



December 05, 2024

Toula Theocharidis, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Planner  
Meridian Planning Consultants Inc.  
3120 Rutherford Road, Suite 353  
Vaughan, Ontario L4K 0B2

Cristal Laanstra, MCIP, RPP  
Director, Planning and Development  
Town of Cobourg Planning &  
Development Division  
55 King Street West  
Cobourg, Ontario K9A 2M2

Dear Ms. Theocharidis and Ms. Laanstra:

**Re: File Nos. ZBA-2023-003 and SP-2023-006 – 2<sup>nd</sup> Submission  
867, 869 and 879 William Street, Cobourg  
(2140243 Ontario Inc. and Veenstra Construction Ltd.)**

---

We are writing to you on behalf of 2140243 Ontario Inc. and Veenstra Construction Ltd. regarding the subject Applications for Zoning By-Law Amendment and Site Plan Approval in the Town of Cobourg. Further to the correspondence received from the public, we wish to summarize and formally respond to the comments therein.

Table 1, below, is a summary of each public comment and our responses. This letter, as well as the required drawings and reports submitted, form our 2<sup>nd</sup> Submission for Zoning Bylaw Amendment and Site Plan Approval applications. Direct quotations are italicized.

---

211 Dundas Street East, Suite 202, Belleville, Ontario K8N 1E2



 613.966.9070  [www.rfaplanningconsultant.ca](http://www.rfaplanningconsultant.ca)

TABLE 1: PUBLIC COMMENTS RESPONSE SUMMARY

| Name   | Comment  | Response  |
|--|--|---|
| O'Donnahue<br>via Statutory<br>Public Meeting<br>(June 30, 2023) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeline?</li> <li>• Where is the water supply from?</li> <li>• Will there be another public meeting?</li> <li>• Relocate existing dwellings</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the statutory public meeting the projected construction start was Spring, 2024 was indicated. This is now projected to be Spring, 2025 subject to completion of the required approvals.</li> <li>• Water supply is presumed to be from the Burnham water tower. Staff indicated during the statutory public meeting that they will check.</li> <li>• It was confirmed during the statutory public meeting there will not be another public meeting.</li> <li>• The developer has considered relocating the existing dwellings.</li> </ul> |
| Crox<br>via Statutory<br>Public Meeting<br>(June 30, 2023)       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Median</li> <li>• Autumn Blaze</li> <li>• Access to units?</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was confirmed during the statutory public meeting there is no centre median along the site's William Street frontage.</li> <li>• It was confirmed during the statutory public meeting that the Autumn Blaze is a hybrid tree that combines the Red Maple and Silver Maple species, and is commonly used in urban applications.</li> <li>• It was confirmed during the statutory public meeting each unit will have its own independent ground-floor access.</li> </ul>  |

| Name  | Comment  | Response  |
|---|--|---|
| Windsor<br>via Statutory<br>Public Meeting<br>(June 30, 2023)   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Balconies?</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was confirmed during the statutory public meeting that none of the proposed dwelling units will feature a balcony.</li> </ul>   |
| Jay<br>via email to<br>Nicole Lizotte,<br>Administrative<br>Assistant –<br>Building and<br>Planning<br>(August 18,<br>2023) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>How many trees are to be left on the site?</i></li> <li><i>She told me that it is illegal to take down trees during bird breeding season several times, and wanted me to make sure everyone involved in the project knows that.</i></li> <li><i>Traffic movement – she doesn't believe there is sufficient room on site for people to turn around and they will have to back out onto Burnham Street. Also, if people can only pull out in one direction, she believes traffic will increase significantly on her street which is Burwash St.</i></li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three (3) existing trees are to be preserved and eighteen (18) new tree plantings are proposed.</li> <li>It is understood any tree removal shall only be outside of bird breeding season, and is to be completed under permit.</li> <li>The Site Plan has been revised to provide a turn-around area located adjacent to the entrance. A Traffic Brief has been prepared by Jewell Engineering in support of the proposed development. The development is expected to produce 8 trips during the Saturday peak hour, which will have no noticeable impact on the operation of the existing road network. Burwash Street is deemed too far from the site by the traffic engineer to include in the traffic analysis.</li> </ol> |
| John and<br>Denise Pontone<br>via email to<br>Vanessa<br>Reusser,<br>Manager of   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>I believe there are currently three separate defined properties. Have they been "joined" to create a single property to allow the proposed townhouse to be permitted? Or is this part of the amendment being presented?</i></li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prior to execution of the required Site Plan Agreement, the title will be made common and Property Identification Numbers will be consolidated.</li> </ol>   |

| Name   | Comment   | Response  |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Development Review<br/>                     (August 28, 2023)</p> | <p>2. <i>Is the townhouse dwelling going to be considered as rental units, owned townhouse units, freehold townhouses or otherwise?</i></p> <p>3. <i>Who is responsible to take care of the amenities of the property...garbage pickup, snow clearing, landscaping maintenance, exterior building up-keep?</i></p> <p>4. <i>Will the existing wood rail fence along the north property line remain or be replaced with fencing consistent with the PVC fencing in the area along the west property line?</i></p> <p>5. <i>Retaining walls are shown on the plans, but a detail is not provided. What is the proposed material? Concrete? Wood? Stone?</i></p> <p>6. <i>It appears the retaining wall along the west property line will be about 1.5m high and very near the existing PVC fence. We are concerned the integrity of the PVC fence and grade on existing properties may be affected during construction. The existing trees on our properties may also be affected during excavation.</i></p> <p>7. <i>Two handicap parking spots are shown on the site plan, each a different width. What is the minimum required width for each spot? I believe it is 4m in the town by-law. Does this change the overall required length of the parking lot area?</i></p> | <p>2. The proposed back-to-back townhouses will be as rental tenure.</p> <p>3. The current registered owner will construct the project and maintain the development (building) as the owner and operator. Garbage collection, landscaping maintenance and snow clearing will be by private contract.</p> <p>4. All existing fencing is to remain. No new fencing is proposed.</p> <p>5. A retaining wall detail is enclosed with the 2<sup>nd</sup> Submission.</p> <p>6. All disturbed areas shall be restored or re-instated equal to existing condition.</p> <p>7. One (1) Type A accessible parking space and one (1) Type B accessible parking space are provided in accordance with Accessibility for Ontarian's with Disabilities standards. The required 3.4-metre width for Type A spaces and 2.8-metre width for Type B spaces is provided together with the required 1.5-metre-wide shared access aisle. These standards are newer and generally accepted to supersede Town of Cobourg Zoning By-law No. 85-2003 accessible parking standards.</p> |

| Name | Comment   | Response   |
|------|---|--|
|      | <p>8. <i>The landscape report and drawings are thorough and well-detailed. There are many white spruce trees on the property but many will be removed along with other types. Can the three spruce trees in the north-west corner of the property be changed to another type consistent in the area? Perhaps columnar type oak trees can be proposed to provide some screening. The close proximity of the three proposed trees close to the existing houses seems excessive.</i></p> <p>9. <i>Regarding the townhouse floor plan, would 2nd floor balconies be permitted by the town? Can the builder come back later during the approval stage with revised plans showing balconies?</i></p> <p>10. <i>Regarding the single-storey unit at the south end, can the floor plan be revised to show entrance coming from the William Street sidewalk instead of the walkway near the main driveway entry to the property? Front elevation could still be similar to what is proposed and may provide a safer entry to the unit.</i></p> | <p>8. The three White Spruce trees proposed by the original Landscape Plan for the north-west corner have been replaced with Crimson Spire Oak by the revised Landscape Plan, which is the presumed species contemplated by the commenter who is also understood to be the abutting landowner. The Landscape Plan has been designed by an Ontario Landscape Architect to provide dense tree and shrubs plantings to screen the proposed development from the abutting residential property to the north, and is considered desirable for the appropriate development of the land.</p> <p>9. There is no regulation, policy or Zoning By-law provision preventing balconies. This said, no balconies are proposed by the subject development.</p> <p>10. A Traffic Brief has been prepared by Jewell Engineering in support of the proposed development. The development is expected to produce 8 trips during the Saturday peak hour, which will have no noticeable impact on the operation of the existing road network. With this, it is further understood that</p> |

| Name   | Comment   | Response  |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>11. <i>Regarding the single-storey units at the north end, can the floor plan be revised to show one entrance for one unit coming from William Street and the other unit entrance coming from the rear parking area? I believe this arrangement is more consistent with the general arrangement of a back-to-back townhouse proposal.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed townhouse development appears reasonable for the area along William Street, with creative use of materials and high pitch roof lines. Even the rear/west elevation has a modern and contemporary look matching the east elevation. The landscaping should greatly improve the street-scape of the property.</i></p> | <p>there will be no apparent safe issue due to low volume vehicle trips in and out of the site. With the door swinging into the unit, in addition to the porch feature setting the doorway back further from the laneway, there is no apparent safety issue with the existing layout.</p> <p>11. Additional doorways are proposed by the architectural plans provided with the original submission for two of the three single-storey units on either the west or east façade depending on its location.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p> |
| <p>Elizabeth Fairley,<br/>                     138 Bagot Street<br/>                     Via email to<br/>                     Nicole Lizotte,<br/>                     Administrative Assistant –<br/>                     Building and Planning<br/>                     (September 1, 2023)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>I have seen the architectural rendering on the sign and as there are no trees contained within that, it is a safe assumption all the century trees are slated for demotion.</i></li> <li>• <i>I wish to register – in the loudest terms, my objection to this development.</i></li> <li>• <i>I would like to know when the next meeting is, or what the next step is, that I may take to register my objections.</i></li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three (3) existing trees are to be preserved and eighteen (18) new tree plantings are proposed.</li> <li>• Acknowledged.</li> <li>• The statutory public meeting occurred on June 30, 2023. It is understood, however, by virtue of the commenter providing written comments to the Town prior to the staff recommendation report and Council decision that it will be registered on file as part of the public record.</li> </ul>   |

| Name | Comment   | Response   |
|------|---|--|
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>Where is the Heritage Committee on this! Surely the removal of many century trees is of concern to them.</i></li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It is understood that the Heritage Committee does not comment on natural heritage features. This said, we have received technical review comments from the Town of Cobourg Parks / Forestry Department, which confirm the required Municipal Tree Levy, confirm required canopy compensation for trees over 30cm dbh, promote retaining larger trees on-site – three (3) trees are able to be preserved – and confirm required cash-in-lieu of parkland.</li></ul> |

If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,



Shawn Legere, MCIP, RPP  
Vice President / Senior Planner  
RFA Planning Consultant Inc.

cc. 2140243 Ontario Inc. and Veenstra Construction Ltd.

