



Rideau Lakes Official Plan Update
Join the community conversation

Discussion Paper #1 - Summary

Lot Creations

Official Plan Update Discussion Paper Series

1. Lot Creations
2. Resilient Communities
3. Housing Options

Purpose of Discussion Papers

To inform the public about important Official Plan issues identified by the public, how the existing Plan addresses the issues, and what policy options exist to tackle the issues.

Who to contact to comment or learn more?

Brittany Mulhern

Manager of Development Services
bmulhern@twprideaulakes.on.ca
ext. 244

Malcolm Norwood

Senior Planner
mnorwood@twprideaulakes.on.ca
ext. 236

Information Sources

Provincial Policy Statement

<https://www.ontario.ca/document/provincial-policy-statement-2014>

United Counties Official Plan

https://www.leedsgrenville.com/uploads/474/Doc_636688912689377695.pdf

Township Official Plan

<http://www.twprideaulakes.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Official-Plan-December-2010-Office-Consolidation.pdf>

What are Lot Creations?

Lot Creations or Land Division can take place by the consent (severance) process, by plan of subdivision, or by plan of condominium.

Consent process is generally used where less than 3 lots are being created and there is no planning reason to require the lots to be created by plan of subdivision.

Most rural lots are created using the consent process while urban and suburban lots are generally created through plan of subdivision.

Vacant land condominium plans were introduced in Ontario only a few years ago to permit land division with common elements such as private roads, shared services, waterfront, recreational facilities, etc.

Provincial Legislation

Section 50 of the Ontario Planning Act provides the legal framework for municipal authorities to regulate the division of land.

Section 51(24) of the Planning Act provides the criteria by which municipal authorities must re-view applications to subdivide land.

Section 51(24)(c) requires that subdivisions of land conform to the Official Plan.

Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requires that Settlement Areas (growth centers & villages) be the focus of growth, that development patterns be efficiently designed, intensification should be encouraged, and that sufficient supply of land be made available to meet projected growth for the next 20 years.

Existing Official Plan Policies (Section 5.2)

In general, minimum lot size is 0.4 ha (1 acre).

A maximum of 3 new lots shall be created from a land holding as it existed on Jan 1, 1998.

Lots must have either suitable public road or water frontage.

No consent shall be granted that would require the creation of a new private road.

Creation of island lots must be accompanied with deeded mainland parking.

Subdivisions must be accessed from a maintained public road and access to individual lots must be from internal public roads, built to Township standards.

Issues such as safe vehicular access, traffic impacts, land use compatibility, natural heritage features, archaeological resources, ground water supply, sewage disposal, and storm water management are required to be addressed.

In general, subdivision policies include greater planning review standards than the consent policies due to the scale and impact of the development.

Identified Issues & Potential Policy Options

Issue 1: Should the limit on lot creations through consent (3) be increased?

- No, keep the status quo that all municipalities in the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville generally adhere to
- Yes, based on an overall growth strategy the number should be increased to 5
- Yes, based on an overall growth strategy, however the standard should remain at 3 with the possibility of an additional 2 if specific criteria is met

Issue 2: Should lot creations be decided based on a ratio that would permit a specific number of lots a year?

- No, keep the status quo
- Yes, there should be a specific target area for lot creations and the ratios should allow 30% of creations in or around villages, 50% for waterfront properties with road access and 20% for general rural properties
- Yes, but the proposed ratios and locations should be different

Issue 3: Should our private road policies be reviewed and better defined for clarity?

- No, keep the status quo
- Yes, there should be more clarity and defined parameters about possibilities with existing maintained driveways that are proposed to have limited new lot creation
- Yes, there should be limited exceptions for the creation of private roads through consents

Issue 4: Should 'strip development' be better defined and/or allowances provided?

- No, keep the status quo
- Yes, we should require additional frontage when there is the potential of strip development
- Yes, shared driveways should be permitted to mitigate strip development
- Yes, staggered front yard setbacks should be required to mitigate strip development

Issue 5: Should large waterfront lots (generally those waterfront lots which are over 5 acres in size) be protected through restricting lot creations?

- No
- Yes, include a policy that ensures multiple lot creations on waterfront lots do not compromise the economic, recreational/tourism policies and waterfront development policies of the Official Plan
- Yes, include a policy that requires waterfront lots over 10 acres to retain a minimum sized parcel (such as 5 acres) when a consent application is proposed

Issue 6: Should new island lots be required to have deeded mainland access & parking?

- No
- Yes, the Township should ensure the intent of the policy - to ensure unrestricted private deeded access that does not rely on public services - is met
- Yes, but only for islands not on the Rideau waterway

Issue 7: Should there be flexibility in the water frontage requirements for new lots?

- No, the minimum 60m must be adhered to
- Yes, a slight decrease should be permitted in specific circumstances but only if one or multiple requirements are met such as an increased water setback, a tertiary septic system, reduced shoreline occupancy etc.

Issue 8: Should the Parkland Dedication requirements be more flexible?

- No, keep the status quo
- Yes, there should be greater flexibility for the Township to be able to require land to support public recreational amenities, such as the widening of trail networks, or enlarging public spaces
- Yes, there should be an exemption of cash-in-lieu payments for lots that are used for conservation use only provided the land is accessible to the public (and not necessarily owned and governed by a public body/agency)

Issue 9: Should lots that merged unintentionally be permitted to be separated even if all policy requirements are not met?

- No, keep the status quo which requires the request to be reviewed as a completely new lot creation with no consideration of the past merger
- Yes, there should be flexibility to re-create an existing lot that unintentionally merged and this should address the maximum lot creations to the original land holding and the ability of the lot to meet current standards
- Yes, but there needs to be defined instances where it can be considered an 'unintended merger'

Issue 10: How should our policies be updated to include condominium developments?

- A new section should be created that is specific to condominiums
- The subdivision section should be revised to include condominium policies as well as exemptions to specific policies for condominiums

Issue 11: Should 'Back Lot' development be permitted?

- No, keep the status quo that new lots should have either publicly maintained road frontage and/or water frontage
- Yes, but subject to specific requirements