

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable and upon request

**STAFF REPORT: Planning & Building Services Department**



**REPORT TO: Committee of The Whole**  
**MEETING DATE: August 18, 2014**  
**REPORT NO.: PL.14.86**  
**SUBJECT: Official Plan Five Year Review**  
**PREPARED BY: Jim Dymont, Acting Director of Planning**

**A. Recommendations**

THAT Council receive Staff Report PL.14.86 “Official Plan Five Year Review” and recommend Council approve the Official Plan as presented.

**B. Background**

The Official Plan update process has taken approximately four years to complete. Through that time there has been extensive consultation with members of the public, the development community and with the Steering Committee appointed by Council to review and provide recommendations to the Planning Consultant with respect to the policies in the Plan. Meridian Planning Consultants Inc. have completed the Plan following further consultation with members of the public and staff and the Plan is now in a state that staff feel comfortable recommending for approval.

Prior to the Public Meeting, the municipality received numerous letters of comments from property owners and representatives of property owners. Each of those letters was received and changes to the Plan were made in response to the comments received where necessary. As noted during the Public Meeting, most of the comments dealt with minor matters primarily related to fine tuning of mapping and carrying forward existing permissions that had been contained in the current Official Plan. The table attached to this report outlines the comments that were received and the responses to those comments.

Following the Public Meeting, Mark Stone of Meridian and staff met with a number of parties to resolve concerns related to the draft Official Plan. The following are some of the more significant changes that have been made to the Official Plan as a result of those comments:

**Siljon Investments Inc.** – The Siljon lands are located in the Thornbury urban area and had previously been designated in a manner that would permit a hotel and conference centre on the property. The proposed designation at the Public Meeting was to place the lands in a Commercial/Light Industrial designation. Siljon had requested that the permission for the hotel and conference centre be returned to the list of the permitted uses in the designation. We have revised the Plan to do that. In addition, we have also revised the plan to re-designate a portion of the Siljon lands from the Commercial/Light Industrial to Community Living Area in order that the designation would be more compatible with the existing surrounding uses. Siljon have indicated that they are satisfied with that designation of the lands.

**Georgian Peaks and Blue Mountain Resorts** – Both of these groups were concerned about the Hazard policies and the ability to use the Hazard land areas for recreational uses. We noted that the intent of the Plan was to protect steep slopes but also we need to recognize that these slopes make up part of the recreational amenity of the Town. We have revised the policies of the plan to reflect that the use of the Hazard land areas for outdoor recreation is permitted subject to meeting the requirements of the other approval agencies (i.e.: Conservation Authority, NEC).

**Natural Heritage Study** – As noted at the Public Meeting, there was a concern put forward that the Official Plan should contain more policies in relation to Natural Heritage areas. The County of Grey is currently developing a Natural Heritage Stud. Staff felt it was premature to presume what may be contained in the County policies at this time. We have put wording in the Official Plan that it will be modified once the County Natural Heritage Study is completed.

**Community Living Area Densities** – The densities permitted by the Official Plan are considerably higher than what have historically been permitted as of right in the Plan. This has resulted in numerous Official Plan Amendments to permit increased densities. As noted at the Public Meeting, the Provincial Policy Statement and the County of Grey Official Plan require The Blue Mountains Official Plan to have densities that make efficient use of infrastructure and provide for compact sustainable communities. As a result, the increase of densities in the Official Plan has been recommended. A number of people have indicated a concern regarding the proposed densities within the Community Living Area. We have identified that Section B3.1.5.3 of the Official Plan sets out numerous criteria that need to be met when considering development to ensure that it is compatible with adjacent uses.

To address the concern with respect to the density provisions in Section B3.1.4 we have added a clause that indicates that in some areas maximum densities may not be appropriate and lower density may be required to meet the compatibility requirements of Section B3.1.5.3. This clause will ensure that it is clear that the densities provided for in this section are recognized as maximum densities and this should reduce the request of Official Plan Amendments to increase densities.

**Recreational Residential Densities** – Similar to the comments above, the Official Plan permissions for Recreational Residential densities have been increased from 2.5 units per hectare to 10 units per net hectare. However, as noted at the Public Meeting, the minimum open space component of 40% is still required in the Plan. Staff received comments on both sides of the argument related to this density; some people saying it is too high and others saying it are too low. Most of the newer Recreational Residential developments that have been approved by the Town have required Official Plan Amendments to increase the densities and many of them have densities higher than the proposed 10 units per net hectare. Staff continues to support the increase in density. However we note that the municipality will need to approach its bonusing provisions in the Official Plan somewhat differently than it has historically done. Following approval of the Official Plan and, prior to approval of the Plan by the County staff will bring forward a report related to bonusing to Council.

**Special Study Area** – There is one Special Study Area designation in the Official Plan covering the Camperdown area. In our internal review of the Official Plan, we realized on Schedule “A-3” that the Special Study Area would be more appropriately used as an overlay designation rather than a specific designation itself. We understand that Mr. Stone and staff had previously discussed this approach to the Special Study Area and final determination of the approach was to be completed as one of the final matters to be considered upon completion of the Plan. We have recommended that the Camperdown Area be designated Residential Recreational with the Special Study Area being shown as an overlay. This provides greater certainty with respect to the future uses of the area. In the absence of an underlying designation, the Special Study Area could potentially result in any type of land use being proposed for the area.

The Special Study Area requires the completion of a Community or Neighbourhood Plan prior to development proceeding. That plan would provide greater details with respect to the development of the area but would rely on the applicable policies of the Residential Recreational designation as a starting point. We believe this provides a greater degree of certainty for the property owners and for the municipality.

**Roads** – We have updated the roads mapping in accordance with more detailed information received from Public Works. The roads policies have also been modified to add a roads category called Local Heritage Roads and subclasses such as Historic Routes/Roads, Seasonal Road and Low Volume/Cottage Roads. These road classifications are reflected in the approved mapping and revised policies.

Apart from these matters, we have made numerous minor changes to the Official Plan to assist in the interpretation of language and have also revised the mapping to reflect to the comments from the public and our internal review. At this stage we believe the Official Plan is in a form suitable for approval by Council and submission to the County of Grey for final approval.

As noted at the Public Meeting, following Council approval of the Plan, it is likely that the County will propose a number of modifications. At that stage, should there be any other substantial matters that need to be addressed; the Town can request the County to further modify the Plan.

Committee of The Whole recommends approval of the Official Plan to Council for approval at their meeting on September 3, 2014.

#### **D. Environmental Impacts**

N/A

#### **E. Financial Impact**

N/A

#### **F. In Consultation With**

N.A

**G. Attached**

G.1 Table of comments received to the Official Plan and changes made to the Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Dymont  
Acting Director of Planning

**INDEX OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED  
TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW  
Revised August 2014**

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
1	Bruce D. Taylor	May 12, 2010	Letter via e-mail	Town-wide – Comments relate to Town’s <u>current OP</u>	<p>Section 1.2(4) – add “and future” before ratepayers in the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence.</p> <p>Section 2 – Goals and Objectives - The Town of Blue Mountains Strategic Plan Adopted by Council November 14, 2005 needs to be updated and aligned with OP to include stronger wording referencing the OP.</p> <p>Section 3.2.4(2) OP needs to expand on municipal servicing strategy policies for Village of Clarksburg, what and when (and how to finance).</p> <p>Section 9.8 Lapse of Approval - A more detailed section needs to be developed, to respect a developer who makes a draft plan submission - one year may not be enough.</p> <p>Section 11.15 (1) Official Plan Review - Should be amended to include for an open house as required in the Planning Act.</p> <p>Section 11.16.3(4) Amendment Procedures – in addition to notification found in this clause, it should become mandatory that a 2m x 2m sign be placed on the development site with the same notification information in a location easily visible.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Not part of the OP Review process.</p> <p>OP does have policies respecting a municipal servicing strategy for Clarksburg.</p> <p>Refer to Section 5.6.12 in new OP with respect to lapsing of draft approval after 3 years and extensions.</p> <p>Changes brought forward through Bill 51 with respect to Open Houses provided for in new OP.</p> <p>Notice requirements under the <i>Planning Act</i> for OP and ZBL Amendments state that “notice shall be given by posting a notice, clearly visible and legible from a public highway or other place to which the public has access, at every separately assessed property within the subject land or, if posting on the property is impractical, at a nearby</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>Section 11.16.3(9) The second last sentence should be deleted or wordsmith to ensure Council <u>does</u> make further notice in the case of substantive modification to proposed Amendment.</p> <p>Section 11.17.2(1) This clause should include a time limit on when the Amendment is brought before Council for a vote. The Council meeting immediately following the Planning and Building Council Committee Meeting is best, but no later than the second Council meeting after the noted Planning and Building Committee Meeting was held.</p> <p>Section 11.17.3 Joint Planning – This section should be expanded to develop a schedule and agenda to speak with neighbouring municipalities as part of the OP.</p> <p>Under Section 14.3.1(10) Niagara Escarpment Plan, Signs – Suggest a section in OP be added to cover all of The Town of Blue Mountains and not just as found in the NEP.</p> <p>Concern regarding intensification and density.</p>	<p>location chosen by the clerk of the municipality or the secretary-treasurer of the planning board.</p> <p>Notice requirements will continue to be in keeping with the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p> <p>A notice of adoption requirement under the <i>Planning Act</i> is required for amendments.</p> <p>Under the <i>Planning Act</i>, municipalities have 180 days of the receipt of a complete application for an OPA to act.</p> <p>Under the <i>Planning Act</i>, municipalities have 120 days of the receipt of a complete application for a ZBLA to act.</p> <p>OPAs, ZBLAs and Plans of Subdivision are circulated to the clerk of every municipality if any part of the municipality is within one kilometre of the land to which the proposed application applies.</p> <p>There is a Sign By-law currently in place within the municipality. Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>Sense of Place Document should be incorporated into the OP.</p> <p>LEED and other proprietary sustainable standards should be referenced in the OP.</p>	Changes brought forward through Bill 51 to address sustainable development and design will be addressed as part of the OP Review.
2	Blue Mountains Chamber of Commerce	September 13, 2010	Letter	Town-wide	Review and amend OP to encourage business growth. Remove restrictive language.	The goals, objectives and policies of the new OP were crafted to encourage the retention and growth of existing businesses, and the establishment of new businesses in the Town.
3	Lelio & Jacqueline Angelantoni	November 19, 2010	Letter	Thornbury	Should be a "Master Plan" for the river and harbour area in Thornbury.	Would be incorporated in Recreational Master Plan in 2015.
4	Bell Canada	April 20, 2011	Letter via e-mail	Town-wide	Request that utility infrastructure, such as telecommunications, be considered as part of the OP Review.	Policies with respect to utility infrastructure provided throughout the new OP, as appropriate.
5	Rosemary and Roland Gosselin	November 8, 2010	Letter via Councillor Michael Martin	Thornbury	Questioning how new development can be integrated into existing neighbourhoods.	Policies with respect to infill, intensification and compatible development provided in new OP.
6	Housing Committee	May 31, 2011	E-mail	Town-wide	Need to incorporate recommendations of the Housing Needs Study, August 25, 2010.	Recommend incorporating some objectives and general policies from the Housing Needs Study to implement Provincial and County policies. However, recommended that vast majority of recommendations from Housing Needs Study not be considered for the new OP until the County's Housing OPA is approved.
7	Agriculture Advisory Committee	May 31, 2011	E-mail	Agricultural and Special Agricultural policies.	Concerns regarding minimum lot size of Special Agricultural designations and consent policies.	In accordance with the County OP, consents are permitted on lands designated Special Agricultural provided the agriculturally productive size of both the severed and retained lots is at least 10 hectares. New policies are also provided in Section B4.24 of the new OP were developed to ensure that the creation of such lots are justified.
8	Roland Gosselin	June 2, 2011	Letter	Town-wide	Would like a demographic profile of the Town available at Official Plan Review	Comments noted. Information provided at public workshop.

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					public workshop.	
9	Anne Cauley	June 18, 2011	E-mail	Town-wide	Concerns regarding allowing commercial uses within Residential designated areas.	It is proposed that home occupation uses continue to be a permitted in residential areas, subject to criteria set out in the Zoning By-law. The Official Plan continues to encourage a mix of land uses throughout the community while ensuring compatibility with existing/established residential areas.
10	Rob Potter, Housing Committee	July 27, 2011	Letter	Housing Policies	<p>Official Plan should contain a definition of Attainable Housing, which has been provided.</p> <p>Section 2 Goals and Objectives - Increasing supply of attainable housing be stated as a goal. Recommended adding wording which has been provided.</p> <p>Section 3 Goals and Objectives - Official Plan address attainable housing as a community priority. Recommend adding wording to Section 3.1.5 Infilling and 3.2.1 Attainable Housing which has been provided.</p> <p>Section 4 Land Use Designations recognize a mix of housing styles and a reasonable range of lot sizes.</p> <p>Section 4.27.1 Purpose – recommend a revision to this section to include a housing mix. Include a mix of residential and commercial. Provision of residential uses for attainable housing be required in all commercial development/redevelopment.</p> <p>Section 5.8 Servicing for Attainable Housing – add wording to encourage</p>	<p>Recommend incorporating some objectives and general policies from the Housing Needs Study to implement Provincial and County policies. However, recommended that vast majority of recommendation from Housing Needs Study not be considered for the new OP until the County's Housing OPA is approved.</p>



Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>environmentally-sound servicing options when attainable housing is being developed as infilling and/or intensification.</p> <p>Section 9.2.3 Compatibility – add wording to include attainable housing in the mix of housing.</p>	
11	Brian Nelson	September 23, 2011	E-mail	Thornbury	<p>Need for clearer Official Plan policies for Thornbury, possibly a secondary plan.</p> <p>Need to determine if the community wants intensification in Thornbury and Clarksburg.</p> <p>The Official Plan should contain policies that allow large scale developments to proceed only via Plan of Subdivision or Plan of Condominium.</p>	<p>Policies in the new OP have been developed to provide clearer land use direction with respect to Thornbury/Clarksburg. The area in the west portion of Thornbury/Clarksburg designated Deferred Development in the current OP, is now identified as a Future Secondary Plan Area in the new OP.</p> <p>Policies with respect to infill, intensification and compatible development in Thornbury/Clarksburg provided in Sections E.1.5, D.7.3, D.5.1, A.3.4, B.3.1.5, B.3.14 and D.4.3 of new OP.</p> <p>Section D4.1 of the new OP sets out circumstances where land division via plan of subdivision is preferred over consent, including development that is not considered infilling.</p>
12	Roland Gosselin	September 26, 2011	Comment Sheet	Town-wide	<p>Business core in Thornbury should be preserved.</p> <p>Need for clear guidelines for professional use of homes in residential designations.</p>	<p>Agreed. The new OP provides a Downtown Area designation established to specifically identify and protect the downtown/business core.</p> <p>Section B2.10 of the new OP provides clear criteria for home occupation uses.</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>Need to keep residential roads to two lanes.</p> <p>Need for good design principles.</p> <p>Limit urban sprawl.</p>	<p>Separate OPA process will be followed.</p> <p>The new OP encourages good community design. In particular, refer to Section D5, Community Design.</p> <p>No settlement area expansion is contemplated at this time. The policies of the new OP speak to intensification, infill and use of existing infrastructure to curb urban sprawl.</p>
13	Rosemary Gosselin	September 28, 2011	Comment Sheet	Town-wide	<p>Protect green space.</p> <p>Create a pedestrian only area in the downtown of Thornbury.</p>	<p>Policies incorporated throughout the new OP to maintain the Town's vision with respect to protecting green space.</p> <p>The OP encourages the creation of pedestrian-oriented streets and pedestrian linkages throughout the Town. The OP would not restrict the Town from identifying pedestrian-only areas in the future, whether on a permanent or occasional basis (e.g. for special events).</p>
14	Tony Santilli	September 28, 2011	Comment Sheet	Town-wide	New growth should maintain present character of the Town.	Goals, objectives and policies of the new OP speak to maintaining the character of the Town.
15	Dave Sinclair, Blue Mountain Resorts Ltd.	September 28, 2011	Comment Sheet	Town-wide	Need for public transportation, especially to the Blue Mountain Village.	The policies of the new OP speak to promoting opportunities for future public transit, including encouraging more compact urban form in proximity to arterial roads to support transit.
16	Bruce D. Taylor	September 28, 2011	E-mail	Height Provisions	Section 3.20 Height: Recommend adding in an item regarding height in relation to existing grade, thus to try and avoid back filling a site to achieve a full basement (as might and has happened) when there is minimal earth depth with expensive to excavate shale preventing a full depth excavation.	This type of requirement is more appropriately regulated through the Zoning By-law.

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					Section 3.20(5) Building heights as discussed in items 1 to 4 shall be measured from existing natural grade.	This type of requirement is more appropriately regulated through the Zoning By-law.
17	Don Kerr, Blue Mountain Watershed Trust	September 29, 2011	E-mail	Natural Heritage Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)	Official Plan Review should anticipate a Natural Heritage Systems approach to development with a study.  Official Plan should be kept open to be made consistent once the PPS review has been completed.	The new OP supports a natural heritage systems approach and also requires a Town-wide natural heritage study to be completed prior to or at the time of the next five-year review of the OP.  It is anticipated that the Town will be required to conform with a new PPS, once approved.
		July 5, 2014	Letter	Schedule A-2	How is the flood water flowing north into Craighleith being addressed.	
				Schedule A-3	Hazard extend from Mountain Road northeastward to Osler Bluff Roads towards Silver Creek. Water quality from the south base parking lots.	
				Slope stabilization	What is happening with this	
				A3.2.1. Natural Environment	Remove the word “work towards the establishment of” and replace with “establish” After Objective 7 say “Provide protection for species of concern as part of an overall objective of preserving biodiversity.”	
				A.2.10.2 Mineral Aggregate Resources	After 4 add “5. Prevent aggregate extraction in all NEC areas and comply with the Aggregate Resources Act and any subsequent Amendments.”	
				B5 Environmental &	Last 2 lines deleted and replaced with “That a natural heritage system be	

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
				Open Space 2 Natural Heritage Features  B5.2.1 Development and Site Alternation  Part C Water, Environmental & Hazard Policies C4 Ground & Surface Water Resources 3 General Policies  C11 Shoreline of Georgian Bay	prepared prior to the adoption of this Official Plan”  After the last paragraph in this section insert “The Official Plan will comply with the PPS and BHRM and any subsequent revisions.  Concern that just to do a site screening questionnaire to get out of doing an environmental site assessment to support a development application does not properly protect the environment. Remove “requirements for” from the 6 <sup>th</sup> line of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph and replace with “scope of”.  3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence of last paragraph after “any alteration to the shore line” insert the words “including offshore dredging”	
18	John McCullam	September 30, 2011	Comment Sheet	Information.	Too much information presented as part of the workshop.	Comments noted.
19	Brian Nelson	October 20, 2011	E-mail	Town-wide	Intensification.	Comments noted.
20	D.C. Slade Consultants on behalf of Slopeside Developments Inc. c/o David Knechtel	December 15, 2011  June 2013  July 4, 2014	Letter  Consultation Request  Letter	138 Happy Valley Road	Consider redesignating lands Residential Infilling or Commercial.  Consider redesignating lands to Residential Resort/Recreational Area  Lands are designated Escarpment however this is an existing lot of record with an existing structure that has been on the property for 50+ years. The lands should be recognized the same as	TBM responded on March 5, 2012. Included copy of Niagara Escarpment Commission letter dated January 31, 2012.  Agreed but limit to 1 residential lot/unit.

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					well other existing lots of record along Happy Valley Road and placed within the Residential Recreational designation.	
21	D. C. Slade Consultants on behalf of Tyrolean Village Resorts Ltd. c/o Denis Martinek	December 16, 2011  February 2, 2012	Letter  Letter	197 Brophy's Lane (Long Pointe Road)	Consider redesignating lands.	CA adjusted Hazard boundary based on survey drawing provided. Lands removed from Hazard redesignated to RRA.
22	D.C. Slade Consultants on behalf of Aldome Investments Inc. c/o Albert Passero	December 15, 2011  February 2, 2012	Letter  Letter	209488 Highway #26	Consider increasing residential density. Lands have restrictions on access to Hwy 26. Official Plan review should consider policies that would enhance this area by linking the development lands to the south, the subject lands and the MTO public beach area.	This is a property-specific request that is more appropriately considered through a site-specific Application for Official Plan Amendment. However, site-specific policy included (Section B3.7.6.14) to recognize existing permitted maximum unit yield of 16.
23	D.C. Slade Consultants on behalf of LMCM Holdings	December 15, 2011  February 2, 2012  July 4, 2014	Letter  Letter  Letter	136 Tyrolean Lane	Consider redesignating lands to a residential designation allowing up to 125 units.   Draft OP permits the subject lands be used for a commercial resort unit complex with a maximum of 125 commercial resort units as per Exception B.7.6.11. We request that the lands also continue to have exception status presently within the existing OP. Exception 49 permits 41 single family units and exempts the lands from the 40% open space requirement. This exception should also be incorporated within Exception B.7.6.11	This is a property-specific request that is more appropriately considered through a site-specific Application for Official Plan Amendment. However, will recognize exception in current Official Plan to permit 41 single detached units.  Agreed and modified.
24	D. C. Slade Consultants on behalf of Tyrolean Village Resorts Ltd. c/o Denis Martinek	December 16, 2011	Letter	138 Kandahar Lane	Consideration should be given to multiple residential uses that would provide attainable housing in close proximity to the base of Blue Mountain.	This is a property-specific request that is more appropriately considered through a site-specific Application for Official Plan Amendment.

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
		February 2, 2012 June 2013	Letter Consultation Request			Site-specific policy included (Section B3.7.6.11) to recognize existing permission for a maximum of 125 commercial resort units.
25	D. C. Slade Consultants on behalf of 1186035 Ontario Inc. (Tom Kritsch)	December 15, 2011 June 2013	Letter Consultation Request	121 Arthur Taylor Lane	Consider lands to be included as part of Settlement Area.	The County has determined that a settlement area expansion is not warranted. Any expansion would require an amendment to the County OP as part of a comprehensive review.
26	Colin Travis	January 28, 2012	Comment Sheet	Town-wide	Potential issues with policy directions on active files.	Comment noted.
27	Ron Hartlen	January 29, 2012	E-mail	Town-wide	Concerns regarding Wind Turbines within the Town.	Green Energy Act and regulations limit the powers of local municipalities with respect to wind turbines/farms.
28	Tim Burkholder	January 30, 2012	E-mail	Town-wide	Concerns regarding Policy Direction #5 and specifically that private road/cul-de-sac development is not compatible with existing neighbourhoods.  Hopes that Peel Street North and other collector roads will not be upgraded to collector roads.	In some cases, this may be true depending on the built form, context, etc. however this cannot be applied as a general rule or policy. The type, built form and design of new development should be considered on a case-by-case and subject to OP policies.  Road classification will be subject to a separate OPA.
29	Michael Seguin on behalf of Blue Mountains Ratepayers' Association	February 2, 2012	E-mail		Previously proposed 'Recreational Resort Area' name is inappropriate; should reflect primarily residential nature of these areas.  Do not agree with using County OP adjacent lands standards; should use standards in MNR Natural Heritage Resource Manual.  Housing – discrepancies between Town and County housing studies; much uncertainty regarding the design, location and implementation of	Designation renamed to 'Residential Recreational Area'.  New OP uses standards from MNR Natural Heritage Resource Manual.  Recommend incorporating some objectives and general policies from the Housing Needs Study to implement Provincial and County policies.

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>affordable housing projects.</p> <p>Do not support road classifications in proposed OPA 24.</p> <p>Will OP recognize special events as contributing to local economy.</p> <p>Support directions relating to the introduction of Future Secondary Plan Areas and concept of community planning.</p>	<p>However, recommended that vast majority of recommendations from Housing Needs Study not be considered for the new OP until the County's Housing OPA is approved.</p> <p>Road classification will be subject to a separate OPA.</p> <p>The OP recognizes the importance of special events including contributing to community identity, tourism, etc. Comments noted.</p>
30	Elsbeth Wright	February 2, 2012	E-mail	Thornbury	Concerns with Far Hills development.	OP policies require securities under Subdivision and Condominium Agreements.
31	Linda Wykes	February 5, 2012	E-mail	Clarksburg	Request wording in OP to recognize alternative methods of servicing.	Provincial and County policies require settlement areas to be serviced via full municipal services however, the consideration of innovative/sustainable design is encouraged.
32	Sally Leppard	February 6, 2012	E-mail	Town-wide	<p>Recommend incorporating The Sustainable Path policies relating to land use planning within the Official Plan Five-year Review.</p> <p>The vision provided in the ICSP should be utilized in the new OP.</p> <p>OP should implement employment/economic development strategies in Red Hot Blue and ICSP.</p>	<p>Policies appropriate for the OP have been incorporated throughout the document.</p> <p>Primarily, the Town's OP is a land use document however, the ICSP was considered in the vision set out in the new OP.</p> <p>The new OP considered the directions set out in these documents, in addition to the policy requirements set out in the</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>Address the future of Hwy 26 and creation of pedestrian friendly communities.</p> <p>Intensification should be considered in all areas.</p> <p>Disagree with Commercial/Light Industrial Corridor designation – supports sprawl and strip development.</p> <p>Sand and gravel extraction should be removed from the Rural designation.</p> <p>Policies required to protect, improve/enhance and restore the Nottawasage shoreline, habitat, fisheries and wetlands.</p>	<p>PPS and the County OP.</p> <p>The function, importance and design of Hwy 26 provided in the new OP; creating pedestrian friendly communities was a key consideration in the preparation of the new OP.</p> <p>Policies have been developed with this in mind.</p> <p>New CLIC designation replaces and clarifies existing Thornbury Commercial Arthur/King Street Corridor designation. The policies of the CLIC encourage more intensive, integrated development in these areas.</p> <p>Disagree; must conform with County OP.</p> <p>Policies are provided throughout the OP in this regard.</p>
33	Brian Nelson and John Corrigan on behalf of the Napier-Victoria Residents' Group	February 6, 2012  July 9, 2014	E-mail  Letter	Thornbury  B.3.13.5 Provisions for Community or Neighbourhood Plans	<p>Agreement with guiding principles, intensification, low density residential designation, secondary plans, community services and block plans.</p> <p>Concerns with housing, roads and road reclassification and zoning by-law issues (development zones).</p> <p>Looking for detailed planning that has full legal status and an ability to control development, as opposed to general concepts or guidelines that may be considered when evaluating proposals.</p>	Comments noted.



Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
				<p>D2.2 Transportation Schedule</p> <p>D5.2 Community Design Guidelines</p> <p>E1.3 Holdings Provisions E1.4 Interim Control By-laws</p> <p>E1.6 Site Plan Control Policies</p> <p>B3.1.4, A-2</p>	<p>Public opposition to reclassification to Collector Roads. Decisions should be postponed until future Secondary Planning processes enable this.</p> <p>Development proposals shall be evaluated to determine the extent to which they respect these guidelines.</p> <p>Provision for this</p> <p>Appear to give Council a wide range of options to control development.</p> <p>Maximum density of development permitted is far too high for established low-rise neighbourhoods in Thornbury/Clarksburg settlement area.</p> <p>No specific references to those areas in Thornbury that are designated "Development" in the Zoning By-law.</p>	<p>Road classifications will be addressed in future with Zoning By-law provisions as appropriate.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree given policies in OP that require consideration of compatibility, etc.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
34	Barb Hector, Chair, on behalf of The Blue Mountains Public Art Evaluation Committee	February 6, 2012  November 28, 2013	E-mail  Letter	Town-wide	<p>Request added wording regarding public art.</p> <p>Happy to see 2 policies recommended by the Committee incorporated in the OP.</p> <p>Cannot find incorporation of other recommended policy [a percentage of the value of new buildings (such as 1%) be devoted to public art]</p>	<p>The provision of public art encouraged throughout the OP and in particular in Section D5.9 Arts and Culture.</p> <p>The Planning Act does not provide the statutory authority to make such a requirement. Could be included in Community Improvement Plan Policies and through the Site Plan Approval</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
						process.
35	Adam McMullin on behalf of The Sustainable Path Steering Committee	February 6, 2012	E-mail and letter		Recommend integrating The Sustainable Path and other policies relating to land use planning within the Official Plan Five-year Review.  Additional comments provided regarding: guiding principles, employment lands, intensification, commercial designation, sand and gravel extraction and ecological, water and heritage features.	Comments noted.  Comments noted.
36	Glen Broll, Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. on behalf of Romspen Mortgage Ltd.	February 6, 2012  June 2013	Letter  Consultation Request	Camperdown Area	Will the Town be advancing a secondary plan process for the Camperdown area?	Application(s) have been submitted draft by property owners. Town in process of review.
37	Town CAO's Office	February 6, 2012	E-mail	Town-wide	Comments regarding natural areas, features and hazards along with community design and public art.	Comments noted.
38	Norman Wingrove on behalf of Blue Mountain Watershed Trust Foundation	February 6, 2012	E-mail	Town-wide	Comments regarding natural heritage system, intensification and proposed directions.	Comments noted.
39	Norman Wingrove on behalf of Blue Mountain Watershed Trust Foundation	February 7, 2012	E-mail	Town-wide	Comments regarding significant woodlands and a change to comments noted in Submission #40 above.	Comments noted.
40	Audrey Holden on behalf of Historic Saugeen Metis	February 7, 2012	E-mail	Town-wide	Comments with regard to continuing to consult with aboriginal communities on development proposals and include wording to such in the Official Plan.	Policies with respect to consultation with First Nations provided in Section D3.4.2 of the new OP.
41	Chris Hibberd, Nottawasaga Valley	February 10, 2012	E-mail	Town-wide (where the	Comments included: • Identify the role of the CAs in the	The role and regulatory mandates of

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
	Conservation Authority (NVCA)			NVCA has an advisory role to the Town)	<p>planning process as well as their regulatory role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an enhanced explanation and policies regarding natural hazards consistent with the current PPS.</li> <li>• Update the existing water quality and quantity policies to address sustainable development tools including current stormwater management expectations.</li> <li>• Expand on the existing natural heritage policies as well as examining the opportunities to develop a Town-wide natural heritage system.</li> </ul>	<p>CAs are noted throughout the OP</p> <p>Policies updated regarding natural hazards.</p> <p>Policies updated with respect to water quality/quantity, sustainable development tools, stormwater management, etc.</p> <p>Natural heritage policies enhanced and expanded; OP speaks to development of Town-wide NHS in the near future.</p>
42	Lindsay Ayers on behalf of Blue Mountain Resorts Limited	February 10, 2012  July 4, 2014	Letter via e-mail  Letter		<p>Comments regarding proposed Directions.</p> <p>Need to discuss “further discussion items.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Plan to be reviewed with respect to Tourism.</p>
43	D. C. Slade Consultants on behalf of Jeff Becker	February 10, 2012  June 2013  July 4, 2014	Letter  Consultation Request  Letter	<p>Part of Lot 20, Concession 1, Lot 6, RP 824</p> <p>Constraint mapping</p>	<p>Consider increasing maximum density yields in and around Craighleith/Terrasan area.</p> <p>Correct hazard designation</p> <p>Show property lines on OP Schedule</p> <p>Does not appear to conform to Minutes of Settlement from OMB</p> <p>Lands designated Woodlands on the constraint mapping. The subject lands</p>	<p>Property-specific density increases not considered as part of this OP Review however, new OP policies will allow for consideration of density increases in certain circumstances. Existing permitted maximum unit yield recognized as per Section B3.7.6.15.</p> <p>Hazard boundaries modified</p> <p>Property lines shown</p> <p>Modified accordingly</p> <p>Agreed. Constraints Map modified accordingly.</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>would be subject to Section B5.2.1 Development &amp; Site Alteration Criteria of the OP. Section B of this section states that development &amp; site alteration shall not be permitted within significant woodlands. In association with Tyrolean Village Resorts, Becker has completed a detailed EIS for the lands which resulted in establishing designation on the subject property that are outlined within the previous OP. These lands should be removed from the Woodlands constraint mapping.</p> <p>Subject lands are designated within Exception 50 within the current OP and specific policies were established for parcel A8 being Becker lands. Section B3.7.6.15 does recognize the maximum unit yield to be 69 units, however the exception does not cover all the Becker lands and incorrectly covers land beyond the Becker lands.</p>	<p>Agreed. Schedule A-4 modified accordingly.</p>
44	D. C. Slade Consultants on behalf of Eden Oak (Trailshead) Inc. c/o Romas Kartavicius	February 2, 2012  June 2013	Letter  Consultation Request	Part Lot 20, Concession 2, being Part Lots 158 and 173, Plan 529	<p>Consider increasing residential density.</p> <p>Subject lands should be included in Schedule A-2 (Craigleith).</p> <p>Correct hazard designation</p>	<p>Property-specific density increases not considered as part of this OP Review however, new OP policies will allow for consideration of density increases in certain circumstances.</p> <p>The area covered by Schedule A-2 (in a previous version of the draft new OP) was not a settlement area boundary; it was based on the approved Terrasan Official Plan Amendment and the Town's CIP boundary. Craigleith now incorporated into broader Craigleith/Swiss Meadows Schedule A-4.</p> <p>SWM pond removed from Hazard</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
		July 4, 2014	Letter		<p>Show property lines on OP Schedule</p> <p>Lands are designated Residential Recreational which permits a maximum density of 10 units/hectare in the latest draft of the OP. The site would therefore be permitted a maximum of 155 units. Exception B.3.7.6.17 which applies to the subject lands is no longer necessary as it had provided an exception to permit a maximum of 77 units. We request this Exception be removed.</p>	<p>designation; now designated Major Open Space.</p> <p>Property lines shown</p> <p>Do not agree with property-specific request for increased density.</p>
45	John La Chapelle, Bell Canada	February 21, 2012	Letter via e-mail	Town-wide	Comments provided regarding proposed directions #30, 31 and 32 as well as comments regarding Town Community Design Guidelines and Draft Official Plan Amendment No. 25.	Comments noted.
46A	D. C. Slade Consultants on behalf of Tyrolean Village Resorts Ltd. c/o Denis Martinek	March 12, 2012 June 2013 July 4, 2014	Letter Consultation Request Letter	Nipissing Ridge Golf Course Community Pt Lots 19 & 20, Con 1 (Lowlands)	<p>SPA #1</p> <p>Review proposed Hazard designation. Acknowledge previous approved unit yields and exceptions. Does not appear to conform to MOS from OMB.</p> <p>Subject lands designated Woodlands on the constraint mapping. As a result, the subject lands would be subject to Section B5.2.1 Development &amp; Site Alteration Criteria of the OP. Section B of this section states that development &amp; site alteration shall not be permitted within significant woodlands. Tyrolean has completed a detailed EIS of the lands which resulted in establishing designations on the subject property that</p>	Constraint Map modified accordingly. SPA 2 removed however, SPA 1 maintained as all requirements under current OP have not been addressed.

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>are outlined within the previous OP. These lands should be removed from the Woodlands constraint mapping.</p> <p>The lands are designated within the Exception 50 of the current OP and specific policies were established for parcel A7. We request this exception be incorporated in the new OP. Section B3.7.6.16 does recognize the maximum unit yield to be 265 units however there are many other special provisions that related to the subject lands which must also be incorporated into this exception.</p>	<p>Site-specific policy included (Section B3.7.6.16) to recognize existing permitted maximum unit yield of 265 and other components of existing exception.</p>
<b>46B</b>	D. C. Slade Consultants on behalf of Tyrolean Village Resorts Ltd. c/o Denis Martinek	December 19, 2012  June 2013	Letter  Consultation Request	330 Grey Road #21	<p>SPA #2</p> <p>Review proposed Hazard designation. Acknowledge previous approved unit yields and exceptions. Does not appear to conform to MOS from OMB.</p>	
<b>47</b>	Shelley Wells, Plan Wells Associates on behalf of Siljon Investments Inc.	April 16, 2012  July 2013  June 26, 2014	Letter  Consultation Request  Letter	10.9 hectares in Thornbury Urban Area	<p>Comments provided regarding proposed directions #4, 8 and 32.</p> <p>Designated Commercial Exception 12 in current OP which permits a commercial resort hotel complex subject to zoning amendment. Propose Neighbourhood Mixed Use designation.</p> <p>Oppose Commercial Light Industrial designation on subject property – restrict development on lands/not in public interest.</p> <p>Town has not commissioned employment study to demonstrate need for light industrial uses in Thornbury.</p> <p>Industrial uses would not be compatible</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Property-specific redesignations not considered as part of this OP Review.</p> <p>Designation modified to remove employment uses.</p>



Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
	Consultants on behalf of Les Mallins (Streetcar)	July 4, 2014	Request  Letter	Concession 3 Salzburg Place	Hazard – intent?  Manmade pond has now been designated within the Hazard designation. Not designated Hazard in the existing OP. The pond should be Residential Recreational similar to the approach of other manmade ponds.	Hazard designation removed from man-made pond.
52	D. C. Slade Consultants on behalf of Castle Glen Development Corp. (Michael Larkin)	June 2013  July 4, 2014	Consultation Request  Letter	Castle Glen Community	Confirm that the Castle Glen Resort Community policies will 'stand-alone'  Mapping error in n/w corner of Schedule A-4  Lake of Clouds should not be PSW  Schedule A-6 does not reflect the original land use schedule as contained within the Castle Glen OP. Schedule A-6 needs to be identical to the original Castle Glen Schedule A as all of the policies have been adopted by the Town within the text of the new OP. Castle Glen has 5 separate hazard designations with 5 separate policies. These are listed as Hazard H to Hazard H4 and specific policy is referred to each designation. Schedule A-6 only has 1 hazard designation and therefore the site specific policies cannot be applied.  The OP has adopted the text of the Castle Glen OP in its entirety. There are certain policies within the draft OP that also apply to the Castle Glen lands. These include Sections B1, B2, C12,	Vast majority of Castle Glen Resort Community policies will stand-alone however, proposed to apply Sections B1, B2, C12, C13, E5 and E11 from Parent OP.  Corrected.  Corrected.  Corrected.  Modified as required.



Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					C13, E5 & E11. By applying these policies to the Castle Glen OP creates conflict in certain cases as they policies would be contrary or different than policies already established within the Castle Glen OP. ie Section E11 contains approximately 30 pages of definitions. Many conflict with the intended definitions within the Castle Glen OP.	
53	Colin Travis on behalf of Thornbury Gate/Applewood	June 2013	Consultation Request	Thornbury	3 storey maximum should apply to all of Downtown Area.  Section B3.3.5.3.2 'Residential Uses on Side Streets' in the Downtown Area should also permit street townhouses.	Agreed; Section B3.3.4(d) modified accordingly.  Agreed; modified accordingly.
54	Colin Travis on behalf of Lora Bay Heights	June 2013	Consultation Request	Lora Bay Heights	Community Living Area designation – impact on density, housing form and existing application process?	Further discussions required in context of OMB decision on previous Zoning By-law Amendment Application and new ZBLA.
55	Christine Loft on behalf of Meridian Credit Union	June 2013	Consultation Request	Lots 21 & 22, Concession 1 (Lots 86, 88 & 89, Plan 529)	Significant woodlands policies. Natural heritage policies including timing of studies required by OPA 20.	Approved OPA 20 incorporated into OP.
56	Norman Wingrove on behalf of Blue Mountain Watershed Trust Foundation	September 27, 2013	Letter	General Comments	Thornbury-Clarksburg: Has the Hazard designation expanded? Can construction occur on lots designated Hazard?  Craigleith: Hazard and other policies reflect OPA 20?  Blue Mountain Village: In southeast corner, should Hazard extend Mountain Rd to Osler Bluff Road to Silver Creek?  Slope stabilization issues – strengthen	It has been modified in consultation with the GSCA. Development is generally restricted in accordance with the policies of the OP however, new development, and alterations/expansions/demolitions will be subject to the Town's Zoning By-law and GSCA regulations.  Yes.  Mapping modified accordingly.  OP has requirement for slope stability.

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>policies in OP including Recreational Ski designation?</p> <p>Craigleith Village Residential designation (B3.12.3.2.1b) – ‘residential’ instead of ‘recreational’?</p> <p>Section A3, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: change reference from <u>supporting</u> development to <u>limiting</u> development.</p> <p>Strategic Objective A3.2.2 #4 – Town will require program to monitor and enforce this goal.</p> <p>Goal A3.2.1 – modify to ‘establish’ a natural heritage system instead of ‘work towards’ and similar reference in Section B5.2</p> <p>Strategic Objectives (A3.2.2) – add “Provide protection for species of concern as part of an overall objective of preserving biodiversity”</p> <p>Strategic Objectives (A3.6.2) – add “Reduce the application of fertilizer and pesticide....”</p> <p>Strategic Objectives (A3.10.2) – add “Prevent aggregate extraction in all NEC areas and comply with the Aggregate Resources Act and any subsequent Amendments”</p> <p>Craigleith Village Residential (B3.12.3.2.1) – add “including public access to the beach and development of a public waterfront/beach area” to permitted uses</p>	<p>No-policy correctly reflects OPA 20.</p> <p>Do not agree, recommend no change to policy.</p> <p>Maintenance and enhancement of groundwater quantity and quality are subject to policies of the Plan including Section C4.3.</p> <p>Do not agree. As per Section B5.2, the Town will develop a NHS prior to or at the time of the next OP review.</p> <p>Objectives already speak to protecting habitat, etc.</p> <p>Agreed. Objective modified.</p> <p>The Niagara Escarpment Plan dictates where aggregate extraction can occur. All aggregate-related uses must comply with Provincial legislation as set out in the draft OP.</p> <p>Policies related to Craigleith carry forward the policies approved by the OMB in 2011. However, an objective of the draft OP is to create an appropriate</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>Strategic Objectives (B4.6.1 – 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet) – remove “little or”</p> <p>B4.6.4.3 – detail required respecting methods of rehabilitation and guarantees of completion.</p> <p>B5.2.1 – add “The Official Plan will comply with the PPS and NHRM and subsequent revisions”</p> <p>B5.3.2 (b) – add “a minimum of” after “shall be located”</p> <p>C4.3 (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph) – replace “requirement for” with “scope of”</p> <p>Objectives (C8.1) – includes objectives respecting fertilizer and pesticide application and buffer strips along water courses and fence streams to prevent cattle access.</p>	<p>number of public waterfront parks distributed along the length of the shoreline (D6.3.6).</p> <p>Agreement in part. OP modified to replace “little or no” with “no negative”.</p> <p>Detailed rehabilitation plans are required to ensure appropriate rehabilitation to the satisfaction of the Town and the MNR. Refer to Section B4.6.4.8.</p> <p>Conformity with the PPS (and future amendments) is required and noting same is not required. Do not agree with including a statement that the OP will comply with the NHRM. The NHRM represents the Province’s recommended technical criteria and approaches for implementing the PPS however, other approaches are also acceptable.</p> <p>Agreed and modified.</p> <p>Do not agree. The requirement for additional study should be determined on an area or property specific basis.</p> <p>Additional objective included regarding fertilizer and pesticide usage. Agricultural best management practices would include consideration of buffer strips.</p>
57	Michael Seguin	April 24, 2013	Email		<p>The majority of lands on Schedule ‘A’ located east of Thornbury and north of Hwy 26 appear to be in a Special Policy Area.</p>	<p>Understanding is that reference is to lands west of Thornbury. Lands were not shown as Special Policy Area however, an exception was incorrectly applied to these lands. Schedule corrected.</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
58	Glenn Wellings on behalf of MacPherson Builders (Blue Mountains) Limited	<p data-bbox="409 224 604 248">July 10, 2013</p> <p data-bbox="409 743 604 768">July 9, 2014</p>	<p data-bbox="634 224 793 248">Letter</p> <p data-bbox="634 743 793 768">Letter</p>	<p data-bbox="823 224 1026 280">Part Lot 20, Concession 2</p> <p data-bbox="823 1174 888 1198">E1.5</p>	<p data-bbox="1050 224 1522 402">Configuration of Hazard on subject lands has changed. We fully expect that the boundary of the identified Hazard lands will be further refined once the on-going Environmental Impact Study is completed.</p> <p data-bbox="1050 443 1522 711">Recognizes maximum density of 2.5 units/net ha and minimum open space of 40% in current OP and provisions in new draft OP (Subsection E1.5) for increasing the density to 5 units/net ha. Would like to discuss possibility of special site policies for the subject lands to support an increase in the unit yield beyond 5 units per ha.</p> <p data-bbox="1050 751 1522 1109">OP designates the lands as Residential Resort/Recreation Area and Hazard. Appendix 1 – constraint map shows the Hazard lands as woodlands. We understand Schedule B no longer applies to the Residential Resort/Recreation Area designation and the maximum density permitted has increased to 10 units per net hectare. Up to 15 units per net hectare could be achieved through the application of density bonus policies.</p> <p data-bbox="1050 1141 1522 1435">The subject lands are unique as they contain a proposed Heritage Site, Hazard Lands and large open space blocks associated with the hazard lands. Clarification on the scope of the significant public benefit that may be required to achieve a density increase above the 10 units per net hectare ie: requirements for incremental increases between 10 and 15 units per net</p>	<p data-bbox="1554 224 2026 345">Configuration has changed as per new mapping provided by NVCA however, refinements can be discussed as part of an EIS.</p> <p data-bbox="1554 443 2026 557">Section B3.7.4.1 of draft OP maintains 40% open space requirement however, maximum density has been increased to 10 units/net ha.</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>hectare. Additional wording may be required to clarify the intent of the density bonus policies.</p> <p>Open space component required for the Residential Resort/Recreation Area designation – 40%, it is stated that lands designated Hazard and wetland may be included. Policies also state that the blocks of land created for the open space component must be made available for use by all lot or unit owners under the plan of subdivision. There are situation where there should not be access to wetlands &amp; hazard lands. This policy requires clarification.</p> <p>B3.7.4.1 states majority of lots &amp; units should have direct access to the public or private open space and all lots shall have access to public open space pedestrian walkways, with linkages to sidewalks along roadways. Both these are difficult to achieve in all cases. Add where feasible or if appropriate to provide some flexibility.</p> <p>Configuration of hazard land designation has changed significantly between what is shown on Schedule A - Land Use Plan – Map 4 to the OP and the draft Schedule A-4 to the new OP. We did request an explanation for the change and have not received same. On draft Schedule A-4 there is now an undefined green blob on the front portion of the lands. The extent of the hazard lands designation is incorrect.</p> <p>Hazard lands designation should not</p>	

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>simply reflect the extent of the regulated area. The purpose of the Hazard lands designation is to identify lands susceptible to flooding and erosion and hazardous sites that exhibit instability or poor drainage or any other severe physical conditions.</p> <p>Constraint Schedule shows the front portion of the lands as woodlands in the same location as the undefined green blob (hazard lands) on Schedule A-4. Section A4.3.3 of the OP states that the purpose of Special Constrain Areas is to identify Significant woodlands as identify in the CGOP. No development or site alteration may occur within SW or adjacent lands unless demonstrated through an EIS there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions. Inconsistences and errors in mapping.</p> <p>EIS is being prepared. Section B5.4 – Hazard lands and Subsection B5.4.2e) states Minor alternation of hazard mapping, as interpreted by the Town in consultation with CA, may occur without an OPA. Should a site-specific EIS be prepared which proposes changes to the hazard lands and significant woodlands mapping which are not considered minor in nature by the Town, we assume TBM would require and consider an OPA. Minor alteration reviewed on a case by case basis. Confirmation on this.</p> <p>A portion of the Hazard lands designation (flood prone area) has been</p>	

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>altered (expanded) over time due to farming activities &amp; construction of beaver dams. Without these the flood pone area would be different. Present watercourse flows in areas outside the hazard lands as shown on the OP mapping. The morphology of this site is indeterminate.</p> <p>Would the draft OP policies permit the relocation of a creek/watercourse subject to the approval of the CA. OP states an EIS must demonstrate the development will not cause erosion or siltation of watercourses or changes to watercourse morphology. Part C – Water, Environmental &amp; Hazard policies Section C1a states recognize watercourses in the Town and protect them through the planning process from developpment that may have an impact on their function as an important component of the natural heritage system. Part C of the op contains additional policies related to watercourses and other natural features. Require clarification regarding the hazard &amp; woodlands designations on the subject lands &amp; associated policies in terms of restrictions on development as well as the Town’s policy position on the relocation of the watercourse.</p>	
59	Victor Labreche on behalf of A&W Food Services, McDonalds Restaurants, TDL Group, Wendys Restaurants and the Ontario	May 24, 2013	Letter		<p>OP policies that specifically prohibit or unduly regulate drive-through facilities (DTFs) in areas that would otherwise permit service retail commercial uses and associate parking areas in not common or appropriate.</p> <p>Section B2.6(a) – Object to DTFs only</p>	OP modified to not limit DTFs to

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
	Restaurant, Hotel and Motel Association				<p>permitted on lands designated Commercial/Light Industrial Corridor.</p> <p>B2.6(b) – Not appropriate and premature to specifically dictate what the Zoning By-law should state.</p> <p>B2.6(d) – Object to use of Holding Symbols on lands designated Commercial/Light Industrial Corridor.</p> <p>B3.3.3(o) – Downtown Area – Object to DTF prohibition.</p>	<p>Commercial/Light Industrial Corridor however, permissions subject to modified policies in Section B2.6.</p> <p>Disagree; it is entirely appropriate for an OP to provide some direction with respect to implementation through the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Section B2.6(d) was deleted.</p> <p>Prohibition on DTFs removed.</p>
60	David Parks, Simcoe County	June 28, 2013	Letter		No comments regarding the draft OP. County would appreciate being contacted regarding future applications within the area abutting area designated Future Secondary Plan Area along Grey County Road 21.	Noted.
61	Skyline Blue Mountain Development Inc.	June 2013  July 4, 2014	Consultation Request  Letter	<p>Jozo Weider Blvd &amp; Gord Canning Drive, Lots 6, 10, 14 &amp; 15, Plan 1065</p> <p>B3.10.6.1a), B3.10.6.1.f) &amp; B3.10.9g)</p> <p>B3.10.6.1f)</p>	<p>Hazard designation of Mill Pond in Village?</p> <p>Permitted number and location of commercial residential units and residential units.</p> <p>Our understanding these sections would be revised in order to clarify that the maximum number of units permitted within the Blue Mountain Village Core is 1,590, consisting of 1,290 units listed under paragraph a) and 300 units under paragraph f)</p> <p>Limit is implemented through the C5-67 land use zone in the ZBL which contains the same 9,300 m<sup>2</sup> maximum.</p>	Mapping to be revised – previous permissions carries forward.



Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					Confusion may arise should any ancillary commercial floor space of BMR day ski lodge be considered as part of this retail and service commercial floor space limit which was never the intention. Add sentence to clarify.	
62	Skyline Blue Mountain Development Inc.	June 2013	Consultation Request	276 Jozo Weider Blvd	Blue Mountain Village Schedule A-3 – low density or medium density residential?	Lands designated BMV Medium Density Residential.
63	Skyline Blue Mountain Development Inc.	June 2013	Consultation Request	Grey Road 21/Grand Cypress Blvd/ Augusta Blvd	Delineation of Hazard designation.  Dwelling units permitted on lands.	Hazard designation boundaries adjusted.
64	Skyline Blue Mountain Development Inc.	June 2013	Consultation Request	Part __ 16R-4135, Parts 5-8 16R-5057 (Pt Lots 17 & 18, Con 1)	Delineation of Hazard designation.  Dwelling units permitted on lands (Section B3.7.6.5).  Implications on existing Draft Approved Plan?	Refer to Section B3.7.6.5 of OP and lands identified on Schedule A-5 – reflects permissions in current OP.
65	Chris Hibberd, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	December 5, 2013	Email	General	Encourage inclusion of section that describes planning and regulatory roles of conservation authorities.  A3.2.2 Item 7 – Encourage the Town to add locally significant wetlands and unevaluated wetlands.  A3.10 – suggest mentioning enhancement opportunities to compliment Section B4.6.4.3.  A4.3.1 - encourage the protection of all wetlands.	In accordance with the County OP, development and site alterations are prohibited in other identified wetlands and adjacent lands (30 metres), unless unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions. Refer to new Section B5.5.9 in this regard.  Agreed. A3.10.4 modified with the addition of “including exploring opportunities for enhancement”.  See above comments.

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					<p>B3.7.4.6(c) – include Natural Hazard Assessment and encouragement of Audubon certification for new courses.</p> <p>B5.1.1 and B5.2 – encourage protecting all wetlands.</p> <p>B5.4.2(f) – Some slopes less than 3:1 require setbacks from top of bank and may be considered significant valleylands.</p> <p>B5.5.3 – Karst is also under the regulatory jurisdiction of the Conservation Authorities Act.</p> <p>B5.7.2 – encourage Town to apply a 30 metre buffer to all watercourses.</p> <p>C1 – encourage the Town to add the protection of water quality and quantity through stormwater management and sourcewater protection.</p> <p>C6 - should reference MNR's Technical Guide.</p> <p>C6(b) – toe erosion is also a factor that needs to be considered.</p> <p>C6 – a setback should be established from all significant slopes.</p> <p>C6(c) – could identify the need for Natural Hazards Assessment using guidelines established by the MNR</p>	<p>Agreed. New subsection (viii) added requiring Natural Hazard Assessment or Study, and new subsection B3.7.4.6(g) added encouraging Audubon certification.</p> <p>See above comments.</p> <p>Additional discuss required.</p> <p>Noted; reference added to B5.5.3</p> <p>Refer to Section C2.</p> <p>Agreed. See new subsection C1(p).</p> <p>Do not agree.</p> <p>Additional discussion required</p> <p>Additional discussion required</p> <p>Agreement. Policy included.</p>

Tab	Author	Date	Form of Submission	Area or Property of Interest	Summary of Comments	Responses
					D4.2.1 – include wording directing development outside natural hazards and lot lines should not bisect environmental features.	Policies of the OP already direct development to outside of natural hazards. Policy respecting bisecting environmental features added.
66	Rosemary and Roland Gosselin	July 1, 2014	Letter	General	To what extent are environmental matters/environmentally-conscious construction requirements included in the OP? Should consider future energy and other needs.  Concerned with asbestos being introduced into construction as it is being removed.	Policies related to the protection of the environment and promoting sustainability are provided throughout the proposed OP. In particular, refer to Section D8.1 which speaks to the creation of Green Development Standards and Section D8.4 regarding energy conservation and efficiency.  There are Provincial regulations with respect to the use of asbestos in construction/demolition activities.
67	Colin Travis - Windfall	July 8, 2014	Letter	3.7.3 Unit Types  B3.7 & A-3 Density	Add Townhouse to the range of permitted uses  April 2013 was at 10 units per net ha and a 10% minimum open space requirements. June 2014 went to 10 units per net ha and a 40% minimum open space  Intent was to introduce density policies in keeping with the 2014 PPS, reflecting contemporary community building principles that encourage efficient land use patterns, transit friendly neighbourhoods and increase density.	
68	Alpine Ski Club	July 8, 2014	Letter	A-4	Retained the parking lot as Residential Recreational Area and shows as a single detached residential subdivision. Should be designated Recreational Ski.	Agreed and modified.
69	Town of Collingwood	July 9, 2014	E-mail	County Road 19/21 Corridor –	An Institutional designation has been added to the west side of Long Point	Modified as required.

				Proposed Development Areas and Gateways	Road. Will the entry points for gateways become intersection focused commercial nodes.	Only where designated for such use.
				Craigleith Village Community	Banking institution A-20-A through A-20-F does not appear to have been identified on Schedule A-4 of the proposed OP. Intention to include site specific schedules of OPA 20 or will these be incorporated into the proposed Schedule A-4.	
				General Inter-boundary Area issues & Future Secondary Plan Area (sw of Grey Road 19 & Mountain Road intersection)	Does not reference the need/benefit to co-ordinate inter-municipal planning matters such as transportation linkages, natural heritage system, natural hazards and the overall recreational & economic environment.	

70	Mary Milne	June 20, 2014	E-mail	Pt. Lot 29, Conc. 8	Hazard on her property	
----	------------	---------------	--------	---------------------	------------------------	--

71	Plan Wells Associates for Matesa	June 26, 2014	E-mail		Mapping	Modifications made to correct discrepancy.
----	----------------------------------	---------------	--------	--	---------	--------------------------------------------

72	Eleanor Ward	June 8, 2014	E-mail		Development policies and legislation that promote environmental sustainability	Such policies included as appropriate.
----	--------------	--------------	--------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

73	County of Grey	June 16, 2014	Letter	A3.6.2.1	"Scale of new uses" should read "non-farm uses"	Agreed; modified.
				A3.10.2 or B4.6	May wish to consider adding wording	Agreed; modified.

				<p>regarding “comprehensive rehabilitation” and recycling of aggregates as per the direction in the 2014 PPS</p> <p>B.1 Tomahawk property – would recommend that it should be through more generalized wording similar to Section 3.14(2)( c). Leave the door open for specific circumstances where it is demonstrated that there are no suitable alternative locations in other more appropriate land use designations.</p> <p>B3.1(e) &amp; B3.7.3(d) Legislative changes through Bill 140, would TBM consider permitting accessory apartments in accessory structures where certain restrictions or criteria would apply.</p> <p>B4.1, B4.2, B4.3 &amp; B4.4 Not specifically a conformity issue with the CGOP, the Town may wish to consider a rural lands versus rural areas approached as set out in the 2014 PPS.</p> <p>B.4.6.3 &amp; B.4.6.4 Policies with respect to asphalt or concrete batching plants which are not portable in nature.</p> <p>B4.6.4.3(f), B4.6.4.4( c) &amp; B4.6.4.8 Within the provisions regarding progressive rehabilitation, the Town may wish to consider wording with respect to the consideration of maximum disturbed areas as a form of ensuring this.</p> <p>B4.6.4.5(a) Not clear on what this subsection means or how a haul route would be demonstrated to either have or not to have a significant impact on residents or businesses in this regard.</p>	<p>Agreed; modified.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. No change recommended at this time.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

				B4.6.4.7	Reference to “Amendment to the County Plan” can be deleted as an amendment is no longer required for a rehabilitated aggregate operation.	Agreed; modified.
				B5.5.2	Delete reference to CGOP and reference MNR who is the keeper of this information.	
				B5.5.4	Amend first sentence by inserting the word “or” between “significant wildlife habitat area” and “a deer wintering yard.”	Agreed; modified.
				B5.5.5	Amendment reference to PPS 2005 to PPS 2014.	Agreed; modified.
				B5.5.6	Amend last sentence by referencing that the CGOP, Appendix B, also maps water-bodies, rivers and streams.	Noted.
				C9.4	Consider Waiving an EIS as per the criteria under Section 2.8.7(2) of the CGOP.	Noted.
				C.10	Consider reducing the 500 metre buffer where an approved closure plan exists, as per the criteria under Section 5.4.2(2) of the CGOP.	Agreed; Section C10 modified.
				D.1	County staff question whether further servicing details are needed for development being proposed on private or partial services.	Agreed; modified.
				D1.6	Second paragraph references the removal of a holding symbol contingent upon payment of DC’s amongst other items. County staff question how a DC, which is collected at the time of a building permit, would be paid in advance of a holding symbol being removed.	Agreed; modified.

					First paragraph there is a requirement for an OPA where a road classification is changing. County staff suggest that is may be appropriate to exempt an OPA where a road is being down-designated, but still require one where a road is moving up a classification.	Noted.
				D.7	Unfortunately County OPA 110 is still on-going and may not be resolved in time to provide clear direction for the OPR.	Noted.
				D7.1	County questions how the Town will monitor a number of items listed under this section.	Noted.
				D8.8	County questions who would complete a Health Impact Assessment.	Noted.
				E1.2	County staff interprets it would be a 3 year extension to a temporary use by-law for a garden suite – not 10 years as noted in this section.	Noted and modified.
				E11	Number of definitions which may bear re-examining based on PPS 2013 (ie based on some of the new or redefined terms in PPS 2014.	Definitions modified as required.
				Sch. A	Northern boundaries of Heathcote appear to extend further beyond the County's designated settlement area boundaries.	Modified as required.
					In the area of Grey Road 13 & 24 <sup>th</sup> SDR there appears to be a white block which is absent of any land use designations. Should this be rural. County staff are aware this issue already exists in the TBM current OP, however would flag it as a minor conformity issue.	Noted.

					<p>On the SE corner of the Grey Road 2 and 24<sup>th</sup> SDR intersection there is a plan of subdivision which is designated as “Residential Recreational Area” in the OPR, but remains designated as “Special Agriculture” in the CGOP. County staff are aware that this issue already exists in the TBM current OP, however would flag it as a conformity issue.</p>	Noted.
					<p>NE of GR 40 &amp; GR2 intersection, the OPR has designated some “Agricultural” lands which are surrounded by “Special Agricultural” and “Rural” lands. County would not object to these lands being designated as such, the County Plan has them designated as Rural and as such staff would see merit in re-designating these lands to Rural as they generally do not meet the requirements for an Agricultural block. County staff are aware that this issue already exists in the TBM current OP, however would flag it as a conformity issue.</p>	Noted.
					<p>Along the 3<sup>rd</sup> Line, s of GR 19 in the Castle Glen lands, the County has identified a block lands as “Recreational Resort Area” to match the boundaries of the NEC Plan “Escarpment Recreation Area” boundaries. The Town currently shows these lands as Rural County staff are aware that this issue already exists in the TBM current OP, however would flag it as a conformity issue.</p>	
				Schedules	<p>In a number of schedules we noted different Hazard boundaries from what exists in the County plan. Provided the CA support the new Hazard boundaries,</p>	Noted.



				Schedule A-3	<p>County staff see no conformity issues here.</p> <p>In the far western portion of this schedule some lands north and south of GR 40 are shown as “Agricultural” and “Special Agricultural” which are designated as “Recreational Resort Area” and “Escarpment Recreation” in the County plan. County staff are aware that this issue already exists in the TBM current OP, however would flag it as a conformity issue.</p>	
74	Ducks Unlimited	June 19, 2014	E-mail		Reduce phosphorus and other nutrients flowing into lakes & CA areas.	Noted.
75	Paul McGregor	July 9, 2014	E-mail	4.19 Land Use Designation	<p>Is the intent of this plan that Resort Commercial development should include those supporting uses which are necessary for the operation of the primary commercial accommodation use.</p> <p>Questions how this section applies to Mountain Spring Lodge problem with the OP.</p>	
76	DC Slade – Georgian Peaks Ski Club	July 7, 2014	Letter	<p>Georgian Peaks lands</p> <p>A-3</p>	<p>Lands located between Recreation Ski designation and the Hazard lands have been designated Escarpment. This small area should be designated Recreational Ski to reflect the future development potential of these lands.</p> <p>The ski runs and associated lift facilities have been designated Hazard on Schedule A-3. The policies of the Hazard designation (B.5.4.2) generally discourage further ski runs and appear to not permit any buildings or structures.</p>	Agreed. Schedule A-3 modified accordingly.
77	DC Slade – Georgian Woodlands Phase III	July 4, 2014	Letter	Constraint	A portion of the lands have been designated “Woodlands” on the constraint mapping. As a result, these lands would be subject to Section B5.2.1	Constraints Map modified accordingly.

					<p>Development &amp; Site Alteration Criteria of the OP. Section B of this section states “development &amp; site alteration shall be not be permitted within significant woodlands”. These lands are included within a draft plan of subdivision approval. Request that all lots and development blocks be removed from the Woodlands policy.</p> <p>Lands are designated within Exception 50 and specific policies were established for parcel 28a &amp; 28b in the current OP. Special policies and exceptions were granted through the subdivision approval process. Request an exception clause be established for the subject lands similar to the approach of other lands in the Craighleith/Camperdown area.</p>	Exception recognized as required.
78	DC Slade – Cedar Run	July 4, 2014	Letter	<p>Schedule A</p> <p>B3.2.6.1</p>	<p>Special policy B3.2.6.1 has not been outlined within Schedule A. The subject lands are designated Urban Employment Area, however there is not reference to the site specific exception which allows for the horse park use.</p> <p>Adequately reflects the policies of Amendment 10 to the previous OP, however Section (vii) of this exception should be removed as modifications occurred to this policy by the passage of Zoning By-law Amendment 2012-49. This provision should be replaced with the criteria established by this by-law</p>	<p>OP modified to correctly reflect existing exception.</p> <p>Agreed. OP modified.</p>
79	DC Slade - Tabera	July 4, 2014	Letter	Schedule A-4	<p>Is incorrect as it has depicted the southern portion of the development lands as Hazard. This is located between the Residential Recreational &amp; Escarpment designations of the Draft OP.</p> <p>Development boundaries were</p>	Boundaries reviewed. Does reflect OMB approval.

					established by the OMB through MofS between application, TBM, NEC. This decision reflected the accurate location of the prominent escarpment slope and the draft OP does not reflect this decision.	
80	DC Slade – Tyrolean Village Resorts – Beach Lands Property	July 4, 2014	Letter		Tyrolean has provided detailed information in regards to the Hazard lands status of the subject lands. The TBM has modified the designation, however we still have concerns with the extent of the hazard that is indicated to the north & south. Hazard lands have also been established along the shoreline of the lands although it was not been designated on other shorelines areas in the immediate area ie. Brophy's Lane, Blue Mountain Drive, Fraser Crescent areas.	

**INDEX OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED  
TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW  
Blue Mountain Resort Submission  
Revised August 2014**

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
<b>SECTION A</b>			
1	8	Section A 1 starting on page 8, is entitled "The Community Vision and Guiding Principles", "Tourism" is mentioned only once and that in a general context simply indicating a need to balance it with other areas of the community. This represents an oversight that needs correcting. See Section 1.3 (2) and Section 1.3.3 to the existing Official Plan as point of reference.	This Section does speak to the Town as a destination however, it is agreed that additional emphasis on tourism is appropriate. See Section A1 modifications.
2		Section A1.1 acknowledges that the Town has neighborhoods that combine to make it a "four season recreational resort community a desirable place to live". However, there are no "guiding principles" that seek to "investing", "create opportunities for", "protect", "support growth of" the Tourism-Recreation economic sector of the municipality. However, similar terms and principles apply to other aspects of the municipal economy and areas, Appropriate weight needs to be given the Tourism-Recreation sector.	Agreed. See modifications to Sections A1.1.2 and A1.1.9.
3		In section A1.1.2 there is reference to "recreational based/rural lifestyle" -this is a very vague term and is an indication of the apparent dilution or confusion in considering the complex nature of the composition of the TBM.	Disagree. The Town is not confused in its understanding of the complex nature of the Town. This is a component of a Guiding Principle that is further implemented through the policies of the Plan.
4		Note section A1.9 and 14 statements -where are similar supporting statements for the (unrecognized) tourism/recreation sector?	See comments above.
5		In Section A3 Tourism is included with "Economic Development" as a major heading. However, Tourism and Recreation is one of two major sectors of the local economy. This section fails to recognize this reality. Agriculture has its own major section. As does "Community Character' and Rural Character'. This oversight could speak to either the lack of awareness or, how this significant sector is perceived and prioritized by the municipality. Recommend Tourism as separate heading and section.	Covering economic development and in particular Tourism in a single section does not indicate a lack of awareness or prioritization by the Town. Section A3.7.2 identifies a number of strategic objectives related to tourism and recreation. However, modifications made to address concern.
<b>SECTION B</b>			
1	24	Section A4.1.11 on page 24, (regarding "Recreational Ski") is similar to existing policy, but warrants updating given the four season range of	Agreed. "associated with the ski industry" deleted.

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
		activities. The words "in particular" don't recognize the importance and provision of a range of four-season recreational activities -i.e. recreational activities are primary and "service and maintenance" are ancillary or supportive. Recommend re-wording to reflect broader range and year round activities.	
2	26	Section A4.3.2 on page 26 defines Hazard Lands. All of BMR's ski slopes are proposed to be designated as Hazard. This definition needs to be re-worded if ski slopes are to remain designated as "Hazard Lands". However, it is BMR position that ski slopes do not need to be designated Hazard as there are more appropriate land use policy directions and constraints adequately addressing the nature of the slopes and development guidelines affecting them. For example, the existing land use development policy and criteria affecting development on the Escarpment Slope in this area work in terms of policy and implementation. This existing framework is well established and is reasonably efficient.	Agreed. Schedules have been modified to generally reflect the Escarpment designation in the current Official Plan.
3	32	Section B2.2 a) on page 32 provides "Commercial Resort Accommodations" policies. Section B2.2 b) defines CRU complex as, a condo development with "all" units available. Question, if one unit opts out does that nullify whole development? Should delete the word "all" as it does not appropriately reflect what is allowed and what the operating reality is in fact. Also, use of word "all" is not consistent with the opposed ByLaw definition.	Agreed. 'All' deleted from section.
4	33	Large scale commercial use requires re-zoning, however, policy B2.3 on page 33 does not define "large scale". This could have impact on major new commercial proposals and how they fit into the planned commercial structure of the municipality. The current Official Plan seeks to protect the planned function of the Blue Mountain Village. It is unclear how the Draft OP accomplishes this existing objective.	References to 'large scale' deleted from this Section.
5		Policy B2.5 b), second sentence "It is the"." probably should be "It is a "," - proposed wording tells the reader that this STA policy is the only foundation of the entire Draft Official Plan. If "foundation" wording remains, why are other key land use policies not similarly recognized? It is suggested that the wording and use of word "foundation" is out of context if it cannot be evenly and contextually applied to other land use influences.	Section B2.5(b) reflects policies recently approved by the OMB. No change recommended.
6	27	B2.7 page 37 Escarpment Plan Boundary is not identified as such on "Constraint Mapping". Must review the more appropriate use of "Escarpment designation for ski slopes. See point 2, above.	Not required on Constraint Schedule. Schedules have been modified to generally reflect the Escarpment designation in the current Official Plan.

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
7		Constraint Mapping at back of Plan - is it a "Schedule"? If not, what is its purpose? Also, "Hazard" is not shown on constraint mapping.	Refer to the Structure of the Plan Section following the Table of Contents. It states that the Constraints Mapping does not constitute part of the Official Plan, but provides additional information to assist in implementing this Official Plan.
8	75, 275	B2.7 - suggest at least a reference Schedule of NEP land use schedule be included as used as reference to NEP "Rec Area" etc. See page 75 to existing OP, also page 275, S14.1. ideally should be included. This should be reviewed in much more detail, although it is appreciated that any municipal Official Plan document does not necessarily need to replicate the NEP.	NEP boundary shown on all applicable schedules.
9	58	B3.7.4.1 page 58: What is definition of "Blue Mountain Village" as noted in the Table. There is no corresponding land use designation on Schedule "A-3". What is the basis of the maximum density, and does that correspond to Schedule "A-3" and for its component designations? What is basis of the "minimum open space component" and the 10% figure? How does that relate to approved plans and the underlying registered plan, 1065? Why is this table applicable to the Blue Mountains Village, however defined? It is suggested that the former subdivision that resulted in Plan 1065 is essentially built and some existing Official Plan policies can be "updated" to reflect this reality. The planning point is that the operative Official Plan policies can now be analyzed in the context of a mature development plan with appropriate modifications considered to reflect existing built form and land use policy over future plan period. In other words, the Draft OP provide updates to 30 year old policy.	This Section has been corrected to continue to apply the maximum density and minimum open space requirements in the current Official Plan.
10		B3.7.4.5 a) how appropriate is this continued reference to associated ski hill and golf course - seems a holdover from a previous era with unlikely or confusing application going forward.	Do not agree. No change recommended.
<b>SECTION C</b>			
1		Cover page refers to "Office Consolidation" which is misleading as this document is a "Draft Official Plan".	Agreed.
2		The document is basically a new Official Plan as it is a re-write, with significant new policies and a total new structure.	Agreed however, many established and effective policies in the current Official Plan are carrying forward.
3		Generally the proposed new Official Plan places less emphasis on the tourism-recreation sector of the local economy and that sector as a significant "Basis" for Official Plan.	Refer to responses to previous comments.

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
4		Section A3 presents Goals and Strategic Objectives. As a general note, Strategic Objectives are defined in this section as "specific and realistic targets that measure the accomplishment of a goal". This is a standard definition and is important when writing policy. Many of the Strategic Objectives that follow are not specific, are not targeted and are incapable of meaningful measurement.	Noted.
5	57	<p>B3.7 page 57, confusing use of terms "resort" "objectives" and "intent of this Plan .... ", see earlier comment on Goals &amp; Objectives.</p> <p>B3.7 under "objectives" is really the "purpose" of the land use designation. What is missing then is a proper Goal Statement followed by appropriate and measurable "objectives" .</p> <p>Or,</p> <p>"Purpose The Residential Resort/Recreational Area designation identifies those areas within the Town where there are a mix of seasonal and permanent residential uses along, or associated with, recreational and resort development, and where a compatible range of uses shall be encouraged".</p> <p>Existing first bullet does not make sense i.e. is there a "mix" of "recreational growth"?</p> <p>Third bullet is redundant given policies in the Plan.</p>	<p>Section A4 provides descriptions of the land use designations.</p> <p>There is a mix of recreational uses and residential uses (permanent and seasonal). Not change required.</p> <p>Agreed. Third bullet deleted.</p>
6	57	B3.7.2 Location, page 57: is the County OP the "basis" for the location of these designations? If so, should be stated it beginning of the OP.	Agreed. Section A4.1.7 modified accordingly.
7	58	B3.7.3 h) page 58 is worded such that recreational lands and facilities must be provided in "conjunction with the residential component of development". Does this mean if no residential component there is no rec facility? What is the intent of the Plan here?	Agreed. "in conjunction with the residential component of development" deleted from policy.
8	68	B3.7.6.5 page 68 OP now should acknowledge these densities permitted as a result of Monterra Golf Course.	Not required.
9	72	B3.9.3 page 72 - why is "parking" not a permitted use?	Parking would be permitted in accordance with Section B2.8 Accessory Uses of the Plan however, parking noted as a permitted use for

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
			clarification.
10	73	Blue Mountain Village Area B3.10 page 73. There is no specific "Blue Mountain Village Area" defined, per Schedule "A-3" objectives statement is wrong. "Purpose": confusing hierarchy of policy layout.	Agreed. First objective modified to read in part "identify specific policies for the Blue Mountain Village area..."
11	74	B3.1.5 page 74, general - there should be a "purpose" for the land uses - many of the intros jump straight into a range of "permitted" uses. STAs add as permitted use.	Do not agree. Intent was to carry forward current policy structure and polices for the BMV area.
12	58	B3.10.5.1 b) what is basis for this density range and how does it relate to the density ranges established in table on page 58 per previous comment #29? Would this preclude further development?  B3.10.5.1 a) is a throwback - rec facilities were provided through previous approvals - these policies need updating. i.e. Mountainwalk Phase 2 if it goes, should not have to provide rec facilities. Nor should IROC Phase 3.	
13	74	B3.10.6 BMVC page 74, "The intent" is read the "Purpose" and should be stated as such.	Do not agree. No change required.
14		B3.10.6 last sentence - a vestige and needs to be updated.	Do not agree. No change required.
15	76	B3.10.8.1 page 76 - see Schedule A-3, why is berm and 915 park open space "Hazard"? It was conveyed/zoned open space.	Mapping modified as required.
16	79	B3.11 page 79 - Rec Ski - opportunity to broaden purpose and range of uses.	Require more specific information to support this suggestion.
17		B3.11.3 - do we need to add to range of uses to clarify?	Require more specific information to support this suggestion.
18	125, 134	B5.4 Hazard page 125 - applies to Ski Slopes, ponds. Is not necessary and is not per GSCA according to telecon with Andy S should revert back to NEP or such. Ponds as Hazard have complications for development at village "See also C1, page 134.	Agreed. Schedules have been modified to generally reflect the Escarpment designation in the current Official Plan.
19		B5.4.2 b) i) reads as if only existing are permitted  v) NEC prominent slope is not defined or clear in draft OP. Hazard covers more than prominent slope.	New buildings are not permitted in Hazard lands.  Depends on NEC determination.
20	122	B.5.2 - Last sentence below f) re existing agricultural uses "not limit to" Q - Why not similar consideration for existing recreational uses e.g Karst Topo is on Ski Hill But we still get significant woodland, etc. - we have a lot of these on existing - essentially we want same consideration.	This policy is based on PPS relief. Some relief does not apply to recreation uses.



Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
21	122	5.2.1 a) b) Q - Why is municipality included in matters under MNR jurisdiction-why not i.d. main agency overseeing endangered species? Similar wording in b) as found in c)? The principle of recognizing higher jurisdiction is established in c).	No change required. Refer to definition of 'significant' in OP.
22	123	Is the chart taken out of county plan if not, what is basis?	The standards in the chart are based on consideration of the County OP, the Province's Natural Heritage Reference Manual and comments/suggestions from stakeholders and agencies.
23	243	Def. Page 125 B.5.4. 1 f) Q - how is "resource based recreation" defined and how applied - P. 243 see def - seems "limited" due to wording. E.g. such uses "may include" as opposed to "defined to include" - also where did def come from?	Refer to County OP; in particular, permitted uses on lands designated Hazard and definition of Resource Based Recreational Uses.
24	125	5.4.2 b) n) What is definition of "rec facilities" what of BMR facilities are included? - see comments under # 19	Change to buildings and structures.
25	242	Def "rec" how doe ropes course fit in, or lifts? As in "recreation facilities",	Covered under definitions.
26		Schedule A3 proposed base lodge is in Hazard - approved zoning - issues mapping issue	Agreed. Schedules have been modified to generally reflect the Recreational Ski designation in the current Official Plan.
27		"Blue Mountain Village" A-3, includes Grand Central Lodge, where is it exactly?	Review mapping question.
28		Schedule A-3, need update to Gord Canning Drive and the cross hatching is not referenced in legend, Also boundary line is inconsistent and not in legend,	Correction required respecting "Gord Canning Drive". Cross hatching for exceptions should be noted on all schedules.
29		Does it count toward Blue Mountain Village Core commercial square footage if not; needs to be clear	Clarified in S.B3.10.6.
30		Hazard: under current wording we doubt new operations & facilities will be allowed, existing not allowed, see also 19 and 20,	Intent of Hazard designation is to limit new development as these lands are subject to flood susceptibility, erosion susceptibility, etc. Concern will likely be alleviated due to mapping modifications respecting limits of Hazard and Escarpment designations.
31		"Rec Facilities" - needs a broader definition to allow new "future" e.g, water park, See also 19 and 20,	Do not see the need for a broader definition; definition of "recreation" is broad. Recreation Facilities defined.

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
32		Looking at this plan as written, ropes course and ridgerunner would not have been allowed,	Permitted subject to NEC approval. B.5.4.1 permits resource based recreational uses
33		SWM facilities not hazard - ponds are part swm systems per design and approvals of plans, Ponds in other golf course are not identified as Hazard,	Mapping revised.
34	132	B6 e.g, see last para in section as tie in to H concern	Hazard changed to Escarpment
35	134	C1 g) another example of H not suitable or appropriate designation,	Hazard changed to Escarpment
36	135	C2.1 last para - 30m is stated as final- regardless of EIS, mitigation,	Refer to Section C2.2 Implementation.
37		Also - low "zipline" over a stream how would it be treated? or trails, bridge on hiking trail	Resource based recreational uses permitted.
38		C2.1 impact on snow making & SWM management as watercourses identified are part of the system, Also, where does Plan anticipate role of CA?	Reference to snowmaking included in revised OP.
39		C2.2 how to implement in Village? Monterra Golf - how? Example of designation issues in first place	Zoning matter.
40	139	C.6 a) what is real "intent" of policy - we need to do geotech in first place. Question jurisdiction.	Changed to buildings & structures.
41	139	C.6 b) ski development "set back" not appropriate.	Refer to requirement under subsection (c).
42		C6 how defined? Is it 1:3? - still subject to these policies even with H removal off ski slopes, what is basis? Implementation issues.	Revised language.
43	140	C7 Water Taking "commercial sale" - assurance this does not apply to snowmaking, definition?	Refer to County OP. It our interpretation that this would not apply to snowmaking however, we suggest you discuss with the County.
44		If so - f) need "renewal" word added.	See above.
45	147	C12 - compatibility - impact on ski & rec facilities - e.g. snowmaking, also golf courses.	With any development application, compatibility is a consideration.
46		C12.1 - is snowmaking, an "industrial use"? - seems to fit under this - issue for ops	Do not consider snowmaking to be an industrial use in the context of a ski operation.
47	158	Monterra Road noted as a collector existing but it is not "existing" – incorrect designation	Intended to be a collector.
48	173	D.5.3 Community Gateway - BMR roundabout meets criteria and should be noted - it was part of original intent & purpose in location, design, construction	Do not agree.
49	177	D.6.1 - Public Parkland - what about Jozo Weider Park - what is going in – where is LAP on this?	
50	189	D.8.1 a) iv) dark sky - impact on night skiing, - intent - p.25 goal - see Lindsay letter "question". How does this affect the quoted section of sustainable	Would require lighting to be turned off at certain time. Need to recognize ski facilities.

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
		quoted by LA in her letter.	See above.
51	139	D.8.7 Outdoor lighting - policy implication - on night skiing. Recognize exist Rec/Tourism Facility?	
52	199	E.1.5.3 Blue Mountain Village density 20 net ha. How is net ha defined? Wintergreen 8 upa net as indicator.	Definition of 'net hectare' included in OP.
53		A Section - "Blue Mountain Village" is a separate entity - nomenclature problem, very important in terms of: Way finding, Identity, promotion - positioning, A,3 contrary to existing OP land use designation - the land use structure has changed and those changes are questioned.	Mapping reviewed and revised.
54		Some base mapping still show boundary and location of the old snowmaking pond (pre-Village) and, still show 1970's sewer lagoons long since removed and rehabilitated.	Mapping modified as required.

**INDEX OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED  
TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW  
GTDI Submission – (Policy Details section)  
Revised August 2014**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Draft OP Page #</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1		The title to this draft is marked as “consolidation”. In that this appears to be the first opportunity to review this document, the word “consolidation” would appear misplaced.	Agreed. Title page modified.
2		Initial section numbering appears confusing. The Preamble is “Part 1”, the “Preamble” is not numbered and the Policy begins as “Part A”. It may be useful to remove the part numbers prior to the actual policy.	Modifications made to provide more clarity in understanding sections.
3	1	<p>Purpose and Basis #4 – the information contained in this section is relevant to the interpretation and operational characteristics of the Goals, Objectives and the policies of the plan. We would suggest that this should be made a part of the legal context of the Plan to further the ability to understand the basis of the policies, particularly in potential future legal circumstances such as OMB appeals.</p> <p>The reference to “Seasonal Population” appears to be a misnomer being carried forward from the County OP. The Town is a four season recreation destination, with unique operational characteristics that include a non-resident population that occupies dwellings on a part time/holiday basis year round. The policies that deal with development, services and impacts must recognize this unique characteristic and provide policies that enable continuation while implementing suitable new sustainable development directions of intensification and infill.</p>	<p>Agreed. Plan modified accordingly.</p> <p>A discussion of seasonal dwellings and population is appropriate given the County’s growth management work. The GTDI’s other comments are valid however have been considered in the preparation of the draft OP.</p>
4	5	Introduction Part 2 – This document should be “responding to” rather than “considering” changes in Provincial and County policy. We would draw your attention to Section 3 of the Planning Act in this regard.	This reference to Provincial and County policy is now contained in the Introduction Section. The Plan already states that “lower-tier Official Plans must conform to all relevant Provincial Legislation and Plans”. No change required.
5	10	Principle 5 – The direction to maintain compatibility is consistent with the accepted planning principles of the PPS however we feel that the direction of the principle to ensure that the compatibility includes “scale and density” as a conformity control factor is inconsistent with the direction of Section 1.4.3 of the PPS that requires planning authorities to “provide for an appropriate range of housing types and densities” which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities. It is our opinion that the use of scale and density in this circumstance is intended to limit new development to more low density single family occupancies.	Do not agree. The use of ‘scale and density’ is not used to limit new development to low-density development. Ensuring compatibility with scale and density does not prevent an appropriate range of housing types and densities. Also, refer to the definition of ‘compatible’ in the draft OP: “Means the development or redevelopment of uses which may not necessarily be the same as or similar to the existing development, but can coexist with the surrounding area without negative impact”.
6	9-11	Guiding Principles – The principles as provided do not appear to contain directions to	Policies supporting cost-effective development

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
		promote efficiency and cost effectiveness in response to Section 1.1.1 e) of the PPS.	standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs are provided throughout the Plan. For example, refer to Strategic Objectives - Sustainable Development (A3.1.2) and Growth & Settlement (A.3.3.2).
7	11	Community Structure – What is the purpose of this section? It would appear that this section could be removed with no apparent negative impact to the document.	The Community Structure Plan conceptually illustrates the major structural elements of the Town including settlement areas, resort areas and key corridors and connections, and is intended to assist the Town in making land use and infrastructure decisions.
8	14	Sustainable Development – As indicated above, municipal sustainability involves utilizing a variety of tools including promotion of cost effective development standards and efforts to minimize service costs. These matters do not appear to be included in this section.	See response to Item 6 above.
9	16	Community Character – Since this section is aimed at the Urban Area, we would suggest that the title reflect this focus.	Agreed. Title renamed to “Urban Community Character”.
10	16	Sec. A3.4.2 3 – Will the Town be providing further policy context to determine the location and context of “well established residential neighbourhoods” and will there be additional policy provided to determine how infill and intensification may be permitted?	Further discussion required. Could consider zoning provisions to implement.
11	17	Sec A3.5.2.6 – What tools does the Town have to control development on the “crests of hills” and the other locations identified in this policy? What criteria will be applied to ensure consistency in the application of the criteria?	Refer to proposed Escarpment designation policies.
12	18	Sec A3.6.2 – Although the objectives enable control of lot creation on Specialty Crop Land, there would appear to be a void in the recognition of the physical qualities that enable the designation of these lands in compliance with the PPS. We would recommend some statement that the lands are specially protected due to their unique characteristics and economic value to the region.	Agreed. See addition of new Section A3.6.2.5 as follows: “Maintain and protect specialty agricultural lands given the importance of these lands to the region and contribution to the economy of the Town.”
13	18-19	Economic Development – We note that many of the objectives do not appear to have a basis of accomplishment within the planning context provided by the Planning Act or other related legislative tools. Although Council may support these directions, we would encourage the authors to indicate how each direction provided will be accomplished within the municipal jurisdiction. In part, we would suggest that a first step might be simplification of land use controls to allow the industry to better respond to changing economic circumstances and enable a more positive business climate.	It is not intended that all Economic Development and Tourism Strategic Objectives would be achieved through Planning Act mechanisms.
14	20	Infrastructure – The goal must include the ability of the infrastructure to be cost effective.	Reference to cost-effectiveness add to Strategic Objective A3.8.2.4.
15	21	Housing – The word “adequate” in this goal is less than enthusiastic. We would request that the word be amended to “appropriate” to better reflect the direction of the	Agreed. “Adequate” replaced with “appropriate” in both instances.

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
		PPS. The same word change would be appropriate in Objective 1. Based on the policies that are contained in the Residential designations of this plan, it would appear that these objectives are not being implemented.	
16	29	<p>Uses in all Designations – There are a number of issues within this section. Federal and Provincial land uses are not subject to local control except where those agencies accept that control. In this context, we would ask if the open provisions for public uses permit municipal uses and structures that may have impacts on their surroundings, without the benefit of public process including the right to appeal? Accessory apartments, garden suites and home occupations are residential uses. Placement in this section appears out of place and would be more appropriate within the residential areas designations or as a separate section providing policy guidance for accessory uses.</p> <p>Accessory Apartments – any policy on accessory apartments must reflect the direction provided by the “Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act”, which permits accessory apartments in single, semi-detached and row houses. It is also noted that minimum floor areas for any dwelling unit is now regulated by the Ontario Building Code.</p> <p>Garden Suites – are regulated under section 39.1 of the Planning Act. The policies and zoning should reflect the contents of the Act.</p>	<p>Section B1 policies related to accessory apartments, accessory uses, garden suites and home occupation uses moved to Section B2.</p> <p>Noted however, no change required. Floor area minimums are permitted in the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>No change required.</p>
17	32	Commercial Resort Units – it is recognized that this section has been vetted through the OMB. We have no comment at this time.	No change required.
18	33	Large Commercial Uses – It may be appropriate to indicate that the studies required include the two indicated in addition any others that are standard requirements to avoid any implementation issues. Having provided this position, we must question the need for a market study in the passing of a zoning amendment if the lands are already designated for commercial purposes or is being enlarged beyond 2000sq m. This is a matter of economic development and this type of requirement is viewed as a form of an excessive approval requirement.	Agreed; text modified.
19	36	Drive Through – We recognize that there may be issues with drive through uses in locations which limit access or create noise and other impacts on neighbouring residential uses. The impacts mentioned should not occur if sufficient land area and either distance or sound level buffering is provided. As such, it is our opinion that a drive through should continue to be a use permitted in those commercial land use designations and lots that have sufficient area to accommodate them based on maintaining traffic safety, avoiding negative noise impacts and maintaining proper design to accommodate suitable drainage and landscape controls.	Comments from GTDI and industry considered. Modifications to Section B2.6 incorporated.
20	38	Community Living Area – B3.1.3 Permitted Uses - Intended as a primary residential area, it may be appropriate, when considering the simplification of the plan to reduce this section to the following;	Do not agree. Format will be maintained. Specific suggestions regarding permitted uses, in any land use designation, are welcome.

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
		<p>“The uses in this designation shall include all forms of lower profile residential uses that maintain the small town character of the area. This will include all forms of residential uses, parks, playgrounds, accessory uses, senior facilities, special needs housing, and daycare facilities. Facilities and services intrinsic to the primary residential function such as churches, daycare, parks, neighbourhood and community centres are also permitted based on pre-existence or zoning amendment process.” We would welcome similar changes to other permitted use sections.</p>	
21	38	<p>Sec B3.1.4 – The table continues the densities originally presented in the old Thornbury Secondary plan of 1982. The single detached density and height would result in development at a design density that maintains current design densities without an option for intensification or infill. With height limits set at two stories, the policies severely limit the potential infill and entirely void the potential for intensification. The design elements contained in supporting sections impose such restrictive design requirements as to void any lot creation other than those that promote a lot density of not more than the 15 units per hectare noted in the table. These limitations are considered contrary to the directions of the PPS and the objectives of this plan as contained in Section A3.3.2. The limits do not enable a sustainable and efficient development pattern.</p> <p>We would encourage the Municipality to its goals and objectives and to amend the standards to better reflect the direction provided by the PPS, County Plan and their own goals and objectives.</p> <p>We note that the height limits do not reflect the current or historical pattern of development in the area, nor does the density reflect the historical trend. The height and density also negatively impacts on the ability of the municipality to enable affordable housing or to access Federal or provincial funding for affordable housing projects due to the lack of cost effectiveness of the low density in meeting program goals.</p>	<p>Additional discussion required. Height is a sensitive community issue.</p>
22	39	<p>Sec B3.1.5 – We agree with the direction of this section however, find that the following sections intended to provide implementation policy along with the height limits as established have the effect of negating any of the positive direction. For example, the wording of Section B3.1.5.1 g) imposes significant limitations on infill by indicating that new frontages should “provided for, to the greatest extent possible, appropriate separation between new and existing dwellings”. There are many alternatives to a distance separation that can achieve compatibility.</p>	<p>Policies are flexible; refer to ‘generally no less’. Additional discussion required.</p>
23	40	<p>Sec B3.1.5.2 c) – Duplex, Townhouse etc. – The 45 degree angle in this case appears to impose a shadow effect policy but imposes the effect from a lot line where there is no shadow rather than from a structure. First, it is difficult to imagine a shadow impact based on the height limitations that have been imposed. Further, if shadow impacts are to be imposed, it should be done through a more general policy</p>	<p>Could be implemented through Zoning By-law.</p>

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
		<p>and implemented by angles and distances in the implementing zoning by-law rather than the Official Plan.</p> <p>It is quite onerous to impose an official plan amendment on the reduction of shadow impact if the reduction is appropriate.</p>	
24	43	<p>Sec B3.1.8 – The effect of this policy section would effectively designate the entirety of the area between the Thornbury and Clarksburg downtowns into a commercial use strip. We must question the advisability of this policy, particularly in view of having no information to indicate the impacts, negative or positive of such a drastic land use potential.</p>	<p>Do not agree with suggestion that the effect of this policy is to create “a commercial use strip”. Policy clearly speaks to permitting small-scale businesses in existing single detached dwellings while maintaining the primary residential character of the area. No change required.</p>
25	44	<p>Urban Employment Area – The PPS defines an employment area as an area designated in an official plan for business and economic activities including but not limited to manufacturing, warehousing, offices and associated retail and ancillary facilities. The policies expand on the definition by indicating that municipal policies shall promote economic development by supporting a wide range of economic activity and ancillary uses. Our review of the Official Plan policies would indicate that the Objectives reflect the PPS directions however there is a limitation imposed on commercial uses clearly limiting them to accessory status. This would appear to narrow the flexibility provided by the PPS to use the employment areas to the best advantage available by expanding the retail functions to associated and ancillary rather than accessory.</p>	<p>Office uses added as a permitted use in the Urban Employment Area. Ancillary uses also added as a permitted use subject to certain criteria. Definition of Ancillary Use added to Glossary Section.</p>
26	47	<p>Downtown Area Permitted Uses – The list is finite. Are there other uses that are similar that may be considered for this area. We would recommend simplification of the uses permitted system throughout the document to one that is more descriptive rather than the current listing system. This will allow for greater interpretive flexibility and reduce permission complications.</p>	<p>A long list and wide variety of uses are permitted. Specific suggestions regarding permitted uses, in any land use designation, are welcome.</p>
27	48	<p>Downtown Area - Vision B3.3.4 – The absolute limitation of height in this policy would appear to be a contradiction of the need for economic development in the downtown areas. Further, imposing a significant design limitation that limits the ability to promote cost effective development and sustainable use of existing infrastructure. We would suggest a more design impact form of limitation based on shadowing, water pressure service capability and fire control principles be utilized while acknowledging that this does not mean unlimited height. There are many three and three and a half storey structures in Thornbury. Increases of one storey above an existing two or three storey building can be accomplished with some design sensitivity. Similarly, where a building will be isolated from others and where other design elements such as landscaping are suitably introduced heights at the scale of the apartment structures at the harbour or on the east side of the river can be blended with surroundings. Should a 3 storey limitation be maintained by the policy, then provide for exception based on provision of specific design elements.</p>	<p>Do not agree; the policies encourage economic development through an intensive building form, while maintaining an appropriate building scale for the Downtown Area.</p>



Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
28	52	Commercial Light Industrial Corridor – This is a new designation of a former Condominium hotel proposal. The hotel proposal had its basis in the original context of a residential use, considerably different in impacts to the now proposed Industrial use base which may have impacts on the resort residential communities to the north. The imposition of this designation appears to be in the same context as the creation of a commercial use corridor along Bruce Street. This is a land use change that requires justification and supported/vetted through the public process.	This designation replaces the Arthur/King Street Corridor component of the Thornbury Commercial designation in the current OP.
29	56	Institutional Uses Dev Policies – B3.6.4.1 - The section indicates that development of new institutional uses, except those in the Community Living Area, will require both OPA and ZBA process. We draw your attention to our comment 16 which questions the exemption in the CLA. We must also question the validity of imposing SPA on those projects which will be owned by the municipality or other governmental agencies. There is, in our opinion, some question whether the municipality is in a position to impose an agreement or enforcement on itself, the County or other government levels and agencies.	Institutional uses are not limited to publicly owned lands.
30	57	Residential Resort/Recreational Area - We can appreciate the origin of the density and open space area provisions contained in Section B3.7.4.1, however, as this municipality matures and must sustainably meet the cost of development and future maintenance of that development, we must question if it continues to be affordable to forgo the potential increased unit yields and the more efficient use of the open landscape strictly to achieve an open space character. Is it possible to provide an open space character in a development format that provides a more efficient use of the land base, more efficient use of services and a more financially sustainable use of the entire area. It would appear that maintaining the open space concepts originally promoted in the 1974 Craiglieth Camperdown Secondary Plan is becoming an expense that is not sustainable. As part of this issue, we would also note the basis of the open space requirement under the Planning Act, RSO 1990.	Changes made to Residential Recreational Area designation to increase permit densities.
31	58	Sec B3.7.4.2 Lot Creation in Subdivisions – This appears to be a nimby approach to policy development to avoid infill and intensification in this designation. The concept of severance activity should remain as a potential in all areas based on sound planning concepts including the impacts on adjacent development. There are many plans of subdivision in this area that have the potential to yield additional infill lots.	Section B3.7.4.2 modified to rely upon the Infill Development policies of the Community Living Area designation (Section B3.1.5.1) and provided the density of the plan of subdivision will not increase beyond the maximum density requirements of Sections B3.7.4.1 and E1.5.3.
32	91	Future Secondary Plan Areas – We agree that more detailed planning is required in each of the areas identified; however, we cannot agree that a secondary plan process at the cost of the municipal taxpayer is the only available process to arrive at a suitable plan for development. Development applications can be accommodated for these areas based on general municipal requirements for services, parkland and other standard municipal requirements. The policies must place the onus on the private developer to amalgamate sufficient lands to make the proposal viable and to enable front ending of services if required.	Do not agree.

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
		Detailed design issues can be dealt with at detailed design and must meet the municipal design standards.	
33	93	B3.14 Special Policy Areas – Two areas have been identified but no reason for the identification is given to guide future policy or service direction.	Section B3.14.4 provides direction requiring community planning exercises for these lands.
34	101	Special Agriculture – Direction provided by the PPS and County Plan indicate that these lands have special qualities that include the quality of soils and the expertise of the grower. Locally, the specific growing conditions afforded by a micro climate and topography are also critical to the designation. The identification should reference these qualities and provide a policy framework that will protect these essential features including the placement of any non-crop uses in locations that will not impact the crop potential.	No change required.
35	141	Watershed Plans – Section 51 of the Act currently requires, as a condition of application, that any subdivision proposal include a drainage plan that takes into account all areas external to the proposal that may flow to or through a proposal. The applicant is responsible for this study. The policies contained in Section C8 is a significant upgrade to and much more expensive than the studies required by Section 51 of the Planning Act. We would request clarification with respect to the agencies/applicant responsibilities in completing a watershed or sub-watershed plan, noting that the responsibility and expense should be known at the time of pre-consultation. It would be a substantial aid if the Town could indicate the areas in which they are contemplating such studies.	This section is intended to provide direction with respect to the preparation of watershed and subwatershed plans. Section C8.5 does not require the preparation of such plans with development applications but requires conformity with any such plans that may exist.
36	153	Sec D1.4.1 Staging Priority – We are continuing to analyse the implications of this section and will provide comments when finalized.	No change required.
37	157	Bullet point 2 – We must indicate that the Planning Act does not provide widths or other criteria for highways or other roads.  Our review did not find any guidance with respect to road widening as a part of development approval. It is a normal practice, based on various OMB and court actions, to indicate the specific roads and widening required over time that may be subject to a development approval.	Noted.
38	159	Private Roads/Condo Roads – Specific design requirements should be included in the Town Engineering Standards to ensure that road widths and construction values suitably provide for emergency vehicle access.	Noted.
39	174	Sec D5.4 Views and Vistas – This is an admirable policy direction, however, does the Town have a suitable guideline or study to enable equitable application of the concept.	The policy states that such review will take place as part of major planning studies or during the review of development applications. Such review could be part of a required supporting study as set out in Section E.10(d) including View and Vista Renderings and a Visual Impact Assessment.

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
40	174-5	Sec D 5.5 Rural Character – Again, this is admirable, however what tools does the Town have to ensure equitable and realistic implementation of the concepts.	Tools are limited with respect to agricultural uses however, where an official plan amendment, zoning by-law amendment and/or site plan application is required, these policies will be considered.
41	175	Sec D5.7 Safety – The policies contained would more appropriately be contained in your subdivision and development design guidelines.	Do not agree; no change required.
42	177-8	Sec D6 Parkland – The overall policy would appear to provide suitable guidance to the acquisition of land for park purposes. However the policies do not appear to contain the legal limits of acquisition as provided by the Planning Act. It would be appropriate to include the Planning Act criteria.	A portion of Section D6.2.5 has been replaced with modified policies to clarify the Planning Act legal requirements.
43	189	Sec D8.1 Green Development Standards – Except for those standards that may be contained in the Town Engineering Standards, we would request the method of implementation and enforcement for these standards. These comments also apply to the policies on energy efficiency.	This policy requires the preparation of Green Development Standards likely to be implemented through the preparation of secondary plans and comprehensive studies, and the review of development applications.
44	193	Sec D8.8 Health Impact Assessment – Although this may not be mandatory, it must be noted that each study requested by the Town increases the costs of development and the final price of the resultant housing. We must suggest that the Town review its study requirements and evaluate the necessity of each along with any financial impacts to the final product along with any alternative methods to enable the direction being imposed in a more sustainable manner.	Section D8.8 states that the Town may require a Health Impact Assessment and is intended to allow for flexibility in determining if the Assessment is required/necessary.
45	199	Sec E1.5.3 Density Increases – This would appear to be a form of bonusing that would normally be accomplished under Section 37 of the Act. We note that although there is an increase in density of 2x there is no reduction in the % of open space area. As we indicated above, it is our opinion that the whole concept of promoting an open space concept requires review, based on the changing circumstances associated with rising municipal costs, rising housing costs and directions of Provincial Policy to address these circumstances through the more efficient and sustainable use of lands and services. The Provincial Concepts have emerged as a result of the Smart Growth movement. The open space concepts that are being continued by the draft plan could be considered the opposite of a smart growth concept.	The policies in the current OP were established to maintain the open space character of the community. Based on discussions with the community, there is a desire to continue to maintain this open space character while allowing for appropriate increases in density on net developable land. No change required.
46	203	Sec E3 Secondary Plans – We would draw your attention to our previous comments regarding the need for secondary plans and associated costs. We would advocate for a system that would allow the applicant to initiate the planning process in compliance with directions contained in the policies of the Official Plan. This can also be made applicable to Block Plans and Comprehensive Plan processes.	Do not agree.
47	218	Sec E10 Complete Applications – This section should be clarified in a manner that will make it consistent with the directions of the Planning Act.	These policies reflect Official Plan Amendment No. 16 approved in 2009.

Item	Draft OP Page #	Comment	Response
48	222	Sec E11 Glossary – We must question the advisability of a definitions section in this document. Although some terms may require clarification, this list of terms is more in keeping with a zoning bylaw. Perhaps a note that this section is not part of the Official Plan and is provided only for usage purposes.	Do not agree.

DRAFT