



June 22, 2010

Corrina Giles, Clerk  
 Town of The Blue Mountains  
 P.O. Box 310  
 26 Bridge Street East  
 Thornbury, Ontario  
 N0H 2P0

cgiles@thebluemountains.ca

Dear Ms. Giles:

**Re: Comments on Staff Report and Draft OPA and ZBA  
 Terrasan Development Corporation Proposal (Silver Creek)  
 Town of The Blue Mountains  
 Our File: BEC 10119**

---

As you are aware, we act as planners for Blue Mountain Drive Ratepayers Association. Our clients each own lands on Blue Mountain Drive. We were in attendance at the public meeting dated November 22, 2008 and February 22, 2010 and have now had a chance to review the staff report and draft Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.

Based on our review of the Staff Report, we would offer the following comments and request that Council consider these prior to rendering a decision on the applications.

There remain two key concerns with the Blue Mountain Drive landowners. These two concerns are as follows:

1. **RIGHT-OF WAY:** We continue to seek to have the developer rescind Plan 529 right-of-way access for the proposed development as a whole based on the fact that the development is far too dense to expect that a narrow right-of-way can realistically accommodate hundreds of residents. The existing right-of-way access and use is incompatible with such dense development and must be protected. This will require significant planning with respect to waterfront usage at and buffers from the subject development as well as future monitoring of use.
2. **WATERFRONT PARK:** The proposed waterfront park was to provide for passive uses "views and vistas" but has now been elevated to a "regional park". More guidance is required to ensure only passive uses are permitted. Water access should be expressly prohibited *on the west side of the proposed regional park and trail/pathways should be expressly designated to the eastern portion of the development. Any proposed boardwalk should be looped back to the easterly point on the property.*

There is a general concern by our clients that the staff report and draft Amendments will leave important details to the site plan approval and development agreement stages, where there is no public input and where the details of the public process can be elapsd with the level of detail that is inherent of a large site plan submission.

Further, the staff report has seemingly taken a different direction in terms of the generalities relating to the open space area, calling the area a semi-regional park and no

longer speaking to passive uses and the important of views and vistas. This is seemingly absent from this latest staff report and the ratepayers within Plan 529 find this concerning.

We continue to opine that these details can be provided for in part, through specific policies within the Official Plan Amendment and within specific provisions within the Zoning By-law Amendment as follows,

1. Identification of a Limitation on the number of access points to two (2) within the eastern area of the waterfront.
2. Provision that the boardwalk must loop to these two points and have no access from the westerly portion of the lands
3. Definition of `waterfront park` .
4. Definition of `passive use` .
5. Definition of views and vistas.

We request that Council consider the above concerns prior to a decision being rendered on the draft documents before them.

We trust the above is satisfactory.

THE JONES CONSULTING GROUP LTD.



Brandi L. Clement, MURP, AICP, MCIP, RPP  
Partner  
The Jones Consulting Group Ltd.