

TO: L.W.H. Laine
Planning Director

FROM: J.A. Marshall/G. Ross

RE: Rural Estate Development

The following motion, which is dealt with in Part A of this report, was passed by the Official Plan Task Force Committee during its final official meeting on September 21, 1977 and subsequently approved by Council:

"That the inclusion of certain areas east of the Gore Road, between No. 10 and No. 17 Sideroads in the Rural Estate expansion area be approved in principle subject to a report from staff."

An investigation of the suitability of rural condominiums for Brampton, at the request of members of Council, constitutes Part B of this report.

PART A

In response to the above motion, staff is basing its recommendation on the following points:

1. The existing Amendment 5 designation, which allows for over 3,000 acres to be developed as rural estates, is currently less than 15% developed or subdivided.
2. Two expansion areas, one immediately west of Goreway Drive to the top-of-bank, between Turtle Creek Golf Course and Bovaird Drive; and the second, immediately south of Bovaird Drive consuming lot 10, between Goreway Drive and the Humber River, have been indicated by staff as future expansion areas as part of the original 350,000 and 500,000 population scenarios, constituting an additional 400 acres. (see attached Map)

Development of these lands is intended to be conditional upon the substantial completion of the existing designated area. The expansion areas were selected for a combination of the following reasons:

- awkward shape of parcels
 - restrictions on alternative land uses due primarily to the shape of these parcels
 - adjacent to future water line
 - proximity to wooded valley lands
3. The above combined 3400 acres is deemed to be sufficient to meet the local demand for rural estate development through at least the initial 5 year period of the forthcoming Official Plan.

4. A minor tributary of the West Humber River running along the eastern boundary of the lands mentioned in the Official Plan Task Force motion, does not present a firm or "hard line" boundary which would function as a deterrent to further development eastward.
5. There are many concerns related primarily to servicing costs, (e.g. road improvements; education; parks and recreation; and other essential public services, which should be monitored as the amendment 5 area develops. It should be noted, for example, that while the Castlemore Public School is currently operating at slightly more than one half its student capacity, (i.e. approximately 139 vs. 260 pupils), the St. Patrick Separate School in Wildfield is rapidly approaching student capacity of 200, (i.e. 118 in 1975; 163 in 1976 and 182 in 1977). This is an important factor considering the increasing numbers of Italian Roman Catholic families moving into the existing rural estate area. According to the Region of Peel Separate School Board, the subject residential area is contributing a "remarkably high number of students." The 1980 projected enrollment at St. Patrick's is 356 which is double the current figure.
6. The following comments registered by the Region of Peel Planning and Engineering Departments:

"Brampton and Region (should) play down the role of developing estate developments and restrict further development in the OP5 area beyond that which has not been approved."

"continued expansion of watermains to such an area.....will tend to induce higher density development than that originally proposed", and eventually may stimulate a requirement in the area for sanitary sewer service."

"In recognition of these (potential servicing) costs to the municipality as well as the desire for an urban separator between Woodbridge and Brampton it is suggested that, although minor modifications to the already designated rural estate area may be justified, no expansion should occur to the east of the area presently committed for this form of development. It is the position of Regional staff that should any expansion to the east be permitted, development will in all probability end up at the present City limits even if such development is approved on a piece by piece basis." 1
7. There will be a review of the forthcoming Official Plan, following its approval, approximately every 5 years. Therefore, the potential further expansion of the "Amendment 5" area could more appropriately be considered at these intervals.

1 Response of Regional Staff to the "Report on the Alternative Population Scenarios "Prepared by the City of Brampton Official Plan Task Force; July 22, 1976; pages 4 and 5.

PART B

There are numerous 10, 25 and 50+ acre parcels of land ownership by non-farm interests throughout the former Township of Toronto Gore. These large consents were permitted by the Province of Ontario several years ago. The intent, on the part of government, has always been that only one, single-family residential unit would be constructed on each severance, no matter what the acreage. However, many of these severances were obtained by syndicates (i.e. more than one owner) whose intention has been to subdivide the parcel of land owned in common.

To date, the involved government bodies have resisted efforts to subdivide these severances. In conjunction with the formulation of a new Official Plan, several of the subject owners have requested the City of Brampton to consider their lands appropriate for condominium rural estate development, if free-hold development is not permitted.

In response to the condominium question, staff have conducted an analysis of selected precedents,* existing in Canada and the United States, and proposed concepts.* Summarized below are the major findings of this survey:

1. majority of investigated examples are on large acreages in excess of 100 acres;
2. majority associated with a special land use such as a continuing agricultural function; a riding stable and associated open space structures (paddocks and trails); or a private air strip and associated structures;
3. all located in "scenic areas" where topography was varied or vegetative cover substantial.

* include the following:

1. Beacon Hill (rejected by Township of King; 1976)
2. Farm Colony a Development Alternative to Loss of Agricultural Land (existing in Greene County, Virginia)
3. Bryn Mawr Estates Ltd. (proposed for City of Burlington; currently awaiting Provincial Approval).
4. Parkway Co-operative Farms (West of Mississauga Road and south of Steeles; in Brampton rejected by Province of Ontario, 1976)


The concept of condominium, rural estate development, as reflected in the above summary, is to minimize the unit density and intensity of non-rural land use and thereby retain a maximum amount of land as "open space" under common ownership. In each case, the researched example achieved this basic concept. Residential development was clearly of secondary significance in terms of land use. In each case an "open space" i.e. clearly rural-oriented land use dominated the plan and necessitated a very large acreage in order to ensure the viability of this non-residential land use. Furthermore, the large acreage, in conjunction with the topography and vegetative cover, was employed to minimize the visual impact of the residential development to the motoring public. The latter was an essential component of each example.

Staff conclude that condominium rural estate development on 10, 25 and 50 acre parcels, (i.e. parcels less than at least 100 acres), would constitute a form of development so similar to free-hold that the former would be no more acceptable than the latter. An overriding concern with servicing inefficiencies and the magnitude of existing, committed rural estate development, as expressed in Part A, has seriously jeopardized the acceptability of condominium rural estate developments in Brampton at this time. It must also be stated that since our society is currently entering into an age of severe energy shortages, rural residential development, which represents higher energy consumption in terms of all forms of servicing, (e.g. home heating, transportation), than urban residential development, must be at least carefully monitored before any new commitments are made in Brampton.


One must also be cognizant of the potential establishment of an undesirable precedent. Since there are $\pm$ 150 parcels in the size range 10 to 25 acres in Toronto Gore, the approval of condominium development of these parcels would have a considerable collective impact in terms of projected rural estate development. Further to this, the approval of rural estate condominiums in the Toronto Gore area would open up other rural areas in the City for such development - particularly in light of the fact that the examples investigated were on parcels of 100 acres or more.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Council not approve expansion of the Amendment 5 rural estate development east of the Gore Road at this time.
2. That Council not consider condominium rural estate development appropriate in Brampton at this time.
3. That Council monitor the costs of servicing rural estate development during the period before the first comprehensive review of the forthcoming Official Plan.


Greg Ross

Senior Planner-Policy


AGREED: J.A. Marshall
Deputy Planning Director

The RURAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT REPORT was dealt with by Planning Committee and Council. The resulting decisions are stated below.

Recommendation No. 2 concerning Part B of the REPORT was accepted by the elected City Officials as indicated in the following motion which was approved by Council on April 24, 1978:

"That Council not consider condominium rural estate development appropriate at this time."

Recommendation No. 1 concerning Part A of the REPORT was not accepted by Planning Committee and Council as indicated in the following motion which was approved by Council on May 23, 1978:

"That the property of A. Casola be considered as the future expansion of the Hamlet of Wildfield at such time as piped water is available to this area;

And that the land on the west side of the same water course to the Gore Road be included in Amendment 5 in the Official Plan south to the 10th Sideroad."

This decision of Council is intended to result in the development of the area indicated as "Proposed Additional Expansion Area" on the map attached to the REPORT within the time period of this Official Plan.