling Units

Good afternoon,
 You are receiving this correspondence because you requested to be kept informed about updates to the Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw Amendments to increase permissions for additional dwelling units (ADUs).

Please find attached the proposed Amendments and the Notice of Public Meeting to be held September 13, 2021.

Further information is available at Clarington.net/ADUs.

Thank you,

Mark Jull, MCIP, RPP
 Planner II, Community Planning & Design

Planning & Development Services
Municipality of Clarington
40 Temperance St. Bowmanville, ON L1C 3A6
905-623-3379 ext. 2426 | 1-800-563-1195
www.clarington.net

Clarington

Connect with us:   

Jull, Mark

From: Dale Sturrock [REDACTED]@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2021 12:32 PM
To: Jull, Mark
Subject: ADU

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

Good afternoon Mark,

I have some real concerns regarding the amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning Bylaws. I have lived in Bowmanville all of my life as well as my parents who have since passed away. Allowing an ADU to be permitted within a house and another ADU in their garage is unbelievable!! The town of Bowmanville cannot handle the traffic now, Liberty Street, King Street, Scugog Street, Hwy 57, let alone our schools are full of Portables, how is this going to be allowed to happen?? What has happened to our east beach waterfront is a disgrace!! That valuable lake Ontario shoreline should have been designated to million dollar estate homes, not the hundreds of homes that are occupying the land now. I would be embarrassed to have my name associated to that development and the proposed amendments that are about to take place.

Hopefully you will respond to my email.

Dale

Jull, Mark

From: Lori Moore [REDACTED]@sympatico.ca>
Sent: Saturday, August 21, 2021 8:43 AM
To: Jull, Mark
Subject: Proposed zoning bylaw amendments for ADU

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

I strongly support the proposal for ADU in primary and additional dwellings. A progressive way to address housing shortages.

Thank you.

Dr. Lori Moore
122 Cove Rd
Bowmanville

Jull, Mark

From: Sandra Farrell [REDACTED]@rogers.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2021 10:07 AM
To: Jull, Mark
Subject: Clarington ADU

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

As I age, my daughter and I have been searching for a home with an additional apartment as a “granny flat” in Bowmanville or Newcastle. So I was very excited to see the pictures of the ADU places proposed. However, building on Oak Ridges Moraine which is not that large an area, would make a delightful little community but I would not be in favour of building there. It is home to some rare specimens and animals. That’s why we are getting coyotes and foxes in our back gardens and walking down out streets. I feel the same about green belt land. We have precious little free land where we can take our children and grandchildren to experience nature. Please don’t eat that up with housing, even the wonderful and much needed housing you are proposing. There must be other areas of land you can find that would not be such a disturbance to nature. If you should come up with a better plan, I would be most interested in hearing about it.

This probably isn’t what you want to hear but I have given my two penny worth and I thank you for reading it.

Sandra Farrell 🦉
14 Heatherlea Drive
Newcastle, Ontario
L1B 0B1
Email: [REDACTED]@rogers.com
Sent from my iPad

Jull, Mark

From: Derek Godfrey [REDACTED]@yahoo.ca>
Sent: Sunday, August 29, 2021 9:49 PM
To: Jull, Mark
Subject: Amendments to the official plan and zoning by,was

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

Hello Mark

As a 15 year resident in my street in North Bowmanville we have seen a big increase this summer in parking issues as more homes on our street have been rented out to multiple occupants. We have homes with driveways for 2 vehicles where 4 cars are now being parked 2 being parked across the ends of driveways blocking footpaths and sticking into the roads or vehicles being parked all over the street for more hours than bylaws currently allow.

So my main issue with adding more dwellings and allowing more people to live in previously single family homes is that homes should have adequate off street parking facilities. Driveways need to be able to accommodate all the households vehicles. I would hope this issue is being discussed as often it's an after thought.

Colette Godfrey

Sent from my iPad

Jull, Mark

From: Ryan Carr [REDACTED]@rwcarrinvestment.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 12:35 PM
To: Jull, Mark
Subject: Comments re: Bill 108/ ADU's Accessory Structure

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

Hey Mark -

Brief comments on the proposed accessory dwelling units + Accessory dwelling units within an accessory structure.

In agreement with provincial guidelines, the opportunity to have accessory dwelling units in both the principal dwelling and accessory structure is a fantastic way to achieve intensification within an existing residential zoning designation.

Economics are a contributing factor to why people do what they do, and in the perspective of adding 3rd units to homes it will allow homeowners, first time home buyers, rental housing providers, and seniors to float the cost of modern day housing much easier, while freeing up income to spend on other cost of living considerations.

In its simplest form, 5 years ago, an average house may have sold for 400,000. That same house today may be 800,000. On a cost per unit basis, it has doubled. Adding accessory dwelling unit(s) helps to break down that cost so it's more manageable for the constituents of Clarington.

Key items:

Density - 3 units, terrific

Built form - Consider allowing opportunities for 3rd units within existing/ new home principle dwellings, as opposed to specifically in an accessory structure. Reason being, on a 30x100 lot, there may be limited space for that accessory structure + parking, but a 2nd story apartment, main floor apartment, and basement apartment, would function just the same from a density perspective.

Permit additional height for accessory structures as-of-right to allow for a unit above a detached garage. This helps with parking. Also permit basements in accessory structures. Both make best use of a soon-to-be footprint, regardless of height or below grade living amenity.

Parking - Reduction in parking requirements to 1 spot per unit may be beneficial.

Thanks
Ryan

--

R.W. Carr Investment Co.
Residential Real Estate Investment + Coaching

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

www.rwcarrinvestment.com

Find Us On Social Media:

Facebook Profile: <https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100010830488618>

Facebook Business Page: <https://www.facebook.com/rwcarrinvestment/>

Linkedin: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/rwcarrinv/>

Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/rwcarrinvestmentco/>

YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC0yRHdcKLzJ3Rlg7cOZt3Yw>

Get Our New Book On Highest And Best Use In Real Estate

Coming Soon: Spring Market 2021 --> www.TheHighestAndBestUse.com <--

Jull, Mark

From: aimie harris [REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 3, 2021 4:38 PM
To: Jull, Mark
Subject: Re: Limitations for ADUs on rural land

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

I would like to see this expanded to small under 900 sq feet two bedroom additions if room, land space is available to do it... so generations are not stuck in basements forever or in staircase lofts with children or seniors. A little more flexibility needed.

Thanks

A positive move forward for the poorer populations.

Thanks again

Aimie

Sent from my iPhone

> On Sep 3, 2021, at 4:19 PM, aimie harris [REDACTED]@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> I see, my input...

> The Region of Durham and the Municipality of Clarington seriously need to be approving the ADU capabilities for families.

> All my coworkers are in the same situation trying to help their families find affordable housing. Their kids are all moving home too !

> What A1 Ag land all these big developers are cementing over and building hundreds / thousands of houses on... will still never be affordable for the younger generation cause they will start at \$550 - 600,000 and part time, casual, short contract jobs can't pay for that.

> The ADUs are an excellent alternative to affordability.

> We are on a farmland Oak Ridges and Green space ... but We just want a

> nice size implement shed with mow over top with future apartment abilities when money becomes available.

> We are not asking for what the big developers are doing to our farmland, we just want the ability for our son to stay on the land to help us and continue putting food on your tables for the future and beyond generations.

> It will not be surveyed off.

> Thanks

> Looking forward to your feedback and support.

> Aimie

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On Sep 3, 2021, at 1:22 PM, Jull, Mark <MJull@clarington.net> wrote:

>>

>> Good afternoon,

- > The proposed Amendments outline the various restrictions for ADUs on Rural Lands. These are available on the project's website. If you provide your address I could comment more specifically.
- >>
- > Keep in mind that at this stage the amendments as drafted are not being recommended for approval. We will not draft recommended amendments until after our Public Meeting on Sept 13, and receiving comments from the public and commenting agencies.
- >>
- > Information about the meeting is on the website. I encourage you to send me written comments expressing your support or opposition to the amendments, and if there's anything specific you'd like to see changed, added, or removed.
- >>
- > Thanks,
- >>
- > Mark Jull, MCIP, RPP
- > Planner II, Community Planning & Design Planning & Development
- > Services Municipality of Clarington
- > 40 Temperance St. Bowmanville, ON L1C 3A6
- > 905-623-3379 ext. 2426 | 1-800-563-1195
- >
- >>
- >>
- > -----Original Message-----

>> From: aimie harris [REDACTED]@gmail.com>

> Sent: Friday, September 3, 2021 12:56 PM

> To: Jull, Mark <MJull@clarington.net>

> Subject: Limitations for ADUs on rural land

>>

> EXTERNAL

>>

> Hi Mark

> Can you update me on what the limitations are for the rural land as

> we are hoping for a new implement shed with future ADU built in on

> top as there are no other options with current housing prices Thanks

> Aimie

>>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

Jull, Mark

From: john kersey [REDACTED]@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 7, 2021 9:34 AM
To: Jull, Mark
Subject: Amendments for ADU'S

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

Hi, hope you are well, I recently moved from Toronto to NewCastle and I have seen how the ADU units regulations have been taken advantage of In the city, there are not enough inspectors to keep the rental owners within the regulations. 1Parking parking spot per ADU doesn't work. I would like to have some input and questions if possible to keep Clarington the lovely place it is.Can you please tell me the process.

Thank You

Jull, Mark

From: Timothy Carlton [REDACTED]@nexicom.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 7, 2021 11:15 AM
To: Jull, Mark
Cc: Timothy Carlton
Subject: Affordable Housing questions re: septic & health permits please

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

Hello Mr. Jull,

We received a notice of an electronic meeting re: Amendments to Additional Dwelling units on Sept 13 and have a few questions regarding Septic and Health permits. We live on Cove Road in Bowmanville and can see where an increase number of residents in the current housing units will impact the load on septic tanks as well as well water. Will this be addressed in your staff report and how can you control homes that would already be in these configurations now?

In appreciation,
Esther & Tim Carlton
119 Cove Rd.,
L1C 5Z8
Bowmanville, Ontario

Jull, Mark

From: CONNIE OWEN [REDACTED]@rogers.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 7, 2021 3:30 PM
To: Jull, Mark
Cc: adrian@adrianfoster.ca
Subject: So it's here at last

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

Thank you for allowing these questions prior to the public meeting on Sept 13, 2021.

Can I assume that all those who serve on the Municipality of Clarington Council to make decisions on our behalf are themselves well-informed?

I hope they are informed and aware of the contents and policies that have led to this call for re-zoning. That is, have they all read the UN Agendas 21/2030, which spell out the intent, prior to 2030, to seize all private property (yours and mine) to be used for the redistribution of populations globally?

Do they fully understand that if federal money is accepted to enable this re-zoning they will be complicit in the seizing of all privately-owned property (in this municipality and country)?

Have they read "The Great Reset" by World Economic Forum director, Klaus Schwab? With other world elites, he intends that Western nations must give up their standard of living so that poor Third World nations/peoples can have more, basically those things of ours that we earned by hard work over many years (in this country).

They must surely know that PM Trudeau has declared that we are no longer a nation-state. Much of what we once called federal and provincial lands have already been assigned into land (and water) "conservancy".

Now, it's here: this is the serious beginning of private land seizures in the interests of wealthy globalist leaders.

By 2030, Communism/totalitarianism will be the end to these means, like accepting a basic universal income and losing our private property rights. Will this local government that represents us be complicit by making bad decisions to be bribed with our own federal tax dollars?

Will they greedily accept bribes (what these monies are) to force us to comply with the New World Order, which presents itself as caring about environmental sustainability and climate change?

In fact even this Covid pandemic is really another part of this global scheme to achieve these same ends. If this Council is well-informed, do they understand that accepting bribes to eventually destroy our properties, lifestyles and livelihoods will be a very bad and unpopular decision? Do they understand that freedom is not free? No amount of money will be worth sharing, then relinquishing, our privacy and our homes!

If they have not yet, will all Council members please agree to read those UN agendas before any decisions are made?

As an elderly person with some medical issues, I am unable to present this case at a hearing, but I understand you are accepting questions before this happens.

Thank you in advance for providing answers.

Sincerely,
Connie Owen

100 Edward St E.,
Clarington
ON L1B 1M4

Sent from my iPad

Jull, Mark

From: Rudy W. Kraayvanger [REDACTED]@kraco.ca>
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 8:11 AM
To: Jull, Mark
Subject: Additional Dwelling Units, Monday meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

Good morning Mark

Thank you for moving the ADU's topic forward in Clarington, I look forward to the meeting this Monday. I requested to speak, just fyi, my question will be around: "How can we (builders/Clarington/you) do more to allow the full value of ADU's in the Ridges and green belt? What can we press or look into to have the same rules apply ALL across Clarington?"

Also, if you could kindly send me a link to the meeting, thanks

Thank you,

Rudy W. Kraayvanger, President
"Kraco" Carpentry and Contracting

P/O Box 14 Stn Main
Bowmanville, ON L1C 3K8

Home office [REDACTED]

Cell [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@kraco.ca

www.kraco.ca

Jull, Mark

From: Michael Longarini [REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:42 PM
To: Jull, Mark
Subject: Comments for ADU's in Clarington

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

Hello,

Thank you for receiving my comments regarding the proposed Official Plan amendments for ADU's.

I am a Clarington resident, father, farmer, and small business owner.

I think that we should open up the possibilities for ADU's in Clarington, allow more flexibility in the approval process, and reduce the barriers and associated costs.

Within the limits of all the other Regional, Provincial and Federal and Environmental guidelines, ADU's, particularly in accessory structures, can provide Clarington a way to take the stress off the demand for rural lot creation, or settlement area expansion.

There is a need for housing for temporary local and foreign workers in our business areas. There are older adults requiring smaller living spaces closer to family, and young families that need more space. Many farms would support additional possibilities for worker living areas also. These needs are in our rural areas, not only settlement areas.

With regards to Garden Suites;

- These approvals should be temporary, but including "portable" in the definition is an unnecessary barrier. There are plenty of ways to make a temporary, up to code structure, that does not require the additional expense of a chassis and wheels. There are amazing modular buildings being built in the area, and a small structure could have many future uses that are not residential, after the approval expires. Portable does not equal affordable.

- These garden suites should not have restrictions on who the occupants are (family only). Approved uses should be extended family home, residential rental or short term rental, or any other home business already permitted in the area.

- Location of garden suites on large rural lots should be flexible in regards to maximum setbacks, and not have to be located right beside principle residence. Minimal considerations for "good urban design" which can be very personal. This would be within respect of any Natural Heritage area on site, and the minimal setbacks already proposed.

In regards to ADU's in accessory structures, in the Protected Countryside.
OP proposal is to limit ADU's to buildings before 2017.

- Greater framework required to assess which buildings would qualify, particularly in rural areas, on lots with multiple old "buildings"

- If I convert an old garage into an garage/ADU, does that restrict me from building another new garage on my property, if other context and space allows?

- Home businesses that are already permitted for the principle residence, should be permitted for ADU's in converted pre-2017 buildings.

- I understand the Greenbelt restrictions against building new ADU's, but why is conversion better than building new? If I convert an old building, can I make it as nice and energy efficient as building a modern new structure? Which is better for the environment? Which leaves the residence and community with more assets? The conversion process must be flexible for residents willing to make the change.

In General :

- If the cost of a temporary use by-law is and approval process for either of these is too expensive, then the details of this plan do not matter. If the cost is inflated much more than the actual cost to the Municipality of servicing the approvals, or as a way to dis-incentivise applicants, then it will not achieve the goals of the Affordable Housing Plan or Bill 108.

- The proposed changes to the OP are really good and I hope to see continued efforts to support affordable housing in rural Clarington.

Thanks
Michael Longarini
Newcastle



Virus-free. www.avg.com

Jull, Mark

From: FRANK JOHANSEN [REDACTED]@rogers.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 6:37 PM
To: Jull, Mark
Cc: Alan Johansen
Subject: Written comments to draft zoning by-law amendment

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

EXTERNAL

Hello Mark

Further and in addition to my comments in email August 26 below:

Para 5

3.2.f. ii). b): Can the wording for the *rear yard* and *interior side yard* setback requirement be expanded upon to allow for 1.2m rather than the proposed 1.8m **when** those two sides of the ADU structure (lot lines) are adjacent to either a commercial building's parking lot or a garage/shed on a neighboring lot? Or does the Municipality prefer this to be addressed in a variance application and ruling?

3.2.f. ii). c): does the proposed maximum *lot coverage* refer solely to the structure intended for residential occupancy, excluding an attached carport or garage? Can the amendment be expanded upon to address this?

3.2.f. ii). d): Can the *maximum height* wording be expanded upon to allow for a maximum height of 7m rather than the proposed 5.25 **when** the ADU structure's rear yard and interior side yards are adjacent to either a commercial building's parking lot or to a garage/shed on a neighboring lot? Or does the Municipality prefer this to be addressed in a variance application and ruling?

Para 6

Parking space requirement. Comments and questions are as detailed in email August 26 below.

Other:

1) For an ADU located within an accessory structure, will the requirement remain that its utilities (power, water, sewage) hook up with the Primary Unit or can all or some hook up with the utility's or Municipality's infrastructure direct?

2) The questions below are more specific to our corner lot Lambert Street / Church street:

Are there any plans - under preparation or approved - for improvements or changes to Lambert street? For example, will curbs and aprons be constructed on the west or east sides, or both sides of the street? If so, when would this happen and what is the design?

Thank you and regards

Frank Johansen

On Aug 26, 2021, at 12:17 PM, FRANK JOHANSEN [REDACTED]@rogers.com> wrote:

Hello Mark

Thanks for advice on meeting re bylaw changes.

We have noted that questions or comments are needed in writing. Which we will do.

However, only somewhat related I have question re setback from a road (Lambert) of a garage with due recognition of need for 3 m sight lines.

I.e. whether a garage's front can be placed forward towards the street as long as sightlines maintained from garage door?

Depth of the driveway in front of garage therefore only 3 - 5 meter.

As bylaw changes require one carspace be added for an ADU, we would need a double garage attached to the ADU which gives us one spot off Church Street and 2 off Lambert street.

Can you phone me?

Regards

Frank
[REDACTED]