

DRAFT

**NOTICE OF APPLICATION FOR PLAN OF SUBDIVISION
FILE NO. 09-T-08004**

The aforementioned Notice calls for submissions on this Plan of Subdivision to be filed with both Lanark County and the Town of Mississippi Mills. The following is the submission of the Appleton Community Association to both those levels of government

The Appleton Community Association's comments on the Plan of Subdivision relate to errors in the base map upon which the subdivision plan is presented and a question regarding the treatment of those parts of the Appleton Wetlands making up a good portion of Lots 1, 2 and 3 of the proposal. We also wish to present an observation on the proposed road allowance leading to adjacent prime farmland.

- Portions of the boundaries of Appleton as shown on the map of the Plan of Subdivision are incorrect in spite of efforts over several years to have the required corrections made. One such error shows the northwest boundary of our hamlet extending up to the Appleton Side Road then southeast along that Road. The actual boundary in this part of the hamlet extends along the northwest limit of the proposed subdivision, then along the rear of the existing lots on Hillcrest Drive. The last Ramsey Official Plan kept the boundary tight along the back of the Hillcrest lots and the new Mississippi Mills Official Plan did **not** change that border. Past efforts to correct the municipal maps resulted in some maps being changed but not others (Schedule A of the "Council Draft" of the new Official Plan shows the correct boundary but Appendix A of that same document doesn't. "Comprehensive (Zoning) By-Law No. 01-70" also includes the incorrect map). A second error relates to the southeast boundary running parallel to River Road where municipal maps show a much larger portion of the Syme farm as being within the hamlet than is actually the case. **Our Association seeks assurances that the necessary corrections to our hamlet's boundaries be made on all Municipal maps.**
- Approximately 50% of Lots 1, 2 and 3 of the proposed subdivision are made up of parts of the "provincially significant" Appleton Wetlands. The Official Plan provides for protection of such wetlands including setbacks and limitations on what developments and site alterations can take place within the wetlands. "Sustainable forestry" is permitted and, given that there will most likely be a strong tendency for the owners of these lots to clear river views

through the wetlands, the following questions arise and need to be answered in parallel to the approval of Plan of Subdivision:

1. Does the “sustainable forestry” exception apply within an urban development and,
2. If it does, what is the definition of “sustainable” that will apply?

Our Association would like answers to these questions if at all possible and would recommend that buyers of Lots 1, 2 and 3 be advised in some formal manner of the restrictions that apply within the wetlands.

- In approving this Plan of Subdivision as it now stands the Council would be approving a right-of-way for a road running from Hillcrest Drive northeast to the subdivision’s border with the agricultural land extending from that border to the Appleton Side Road. Such a road would serve no purpose other than access into some future expansion of urban development over that parcel of prime agricultural land. That intention to push urban development into this area is also evidenced by the fact that the developer has sold all of his farm except for this agricultural parcel which he designates on the current Plan of Subdivision as being “fallow” (although it produced three crops this past year). A future urban expansion of that nature could proceed in a routine manner if the land in question fell within Appleton’s boundaries as suggested by the faulty boundaries mentioned above. However, that land is **not** within the hamlet’s boundaries and therefore it falls within all the protective provision of the Official Plan for prime agricultural land, including but not limited to the need for a developer to demonstrate “that the Town does not have sufficient lands already designated urban to accommodate projected growth” and that the proposed development “cannot be reasonably located on lands outside the Agricultural designation or lower quality agricultural land”. (Section 3.2.8). **For these reasons our Association would favour approval of the Plan of Subdivision without the provision of the road allowance. Such action would demonstrate Council’s commitment to the intent and provisions of the new Official Plan as it pertains to the protection of our best farmland.**

Respectfully submitted for the Association by: