

Revised Submission of Wilfred Day on proposal for 60 Henderson Street, OP02-2022, ZB04-2022 (Revised Dec. 2, 2022, replacing submission dated Nov. 22.)

1. This is a proposal for a 4 storey, 74-unit seniors independent living residential mid-rise building, and 36 bungalow townhouse rental units, designed as a seniors community (“55+”) with 110 units designed to house up to 220 people in one- or two-bedroom units. The Applicant asks to rezone the subject lands from ‘COM2(H1)’ zone to site specific High Density Residential ‘RES4(137)’.

Current plan

2. This site is zoned General Commercial, as are the lands to the south and west. It is serviced from Henderson Street, which is part of the municipal Business Park acquired and serviced by the town as employment lands, with very beneficial results.

New, different plan:

3. The Applicant refers to these dwellings as “within a commercial plaza” which is not so. They are not accessed through the commercial plaza, but from Henderson Street. This proposal would change the planned use from commercial to residential. It is municipally unprofitable from a cost-and-benefit perspective, failing to maintain the existing ratio of commercial/industrial assessment.
4. Furthermore, the Applicant describes this as seniors housing. Port Hope schools are losing student enrolment because so much new housing is being occupied by seniors rather than families. By the 2021 census Port Hope’s population aged 55 and over is 45.07% of our population. By contrast, the number for Clarington is 29.10%. Port Hope schools need families with children. Port Hope families need employment. Commercial lands generate employment. Even if we needed more seniors housing, it should surely not be on lands planned for commercial use and serviced for employment lands.
5. Staff have strongly recommended the development include affordable housing units. Indeed, Port Hope needs affordable units for families. The Applicant predicts these units will be more affordable than other seniors developments, but staff concluded these units are not considered low income. Moreover, these units are not designed for families; none have more than two bedrooms.

Municipal response:

6. At the July 26, 2021, meeting with the municipal development team (see page 36, Planning Justification Report), staff commented “Staff do not generally support the removal of commercial/employment lands for residential purposes. Planning rationale required to rationale change in use. Assessment ratio: if any proposed form of residential development is likely to change the existing ratio of commercial/industrial assessment (i.e. municipally profitable from a cost-and-benefit perspective) to residential assessment (i.e. municipally unprofitable from a cost-and-benefit perspective) so as to have a significant negative impact upon the tax burden of agriculture, such proposed development shall be deemed to be premature.”

7. The Applicant has responded that this site is 7.3% of Port Hope's vacant commercial land, a significant amount of development potential. It has failed to show that changing this amount of commercial land to residential will not likely stop the change in assessment ratio being municipally unprofitable from a cost-and-benefit perspective.

Servicing costs

8. The cost of building Henderson Street and municipal services under it was passed on to future owners of sites in the Business Park, factored into the sale price. Then, Development Charges on those sites benefitted the municipality still further. Is the Applicant being required to contribute to those Henderson Street costs as a condition of rezoning? If not, why not?

Sidewalks

9. The site plan shows sidewalks internally and on Henderson. This development needs a sidewalk to Jocelyn Street. Staff have recommended this type of proposal would lend itself to building sidewalks, and building a new sidewalk is required. Residents will need a sidewalk to reach the bus stop on Jocelyn, which may require new storm drainage. Is the Applicant being required to build this as a condition of rezoning? If not, why not?

Municipal water

10. The existing watermain up Henderson is barely adequate for the proposed development. Parts of the Business Park are not yet developed. Will the current watermain still be adequate for those future Employment users?

Financial implications

11. Staff comments Sept. 6, 2022, included "There are no anticipated negative financial implications imposed on the Municipality as a result of these applications." Has this view changed since July 26, 2021? For what reason?

Submission

By Wilfred Day, a retired lawyer, resident in Port Hope since 1969. I was a member of the Port Hope Planning Board from 1971 to 1982, and chaired it for a time. I was a school trustee on the public school board from 1982 to 1994.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Dec. 2, 2022

Wilfred Day

300 Croft Street, Unit 2404

Port Hope, Ontario

L1A051

████████████████████
████████████████
████████████████