

**STAFF REPORT:** Council



**REPORT TO:** Mayor and Members of Council  
**MEETING DATE:** February 09, 2009  
**REPORT NO.:** PL.09.12  
**SUBJECT:** County of Grey – Official Plan  
 Five Year Review Update  
**PREPARED BY:** Peter Tollefsen, Director of  
 Planning and Cindy Welsh,  
 Senior Policy Planner

## **A. Recommendations**

THAT Council does receive Planning Staff Report #PL.09.12, “County of Grey – Official Plan Five Year Review Update” for information and review purposes.

## **B. Background**

The County of Grey is in the final process of conducting their Official Plan Five Year Review as per the *Planning Act*. The proposed new Official Plan was circulated to Council in August 2008, with the document being discussed at the August 18, 2008, Planning Council meeting. The Town’s comments were forwarded to the County Planning Department for review after that meeting.

On October 27, 2008, the Town was provided with the changes to the County Official Plan regarding the comments received. The highlights provided a comparison of the Town’s August suggestions and the new edition of the County Plan.

Staff reported to Council on November 24, 2008 the changes, agreeing with most and indicating some concern with others. Council forwarded the report onto the County of Grey as part of the Town’s response to the Official Plan Five Year Review.

The County held a Public Open House and the Statutory Public Meeting on November 25, 2008 which Town staff attended and provided both written and verbal comments.

County staff have forwarded to the area municipalities proposed changes to the Grey County Official Plan as a result of the input from the open house and statutory public meeting.

Attached is a Summary of Municipal Comments – January 2009. You will note the comments from the Town of The Blue Mountains on pages 2 to 4. The chart shows the County staff response opposite the comment with the response from the Planning and Development Committee from the January 15, 2009 meeting. Staff will be reviewing this with Council at the February 09, 2009 meeting.

Also attached is a Summary of Agency Comments – January 2009. The chart shows the County staff response opposite the comment from the various agencies or

ministries, with the response from the Planning and Development Committee from the January 15, 2009 meeting. Staff will be reviewing this with Council at the February 9<sup>th</sup> meeting as well, and in particular, the comments from the Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Rural Affairs on pages 20, 22 and 25.

It should also be noted that Section 2.6.7 on pages 26 and 27 represent comments from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing on the Recreation Resort Area policies pertaining to the Town of The Blue Mountains.

Also attached is the proposed revisions to the new Section 1.8 to the County Official Plan – Housing Policy. Staff will review this with Council at the February 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

County staff will be preparing a document compare version of the Official Plan and going to the February 17, 2009 Planning and Development Committee, and have a recommendation going forward with the draft Official Plan to the March session of Grey County Council.

### **C. The Blue Mountains' Strategic Plan**

1. Managing growth to ensure the ongoing health and prosperity of the community.

### **D. Environmental Impacts**

There are some proposed new policies in the County Official Plan requiring more impact studies for development which will assist in improvements to the environment.

### **E. Budget Impact**

Amendments will be required to the Town Official Plan when the County Official Plan is improved to bring our Plan into conformity. Staff time to review and prepare the amendments.

### **F. Attachments**

1. Summary of Municipal Comments – January 2009
2. Summary of Agency Comments – January 2009
3. 1.8 Housing Policy

Submitted by:

---

Peter Tollefsen, Director of Planning  
Town of The Blue Mountains  
26 Bridge Street E. - Box 310  
Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0  
Tel: (519) 599-3131, ext. 247  
Toll Free: 1-888-258-6867  
Fax: (519) 599-3018  
E-mail: [ptollefsen@thebluemountains.ca](mailto:ptollefsen@thebluemountains.ca)

---

Cindy Welsh, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Policy Planner  
26 Bridge Street E. - Box 310  
Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0  
Tel: (519) 599-3131, ext. 262  
Toll Free: 1-888-258-6867  
Fax: (519) 599-3018  
E-mail: [cwelsh@thebluemountains.ca](mailto:cwelsh@thebluemountains.ca)

**County of Grey Official Plan  
5-year Review  
SUMMARY OF MUNICIPAL COMMENTS – January 2009**

**Comments from the November 25, 2008 Public Meeting**

**There are a number of instances where comments raised are similar to comments received on previous drafts. Please refer to the previous comment summary (August 2008) to determine staff position.**

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>Comment or Concern</b>	<b>County Staff Response (for consideration by P &amp; CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree</b>	<b>P &amp; CD Response (January 15, 2009)</b>
Southgate	<p><b>Aggregate Resource Area</b> - Recommend removing the Aggregate Resource Area on Schedule B where a settlement area exists.</p> <p>Southgate prefers the opportunity to require a local Official Plan Amendment rather than a County Official Plan Amendment</p> <p><b>Settlement Areas</b> - Concerned that Section 2.7.4(6) would prevent lot creation in Settlement Areas where an Aggregate Resource Area has been identified on Schedule B.</p> <p><b>Section 1.8</b> - Generally supportive of the inclusion of a Housing Policy but cautions against requiring a specific percentage of development to be affordable housing. The County should consider a target rather than a requirement.</p>	<p>A - Mapping will be revised by removing the Aggregate Resource Areas on Schedule B from the proposed settlement area boundaries identified on Schedule A</p> <p>NA - The current direction from Planning Committee is to not require a County OPA or a Local OPA for any new or expanding sand or gravel operations being proposed within the Aggregate Resource Area on Schedule B. Local municipal councils will be able to refuse/approve a proposed aggregate operation through the implementing zoning by-law amendment, as well as being actively involved in the Aggregate Resource Act site plan process.</p> <p>A - Mapping will be revised by removing the Aggregate Resource Areas on Schedule B from the proposed settlement area boundaries identified on Schedule A</p> <p>A – County staff will discuss this further with the Province. The policy continues to be reviewed.</p>	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Southgate (con't)	<p><b>Settlement Areas</b> - Concerned about the 5 lot limit applied to development on individual private services within settlement areas. Recommended that the Province confirm this interpretation in writing.</p> <p><b>Settlement Area Boundaries</b> - Concerned about the proposed boundary of Swinton Park. The current boundary is essentially a square and not a 'blob' like the other communities and they are not sure why it needs to be amended.</p> <p><b>Settlement Area Boundaries</b> – The boundary of Swinton Park as shown in the most updated maps has been modified from what the Township had understood the boundaries to be, would like the boundary to reflect what it previously was in the existing Official Plan.</p>	<p>NA – County staff have had numerous conversations with Provincial staff and the proposed policy reflects the Provincial interpretation of Section 1.6.4.4 of the PPS. The County has received an email correspondence from the Province before in the past regarding this interpretation. Staff have also researched how other counties/regions interpret this policy, and the majority of the counties and regions have relied on the Province's interpretation of this policy.</p> <p>NA – All Tertiary Settlement Area boundaries were revised using the parcel data. The intent of the Tertiary Settlement Area is to allow for limited lot creation (i.e. infilling between existing lots, etc.). County Staff supports focusing growth in Primary Settlement Areas as well as Secondary Settlement Areas and therefore development potential in Tertiary Settlement Areas can exist but should be limited.</p> <p>NA/A – The Boundary has been altered from the 'modified' boundary presented, but also, did not retain the original boundary. The northern boundary was reduced. It was approved on January 15, 2009 by PDC.</p>	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)
Town of The Blue Mountains	<b>Special Policy Area Section 2.8.5</b> – TOTBM has concerns with the continued identification of karst topography in the fully serviced area along the base of Blue Mountain and would recommend that it be deleted or updated.	A – The County may continue to show these areas in the mapping but there may be a special policy included which exempts fully serviced areas, such as those referenced, from the requirements.	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Town of The Blue Mountains (con't)	<p><b>Housing Policy</b> - Town is in support of the Housing Policy (Section 1.8) however it is recommended that a planning justification study be completed by the County to properly identify the percentage of affordable housing required for the County and local municipalities.</p> <p><b>Settlement Area Boundaries</b> - The Town's Agricultural Advisory Committee is concerned about the proposed removal of the Hamlets of Banks, Red Wing, Gibraltar and Slabtown.</p> <p><b>Aggregate Operations</b> - Town recommends that an amendment to establish an aggregate operation or to expand an existing operation should still require a Local Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p><b>Renewable Energy</b> - Town is still seeking clarification on a number of items being proposed within the renewable energy policies</p> <p><b>Section 5.3.3 (Water Taking)</b> - Town is requesting that a Local Official Plan Amendment, if required by the Local Official Plan, and a zoning by-law amendment be required for a commercial water taking operation and this should be stated in the County Official Plan.</p>	<p>A – County staff will discuss this further with the Province. The policy continues to be reviewed.</p> <p>NA – Staff continue to support the removal of some of the current Hamlets as some of the Hamlets do not meet the criteria of the proposed settlement area categories (Primary, Secondary or Tertiary).</p> <p>NA - The current direction from Planning Committee is to not require a County OPA or a Local OPA for any new or expanding sand or gravel operations being proposed within the Aggregate Resource Area on Schedule B. Local municipal councils will be able to refuse/approve a proposed aggregate operation through the implementing zoning by-law amendment, as well as being actively involved in the Aggregate Resource Act site plan process.</p> <p>A – Staff have contacted Town Staff to determine which items still require clarification beyond the responses provided to the Town's previous comments in the Municipal Response Document. Yet to have a response.</p> <p>A – Already done in October Version (See Section 5.3.3(1))</p>	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Town of The Blue Mountains (con't)	<p><b>Mineral Aggregate Operations and Site Plan Control</b> - Town Staff do not agree with the exemption of Mineral Aggregate Operations from Site Plan Control</p> <p><b>Recreation Resort Area</b> - Town staff identified two small mapping discrepancies between the proposed Recreation Resort Area designation identified on Schedule A and the Recreational Resort Area designation proposed by the Town (areas near Lora Bay).</p>	<p>NA – Section 41 outlines when Site Plan Control can be used. County staff are of the opinion that aggregate operations can not be regulated through Site Plan Control. The Province has also indicated concerns with municipalities using Site Plan Control to regulate aggregate operations.</p> <p>A – Staff did not initially include these areas because these are new areas that are currently not identified in the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan and therefore could be considered as an expansion to a Settlement Area. Staff recently presented the proposed mapping from the Town and Planning Committee supports adding these two small areas. The maps will be revised prior to adoption of the Plan.</p>	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)
Hanover	<b>Growth Management</b> - the commercial and employment land analysis in the Growth Management Strategy was not based on factual numbers and therefore does not represent actual commercial and employment land supply within the Town of Hanover	NA – the analysis conducted as part of the Growth Management Strategy did look at the current designated commercial and employment lands based on the Town of Hanover Official Plan and the Town of Hanover Zoning By-law. Based on the estimates calculated as part of the Growth Management Study, it was determined that a sufficient supply of commercial lands and employment lands exist in the Town of Hanover. This was further supported by the Town of Hanover's Commercial Needs Study.	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Hanover (con't)	<p><b>Growth Management</b> - due to miscalculation in the Growth Management Strategy, additional lands are required for the future growth of the Town of Hanover; and,</p>	<p>NA – County staff are of the understanding that the miscalculation was actually an ‘error’ that was made in designating some lands commercial in the Town of Hanover Official Plan and Zoning By-law. The Growth Management Study determined whether or not there was sufficient commercial land supply based on the current Town of Hanover Official Plan and Zoning By-law. If these lands were designated/zoned in error then the error needs to be corrected in the Town of Hanover OP/Zoning in order to eliminate these lands from the actual commercial land supply.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>



MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Hanover (con't)	<p><b>Growth Management</b> - as recommended in the Growth Management Strategy, that additional lands for growth in the Town of Hanover are required and that the Urban Fringe designation be maintained to protect these lands for future growth</p>	<p>NA – County staff recommend that the Urban Fringe designation be removed because it is staff’s opinion that these lands do not have as much status as previously had due to the requirement of the 2005 PPS for a comprehensive review. For an Urban area to expand, a comprehensive review must be completed whereby all lands surrounding the urban area must be investigated to determine whether or not it is the most suitable area to grow. The current urban fringe designation did not go through a comprehensive review exercise and therefore this should be done at the time of the proposed expansion to a settlement area. It should also be noted that the proposal is to protect lands within 500 metres of a Primary Settlement Area in order to prevent development that could hinder the future expansion of the settlement area. Also, the proposed urban fringe shown on the attached map to the letter does not reflect the current Urban Fringe designation. The current Urban Fringe designation exists north and south of the Town of Hanover. The proposed Urban Fringe designation has been moved to the southeast corner of the Town of Hanover. Should Committee decide to keep the Urban Fringe designation, justification should be provided by the Town for the proposed Urban Fringe designation. The correspondence provided by the Town’s Planning consultant indicates that the reasoning for the south Urban Fringe designation is that the potential future major arterial road will divert traffic from the downtown area and also create opportunities for new employment lands. It is Staff’s opinion that prior to the Urban Fringe lands being considered for growth, a comprehensive review exercise would be necessary and therefore all of the lands surrounding the Town of Hanover would need to be investigated to determine the best location for growth.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Hanover (con't)	<p><b>Settlement Area Boundaries</b> - Town indicates that the expansion of the Town's boundary should be seriously considered which should result in an increase in the share of population/commercial/employment allocated to the Town.</p>	<p>NA – In order to consider a boundary expansion to the Town of Hanover, a comprehensive review must be completed. The Growth Management Strategy has provided projections on total population, households and employment for the Town of Hanover. Based on the current land supply, the Growth Management Strategy concluded that the Town of Hanover had a sufficient supply of land to accommodate the future demand and therefore a boundary expansion at this time would not be needed. The conclusions of the Growth Management Strategy of course were based on information that was supplied to the consultants at that time. This information included, but was not limited to, the Town of Hanover Official Plan, Town of Hanover Zoning By-law, Building Permit statistics, vacant land inventory, and the Town of Hanover Commercial Needs Study. Based on the information provided to the consultants at that time, the consultants concluded that the Town of Hanover did not need a boundary expansion. Since then, the Town of Hanover has indicated that there was an 'error' in the Town of Hanover OP/Zoning which improperly designates approx. 40 acres of Commercial Land. If these lands were designated/zoned in error then the error needs to be corrected in the Town of Hanover OP/Zoning in order to eliminate these lands from the actual commercial land supply. Further justification, in the form of a comprehensive review, must be provided by the Town in order to justify the proposed boundary expansion. It should be noted that approx 280 hectares of lands was annexed by the Town of Hanover from the former Township of Bentinck for future development purposes and County Staff is recommending that this land be identified as Primary Settlement Area to reflect the changes in the Town of Hanover Local Official Plan.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Hanover (con't)	Despite the Town's formal objection, the Town of Hanover and the Town's Planning Consultant indicate that they will continue to work with County Planners toward the mutual resolution of this matter, through future investigations, analysis or justifications for the above lands.	A – Staff looks forward to further discussions with the Town of Hanover and the Town's Planning Consultant to provide an outline of the requirements for the justification of the proposed expansion. In order for Staff to support an expansion to a settlement area, a comprehensive review would be required.	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)
Owen Sound (comments from the public meeting held November 25, 2008)	<p><b>Section 1.6.1</b> - estate residential development should not be permitted in the rural areas</p> <p><b>Section 1.6.4</b> - minimum lot size for farms as recommended by the Province</p> <p><b>Section 1.6</b> - what is 'adequate justification' in regard to growth management projections</p> <p><b>Section 1.6</b> - County should set out clear monitoring policies, since the policy itself recognizes that there were assumptions in creating the existing projections. They also indicate how data will be collected but they do not detail how data will be evaluated.</p> <p><b>Section 1.8</b> - how will intensification targets be required to be met, especially in consideration of the perceived demand for the 'rural lifestyle' and to live in rural settings.</p> <p><b>Section 1.8</b> - concerned with the affordable housing requirement of 20% and how it will be enforced and regulated. The benchmark for affordable housing should be based on the local market area rather than the regional market area as housing costs vary greatly across the County.</p>	<p>NA – estate residential development is not the same thing as subdivisions, estate lots are essentially large lots.</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – see Section 6</p> <p>The implementation of Intensification targets will be addressed through local policy and monitored by the County.</p> <p>A – County staff will discuss this further with the Province. The policy continues to be reviewed.</p>	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Owen Sound (con't)	<p><b>Section 1.8 e) iv)</b> - needs to be clarified, its been reworded from the PPS policy and is not clear.</p> <p><b>Agricultural Consent Policies</b> - only protect agricultural lands farms in rural areas should be protected too</p> <p><b>Section 2.1.2</b> - Garden suites draw populations outside settlement areas and could lead to surplus farm dwellings in the agricultural area. City does not support.</p> <p><b>Section 2.1.2 (2)</b> - would not need policy 2.1.3(2) if the only non-farm use was residential on existing lots</p> <p>include the definition of development</p> <p><b>2.1.4 (4) c)</b> - elaboration may be needed if the only designations that apply to the property are Agriculture, Hazard or any other natural heritage designation.</p> <p><b>2.2.3 (7)</b> - is not consistent with 2.2.3 (4)</p> <p><b>2.2.3 (8)</b> - is not consistent with 2.2.3 (4)</p> <p><b>Section 2.3.2</b> - Garden suites draw populations outside settlement areas and could lead to surplus farm dwellings in the agricultural area. City does not support.</p> <p><b>Section 2.3.2</b> - definition of 'small scale industrial and commercial uses' does not explain or limits the types of uses considered. The uses should be limited to those required in proximity to agriculture.</p>	<p>A – will look at the proposed wording for consistency, the policy continues to be reviewed.</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – the Planning Act is explicit in that Garden Suites are only permitted as a temporary use and must be designed to be portable. Listing Garden Suites under permitted uses is simply formalizing a use that has always been permitted in this designation.</p> <p>NA</p> <p>A - included in definitions section, see October 2008 draft.</p> <p>A – revise policy by adding 'if the other designation permits the consent.'</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – the Planning Act is explicit in that Garden Suites are only permitted as a temporary use and must be designed to be portable. Listing Garden Suites under permitted uses is simply formalizing a use that has always been permitted in this designation.</p> <p>NA – the definition varies for each designation (Rural and Agricultural)</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Owen Sound (con't)	<p><b>Section 2.3.2</b> - conventional energy is not defined</p> <p><b>Section 2.3.3 (1) (a)</b> - city staff understand that this means that applicants are to look at the same lot and demonstrate why the development cannot occur on a part of the property that does not include 'improved' farmland. The definition of development does not appear to be the intent of this section.</p> <p><b>Section 2.3.3 (1) (c)</b> - clarity in regard to the term 'adequacy of water supply' does it imply both quality and quantity? If it only implies one, then there needs to be another test for the other.</p> <p><b>Ribbon Development</b> - definition under 2.3.3 (i) not consistent with definitions section</p> <p><b>Section 2.3.3 (1) (l)</b> - in the definition of resource based recreational uses, built recreational uses (i.e. golf courses) should be excluded, so that this is not the reason why the subdivision/condominium is permitted.</p> <p>if smaller lot sizes are permitted for non-farm non-residential uses than for residential uses, it is recommended that the implementing ZBL does not permit residential uses in the same zone</p> <p><b>Rural Consent Policies</b> - prefer the 20 hectare option</p> <p><b>Section 2.3.4 (1)</b> - included "A consent may be considered..." before "where a residence is deemed..."</p> <p><b>Section 2.6.1</b> - should not allow for growth in settlement areas where there are only partial services.</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA – no clarification required</p> <p>It includes both</p> <p>NA – this change was made in the October 2008 draft</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – this is a local zoning matter</p> <p>NA – it was the direction of P &amp; CD Committee that we use the proposed policy.</p> <p>A – this suggested change will be made</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Owen Sound (con't)	<p><b>Section 2.6.2 (5) (c)</b> - suggest adding the consideration of expansions in to Space Extensive commercial/Industrial designations.</p> <p><b>Section 2.6.3 (6)</b> - this supports recommendation in 2.6.2 that rather than listing overall municipalities in the intensification table, the list should include the relevant settlement areas in each municipality only.</p> <p><b>Section 2.6.4 (5)</b> - soft services assessment in regard to settlement capability analysis has not been included in the latest policies.</p> <p><b>Section 2.6.4 (7)</b> - infilling and rounding out on partial services is provided for under 1.6.4.5 in PPS, but does not appear to allow for lot creation, seek comments from province.</p> <p><b>Section 2.6.6 (1)</b> - Cobble Beach would fit better in the Inland Lakes and Shorelines designation than “primary settlement area”</p> <p><b>Section 2.9</b> - the City is not satisfied that the requirements outlines in 2.9 (2) (b) as there may be sites designated and available in settlement areas which are large and easily accessible by highway and would accommodate outdoor storage, parking and large buildings.</p> <p><b>Section 2.10</b> - the City is not satisfied that the requirements outlines in 2.10 (2) (b) as there may be sites designated and available in settlement areas which are large and easily accessible by highway and would accommodate outdoor storage, parking and large buildings.</p>	<p>NA –Space Extensive commercial/industrial are not settlement areas</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – reassessed and no longer necessary</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – Secondary Plan on full services</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Owen Sound (con't)	<p><b>Section 2.8.4 (1)</b> - in regard to the policies of the plan on being triggered with a planning Act application unless the policies are part of a municipalities ZBL, OS disagrees a Section 24(1) of the Planning Act states that where an OP is in effect, no public work shall be undertaken and no by-law passed for any purpose that does not conform. The policies of the OP are triggered also by public work and any other (county or lower tier) Council decisions. Suggest the County further limit this section to Planning Act applications and/or include a 'notwithstanding' clause that exempts development and site alteration by 'Conservation Authorities' and 'Local Municipalities.'</p> <p><b>Section 2.8.6</b> - makes reference to ANSI's and Appendix A, Appendix A does not show ANSI's</p> <p><b>Section 2.8.7 (2)</b> - OS still recommend that the County might offer other opportunities to scope the EIS where a site inspection has been completed by a qualified individual.</p> <p><b>Section 3 (7)</b> - change "Local Municipalities shall include...." To Local municipalities shall identify...."</p> <p><b>Section 3 (8)</b> - use the term "archaeological assessment" instead of "heritage impact assessment" The PPS separates heritage properties from archaeological resources.</p> <p>when archaeological management plan is undertaken by County OS want to be notified and given the opportunity to comment prior to adoption</p>	<p>A – will redraft policy for adoption</p> <p>A – change will be made</p> <p>NA</p> <p>A</p> <p>A – will make change based on MCUL's comments</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Owen Sound (con't)	<p><b>Section 3 (12)</b> - the use of zoning to prohibit land use as proposed may be premature until the County's Archaeological Management Plan is complete and areas of archaeological significance is identified.</p> <p><b>Section 5.2.2 (1)</b> - the rest of the policies do not seem to provide any separate provisions (width, setback, development) for a "Special Controlled Access Road" from "Other County Roads." Clarification on the intent of this new breakdown in road classification is requested.</p> <p><b>Section 5.2.2 (2)</b> - local roads should be in accordance with local municipal requirements</p> <p><b>Section 5.2.2 (3)</b> - duplication between settlement area setbacks and county setbacks from County roads must be reduced. During restructuring it was agreed that setbacks in accordance with the City ZBL would not require a special exemption. Preference for local municipal setbacks to apply within Primary Settlement Areas. Duplication between settlement area setbacks and County setbacks from County Roads must be reduced. During restructuring it was agreed that setbacks in accordance with the city ZBL would not require a special exemption.</p> <p><b>Section 5.2.2 (6)</b> - this section should be reviewed with respect to Section 6 "implementation" as pre-consultation is not required for all types of applications (particularly minor variance or consent).</p> <p><b>Section 5.3.1</b> - could provide background per Section 1.6 of the PPS</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA -The breakdown already exists, it just wasn't included in the Plan</p> <p>NA – flexibility exists in the policy</p> <p>A -The County Transportation Policy Manual update will address this</p> <p>NA – it is covered</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>



MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Owen Sound (con't)	<p><b>Section 5.3.2</b> - wording could be stronger with respect to Section 1.6 of the PPS. References to the protection of human health and the natural environment, promotion of water conservation and water use efficiency, and integration of servicing and land use considerations at all stages are missing as well as the process for determining sufficient “reserve capacity.”</p> <p><b>Section 5.3.2 (8)</b> - add “where municipal sewage services and municipal water services or private communal sewage services and private communal water services are not provided an where site conditions are suitable for the long-term provisions of such services.”</p> <p><b>Section 5.3.2 (10)</b> - it should be the responsibility of the developer to complete the study.</p> <p><b>Section 5.3.2 (11)</b> - the process for determining sufficient “reserve capacity” per section 1.6.4.1 of the PPS should be included in the plan</p> <p><b>Section 5.3.2 (12)</b> - the incremental approach for stormwater management is in conflict with Section 2.2.1 (g) of the PPS. City staff suggest that perhaps the requirement be for all subdivisions and any development requiring site plan approval.</p> <p><b>Section 5.4.1</b> - revised policies for waste management do not recognize the necessary leadership role of the County in waste management.</p> <p><b>Section 5.4.2</b> - landfills</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA/A – County staff are proposing draft policies to clarify</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>A – Changes made in the October 2008 draft</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Owen Sound (con't)	<p><b>Section 6.4</b> - intensification targets are of concern because they are based related to the Growth Management and settlement areas (previous concerns made)</p> <p>Approval authority given to OS for LOPA's and plans of Subdivision/condominium needs to be added to section 6.5 (1) &amp; (4)</p> <p><b>Section 6.6 conditional zoning</b> – suggestion that the local municipality may choose to impose one or more prescribed conditions on a permitted use of land or the erection, location of use of building or structure in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.</p> <p><b>Section 6.11</b> - local municipalities could be limited by some of the polices suggested wording "...Site plan Control will address, but not be limited to, such matters relating to..." or "site Plan Control may address such matters as outlined in local Official Plans, and including..."</p> <p><b>Section 6.12.1</b> - add the wording "among other matters" to recognize that other matters are identified in the Planning act and perhaps in local Official Plans. This section should also discuss it applicability to local municipalities who have the authority to approve plans of subdivision and condominium</p> <p><b>Section 6.13 (1)</b> - the level of detail regarding notice should not be required as the public notice requirements are very clear in the Planning Act. Should the County wish to offer alternative notice requirements, perhaps a sentence could be added allowing either notice per the Planning Act or per the alternative notice requirements in the Plan</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>A – wording will be added</p> <p>NA – conditional zoning is not permitted, there are no implementing regs.</p> <p>NA</p> <p>A – wording will be added to allow for the recognition of LOP's</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Owen Sound (con't)	<p><b>Section 6.13 (7) (i)</b> - has not been moved. consideration could be given to break out as a new subsection 6.13 (8)</p> <p>why is the County requiring a background study to outline the need for a CIP. Recommend deletion of this policy. The definition of “community improvement” ends with the phrase “as may be appropriate of necessary” and as the approval authority it would be the Minister’s realm to determine if this definition is met. The final paragraph starting with “the goal” is not broad as the definition of “community improvement project area” in the Planning Act. The paragraph could be removed along with subsection 6.16.2</p> <p><b>Section 6.18</b> - add the following sentence to provide for local official plan requirements to prevail for local applications. There should also be a section added to address where the local municipality is the approval authority over various types of applications.</p> <p>Scoping on the specific studies required for each applications will be done at the time of pre-consultation. Where a local municipality has an official plan which contains complete application requirements for local applications, then the local requirements will prevail. More specific studies referenced in Sections 2, 3, 4 &amp; 5 of the Plan my also be required...</p> <p><b>Section 6.18</b> - there needs to be a section to address where the local municipality is the approval authority over various types of applications.</p>	<p>A -Will move to 6.13 (8)</p> <p>NA/A – wording has been changed</p> <p>NA – already in the Plan</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Owen Sound (con't)	<p><b>Section 6.19</b> - the definition of development included the sentence 'creation of a new lot' there are some times in the plan in which this is not the desired definition....should re-examine.</p> <p><b>Section 6.19</b> - definition of Hazard Lands "between..."</p> <p><b>Section 6.19</b> - definition of Home/Rural Occupations should restrict retail sales (only allow for produce grown on farm, market gardening and nurseries) in the Agricultural and Rural designations as it can detract from the viability of traditional downtowns in all settlement areas (primary, secondary, or tertiary)</p> <p><b>Section 6.19</b> - definition of ribbon development is different then the one noted in 2.3.3 (1) (i) preference is for 3 or more lots as opposed to 4 as noted in this definition.</p> <p><b>Section 6.19</b> - definition of woodlands is not consistent with the PPS definition, instead it is consistent with the forestry management bylaw</p> <p><b>Map 1h</b> - does not reflect the city's own mapping, portions of lots in a subdivision are missing (approximately at the west extent of 1<sup>st</sup> Ave. W.) this change would carry over on to the other maps.</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA – adding the word "between" does not complete the sentence.</p> <p>NA</p> <p>A – change was already made in October 2008 draft</p> <p>NA – this is not the definition for significant woodlands</p> <p>A – will look at this further</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>
Georgian Bluffs (comments on October 2008 version)	<p><b>Growth Management</b> - supports the general conclusions of the Growth Management report as far as future growth allocations to Georgian bluffs. But the Township believes that there is considerable room for interpretation on the assessment of available lots for development by the County.</p>	<p>NA – through County staff analysis on a township scale the analysis concluded that there may be a 10-15 % error</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Georgian Bluffs (con't)	<p>The Study only assessed permanent residential population, not seasonal and not commercial activity or strategies of the local municipalities.</p> <p><b>Servicing</b> – existing infrastructure must be allowed to be fully utilized to ensure economic viability and utilization of existing capacity. Section 1.6 of the PPS requires coordinated, efficient and cost effective management of all infrastructure. This includes municipal water systems operated under the <i>Safe Drinking Water Act</i>. Therefore , the sentence in Section 2.6.2 (5) – “Expansion of a settlement area on partial serviced is not permitted.” Should be removed so as not to influence this alternative should a settlement area be proposed for expansion and all of the necessary studies indicate it has planning merit.</p> <p>Therefore GB requests that the County of Grey</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. remove the last sentence in the October draft of Section 2.6.2 (5)</li> <li>2. Section 5.3.2 should be amended to be consistent with the PPS where Subsection (2) (c) has its own section.</li> </ol> <p><b>Inland Lakes and Shorelines</b> – designation has been altered with no apparent rational and GB requests that it be returned to what exists in the OP today</p> <p><b>Settlement Boundaries</b> – for hamlets that are proposed to be removed a policy identifying ‘rural residential clusters’ and their role in the County.</p>	<p>NA – seasonal populations and commercial/industrial lands have been considered in the Growth Management Plan.</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – Committee agreed to the boundaries as per the October 2008 draft.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Georgian Bluffs (con't)	<p><b>Settlement Boundaries</b> - in general are too restrictive; they need to be set according to the availability of existing service capacity and in particular in GB's case water supply. The township should be able to set these limits at the local OP level.</p> <p><b>Settlement Area Boundaries</b> - are far too rigid, based on a random assessment of what fits the existing lot fabric given the County position that no new lot creation is needed.</p> <p><b>Settlement Boundaries</b> – GB has suggested changes to their settlement areas, if the County does not support these changes, they would like the existing 'blob' effect to remain.</p> <p><b>Boundaries of Rockford and Springmount</b> - should be reconsidered. Seniors housing options need to be considered within legitimate Settlement Areas where they are compatible with surrounding uses. Need to plan for long term availability of employment lands, Springmount and Rockford are the desired location. Mapping was included with formal comments to indicate the Municipality's desired boundary adjustments. As proposed in OPA 40</p> <p><b>MDS</b> -how will the plan address the existing lots of record that become un-developable as a result of reciprocal MDS?</p> <p><b>Rural Consent Policy</b> -supports consent policies where lots are 20ha and have 100 metres frontage with a degree of flexibility</p>	<p>NA – PPS requires more clearly defined boundaries for settlement areas</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – Committee agreed to the boundaries as per the October 2008 draft.</p> <p>NA/A – revised Springmount boundary supported by PCD Committee did not include the Acton lands</p> <p>NA – Committee agreed to the boundaries as per the October 2008 draft.</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – it was the direction of PCD Committee that we use the proposed policy.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

MUNICIPALITY	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Georgian Bluffs (con't)	<p><b>Small Scale Commercial and Industrial Uses</b> - create a dilemma in terms of preserving rural community lifestyle. Township would support a reduction of the overall size of these uses and a minimum lot size that would help address these issues.</p> <p><b>Significant Woodlands</b> - protecting isolated woodlots that do not have natural heritage significance needs to be balanced with environmental and economic needs of farmers and others.</p> <p><b>Conditional Zoning</b> - want the ability to pass property standards by-law and apply conditional zoning</p> <p><b>Policies of 5.3.2 (2)</b> - are not consistent with the PPS, regarding a hierarchy of services. Including partial services in a hierarchy is misleading and not consistent with the PPS. Need to look a wording of the Plan related to partial services.</p>	<p>NA – it was the direction of PCD Committee that we use the proposed policy.</p> <p>A – County Forest Management By-law currently does this</p> <p>NA/A – Property Standards By-laws yes, conditional zoning is only permitted under the <i>Planning Act</i>, once the implementing Regs. are released</p> <p>NA/A – PPS doesn't include in hierarchy, County Staff feel it appropriate to include them</p>	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)
Chatsworth	<b>Settlement Area Boundaries</b> – maintain the Hamlet of Massie in the settlement area designation.	NA – Committee agreed to the boundaries as per the October 2008 draft.	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)

**County of Grey Official Plan  
5-year Review  
SUMMARY OF AGENCY COMMENTS – January 2009**

**Comments from the November 25, 2008 Public Meeting**

**There are a number of instances where comments raised are similar to comments received on previous drafts. Please refer to the previous comment summary (August 2008) to determine staff position.**

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Grey Bruce Public Health Unit	<p>The Grey Bruce Public Health Unit provided a number of suggested wording changes throughout the entire Plan. Most of the proposed wording changes are fairly minor in nature. The wording that has been bolded represent the changes recommended by the Grey Bruce Public health Unit:</p> <p><u>Section 1 Introduction 1.1: (iv)</u> Provide a policy framework which encourages <b>healthy social, natural and built environments, sustainable</b> growth and prosperity in the County...</p> <p><u>Section 1 Introduction 1.1 (v)</u> Provide a framework for comprehensive, integrated and long-term planning that supports and integrates the principles of <b>healthy and</b> strong communities, a clean and...</p> <p>1.3 MISSION STATEMENT PARAGRAPH 2- Grey County is a family of distinctive communities which values its heritage, natural beauty, clean healthy environment, and rural lifestyle. We value the freedom of the individual and the security of the “hometown” community. Grey County is committed to <b>healthy</b>, sustainable, affordable growth through progressive and well-managed planning for the...</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>A</p> <p>NA – mission statement adopted by County Council</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>



NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Grey Bruce Public Health Unit (con't)	<p>SECTION -1.5 GOALS:</p> <p>#2: Provide as much direction and assistance to local municipalities in their planning process as possible to ensure that environmental, social, <b>public health</b> and economic considerations are integrated into the decision making process of planning and development</p> <p>#7. Ensure sufficient lands have been identified for development to accommodate a variety of <b>mixed</b> housing and employment opportunities to meet current and future needs</p> <p>#8. Strengthen the role of Grey County as a desirable place to work, live, and visit by encouraging <b>maintenance and public accessibility to the natural environment</b>, the provision of <b>affordable, diverse and accessible</b> housing and by promoting the provision of adequate social, recreational, cultural, health and educational services</p> <p>#10. Preserve the agricultural/rural character of Grey County by encouraging local municipalities to designate rural heritage, <b>public shorelines and</b> countryside landscapes under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as conservation districts and/or defined cultural heritage landscapes</p> <p>#11. Ensure a policy-led planning system that recognizes and addresses the complex inter-relationships among environmental, economic, <b>public health</b> and social factors in land use planning</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>NA</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Grey Bruce Public Health Unit (con't)	<p>1.6 OBJECTIVES</p> <p>1.6 Physical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide for seasonal, tourist and estate type residential development in rural and recreation areas in a manner that <b>enhances or maintains trail systems</b>, is compatible with the rural landscape, and where it will not adversely affect any existing and/or potential agricultural, forestry, or mineral aggregate operation or cultural heritage landscapes, <b>and in a manner that does not adversely impact the health of the population.</b></li> </ul> <p>1. 62 SOCIAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To encourage the local preservation, conservation, <b>public accessibility</b> and maintenance of natural, cultural or man-made historical or heritage features</li> </ul> <p>1. 64 ECONOMIC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide opportunities for sustainable resource development and outdoor recreation for the continuous economic, social <b>and health</b> benefit of area residents and visitors, and to support the management, protection and conservation of public lands and waters in an environmentally sound manner.</li> <li>To promote the <b>sustainable</b> processing of raw natural resources within the County.</li> <li>To promote efficient <b>transportation systems</b> to serve the agriculture, tourism, commercial, industrial and residential needs of the County.</li> </ul>	<p>NA – staff are of the opinion that this additional wording takes away from the original intent of the objective</p> <p>NA – would be difficult to demonstrate</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>NA – prefer to keep it as roads</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
<p>Grey Bruce Public Health Unit (con't)</p>	<p>1.7 GROWTH MANAGEMENT BACKGROUND (END OF PARAGRAPH #2) adverse impacts on agricultural and heritage features <b>and minimize negative impacts on population health</b>, be phased in accordance</p> <p>1.8 HOUSING POLICY The County supports: b) the provision of alternative forms of housing for special needs groups where possible. <b>Special needs groups may include, but are not limited to, seniors, disabled and low income earners;</b></p> <p>2.3.3 DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA POLICIES (C) last line of Para 2 (or any municipal procedure that achieves the same objective) <b>and the regulatory requirements of the Ontario Building Code.</b></p> <p>(j) (iii) how the need for the proposed uses cannot be met by approved development in other locations in the County and how the development will consider resident transportation needs for access to services <b>and amenities and not contribute to increased reliance on automobile transportation;</b></p> <p>(p) It must be demonstrated that the non-farm residential, small scale commercial and industrial and institutional uses must be necessary to serve the needs of the immediate area and the agricultural/rural community <b>and that the site-specific locations proposed will not induce increased reliance on automobiles for consumers to access services.</b></p>	<p>NA – seems fairly general and may be difficult to demonstrate</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>NA – staff are unsure how this criteria will be met (i.e. all rural consents would contribute to the increased reliance on automobile transportation). Based on the Committee’s direction to still permit rural consents, staff would not support the inclusion of this criteria.</p> <p>NA – staff are unsure how this criteria will be met (i.e. all rural development would contribute to the increased reliance on automobile transportation in order to access services and amenities located in settlement areas). Based on the Committee’s direction to still permit rural consents, staff would not support the inclusion of this criteria.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
<p>Grey Bruce Public Health Unit (con't)</p>	<p>2.6 SETTLEMENT AREAS 2.6.1 BACKGROUND (second last line of Para 3) development which does not negatively impact on natural resources, <b>public health</b> and which is...</p> <p>Paragraph 6 • Primary Settlement Areas – larger settlements with full municipal servicing <b>and a wide</b> range of uses, services and amenities</p> <p>2.6.2 GENERAL POLICIES AFFECTING SETTLEMENT AREA DESIGNATIONS (2) Local Official Plans, Secondary Plans, Plans of Subdivision and Condominium Plans shall ensure a proper and orderly street pattern <b>facilitating safe motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian travel</b>, efficient use of services, and a variety of housing and development opportunities within designated Settlement Area designations.</p> <p>(3) Local Official Plans, Secondary Plans, Plans of Subdivision and Condominium Plans should give consideration to the orientation of the streets and dwelling units in order to ensure energy efficiency, convenient <b>and safe</b> access to retail facilities, schools, recreational facilities, and services <b>via motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian travel</b>.</p> <p>(g) Impacts on the Natural Environment <b>and Public Health</b> are minimized;</p>	<p>NA – seems fairly general and would be difficult to demonstrate</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>NA A</p> <p>NA – seems fairly general and would be difficult to demonstrate</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
<p>Grey Bruce Public Health Unit (con't)</p>	<p>7) Development within designated growth areas should progress in an orderly Manner, <b>with mixed land uses</b>, in keeping with the timely expansion of municipal services and the provision of public service facilities. Municipal Official Plans shall define phasing policies to guide orderly development..</p> <p>2.6.3 URBAN DESIGNATION PRIMARY SETTLEMENT AREAS Last Line- (6) sympathetic in form. <b>Intensification should consider proximity of housing to services and amenities (mixed use); pedestrian and cycling needs; sidewalks, lighting, streetscaping, aesthetic and visual appearance, parks and recreation lands.</b></p> <p>2.6.4 HAMLET DESIGNATION SECONDARY SETTLEMENT AREAS NEW (5) &amp; (6) (5) (c) An assessment of the long-term sustainability of the soil, hydrologic and hydrogeological conditions to accept sewage effluent, <b>subject to the approval of the [appropriate] authority designated under the Ontario Building Code for sewage systems;</b></p> <p>(6) New commercial or dry industrial uses in Secondary Settlement Areas shall only be permitted if it can be shown that the proposed uses can be accommodated by individual on-site private services with no adverse environmental <b>or public health</b> effects. For Secondary Settlement Areas that are partially serviced by a municipal water system, it must be demonstrated that the system has capacity to accommodate the development and the site is capable of accommodating <b>an</b> on-site private sewage <b>system</b></p>	<p>A</p> <p>NA – not all of these criteria may be appropriate for certain forms of intensification. For example, an accessory apartment should not be expected to consider the proposed criteria.</p> <p>NA/A – Staff agree with the intent but in order to be consistent with other policies we prefer using the words “appropriate authority” rather than “principle authority”.</p> <p>NA – seems fairly general and would be difficult to demonstrate</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
<p>Grey Bruce Public Health Unit (con't)</p>	<p>(8) (last line) <b>Intensification should consider proximity of housing to services and amenities (mixed use); pedestrian and cycling needs; sidewalks, lighting, streetscaping, aesthetic and visual appearance, parks and recreation lands.</b></p> <p>(2) PERMITTED USES (c) Soils shall be suitable to support an individual <b>sewage</b> system, subject to</p> <p>2.10 SPACE EXTENSIVE COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION 3) DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA (c) Soils shall be suitable to support an individual <b>sewage</b> system, subject to the approval of the appropriate authority.</p> <p>2.8.4 RENUMBERED TO 2.8.5 2.8.5 SPECIAL POLICY AREA The proponent shall dig two test holes in the location of a proposed dwelling or business (e.g. in the northwest and southeast corners), one test hole in the location of the proposed <b>sewage</b> system... The study shall be to the satisfaction of the County of Grey, the local municipality, <b>and the principle authority designated under the Ontario Building Code for sewage systems.</b></p> <p>SECTION 5 TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITIES 5.1CORRIDORS 5.1.1BACKGROUND Second Paragraph The careful evaluation of the locations of any future corridors required within the County, the minimization of undesirable effects of the development of these corridors on agricultural lands, the natural environment, <b>public health</b> and people,...</p>	<p>NA – not all of these criteria may be appropriate for certain forms of intensification. For example, an accessory apartment should not be expected to consider the proposed criteria.</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>Planning Staff will consult with the Transportation &amp; Public Safety Department for comments.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
<p>Grey Bruce Public Health Unit (con't)</p>	<p>5.2COUNTY ROADS AND PROVINCIAL HIGHWAYS 5.2.1 BACKGROUND Since both County Roads and Provincial Highways are an integral component of the road network in the Planning Area, policies to regulate development and access are Needed, <b>including policies for the development of active transportation routes</b>, to ensure the efficient and safe functioning of the system.</p> <p>5.2.2 POLICIES- Last line of last paragraph before the heading ROAD CLASSIFICATION PG. 96 order to protect for the future transportation corridors for the <b>safe</b> movement of people and goods</p> <p>5.3SERVICES 5.3.2 POLICIES (10) In any part of the County to be serviced by individual on-site private systems, new development shall be subject to a study sufficient to demonstrate the feasibility, as defined in this section, of the development to meet the requirements of Ministry of Environment, or <b>the principle authority respecting Ontario Building Code approved sewage systems</b> , and the provisions of this Plan</p> <p>#10 (a) This study will collect and evaluate hydrogeological data, assess the hydrogeological environment of the area of the proposed development and comment on the suitability of the study area for development to be serviced by private water supply wells and by <b>sewage systems</b> waste water disposal, taking into account the cumulative impact of development in the area. Where appropriate, it will also..</p>	<p>Planning Staff will consult with the Transportation &amp; Public Safety Department for comments.</p> <p>NA - Planning Staff will consult with the Transportation &amp; Public Safety Department for comments.</p> <p>NA/A - Staff agree with the intent but in order to be consistent with other policies we prefer using the words “appropriate authority” rather than “principle authority”.</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Grey Bruce Public Health Unit (con't)	<p>(b) The creation of new lots will be strongly discouraged where the construction of a raised Class 4 septic system, or Class 1 septic system would be required creation of new non-farm lots will be encouraged to be serviced with a Class 4 <b>sewage</b> system or similar approved technology. <b>Sewage</b> systems shall be constructed in accordance with the Ontario Building Code.</p> <p>6.3 OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW AND AMENDMENT (2) (a) Changing social, demographic, economic, <b>health</b> or environmental conditions which may affect the assumptions upon which the policies of this Plan are based</p> <p>6.4 MONITORING (1) To provide information for the on-going evaluation of policies, and comprehensive reviews of this Plan, the County will continue to carry out a program of research to identify the changing social, economic, environmental, <b>public health</b> and physical needs of the residents of the region and the</p> <p>(2) The County will continue to develop financial and/or information collection and sharing arrangements with the Province, local Municipalities, the various Conservation Authorities, <b>the Public Health Unit</b>, the First Nations...</p> <p>6.8 NON-CONFORMING USES (3) (e) The servicing policies of Section 5.3 can be met <b>and the development proposed observes compliance with the Ontario Building Code.</b></p> <p>6.11 SITE PLAN CONTROL (3) (b) Ensuring the safety and efficiency of vehicular and pedestrian <b>and bicycle</b> access;</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>



NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Grey Bruce Public Health Unit (con't)	<p>(4)In order to achieve these objectives, Site Plan Control will address such matters as relating to exterior design, including the character, scale appearance and design features of buildings, and their sustainable design, within the County and the location of buildings and structures, possible road widenings in accordance with Section 5, location of access points, off-street parking and loading facilities, pedestrian <b>and bicycle</b> circulation, lighting, landscaping,</p> <p>6.12 LOT CREATION (1) (f)Evidence that soil and drainage conditions are suitable to permit the proper siting of buildings, that a sufficient and potable water supply exists, and that <b>conditions are suitable for sewage system construction</b>;</p> <p>6.17 ACCESSORY APARTMENTS 7<sup>th</sup> line down from first paragraph or designated <b>principle authority for sewage systems</b> may be necessary prior to granting a..</p> <p>6.18 COMPLETE APPLICATIONS 3<sup>rd</sup> line of 4<sup>th</sup> bulleted paragraph Zoning By-law Amendment •Required studies which may include, but are not limited to environmental impact study, traffic, noise, water supply, sewage <b>system development</b>, storm water management, a drainage study,</p> <p>Local Official Plan Amendment •Required studies which may include, but are not limited to environmental impact study, traffic, water supply, sewage <b>system development</b>, (second line of 5<sup>th</sup> bulleted paragraph)</p>	<p>A</p> <p>NA - Redudant</p> <p>NA/A - Staff agree with the intent but in order to be consistent with other policies we prefer using the words "appropriate authority" rather than "principle authority".</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Grey Bruce Public Health Unit (con't)	<p>Plan of Subdivision/Plan of Condominium ...Plan(s), water supply, hydrogeological report, sewage <b>system development</b>,...</p> <p>INDIVIDUAL ON-SITE SEWAGE SERVICES means individual, autonomous sewage systems within the meaning of s.8.1.2, O.Reg. <b>350/06</b>, under the Building Code Act, <b>2006</b> that are owned, operated and managed by the owner of the property upon which the system is located.</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>
<p><b>MMAH ONE WINDOW COMMENTS</b></p> <p>Ministry of Transportation (MTO)</p> <p>Ministry of the Environment</p>	<p>The use of the word 'ramp' is unclear in Section 2.10.3(f). MTO suggests the following edits in bold: "<b>Entrances will</b> be limited in number <b>and typically only one entrance will be allowed</b> and continuous access across the lot frontage is discouraged. Common <b>or shared entrances</b>, rather than separate <b>entrances</b> for each establishment are strongly encouraged and applicants for new development who propose individual <b>entrances</b> are required to justify why common <b>entrances</b> could not be used."</p> <p>Ministry staff have reviewed the revised draft document and have no comments at this time.</p>	<p>A</p> <p>It should be noted that there have been some recent staff changes and MOE has now indicated that they will be providing comments in the near future.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p> <p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Culture (MCUL)	<p>Section 2.6.2(11) – MCUL staff recommend deleting "and structures of architectural significance" as this is covered by the phrase "cultural heritage value or interest", which is explained in Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act. This should be followed throughout the document.</p> <p>Section 3 (Heritage Policies) - MCUL staff recommend keeping the term "resources" and removing "properties", as it was incorrectly identified for change in the previous comments. In addition it is also recommended that the phrase "or records their heritage value" be deleted, as this phrase could be interpreted as meaning that documenting the heritage resource is just as acceptable as retaining the resource.</p> <p>Section 3(2) – MCUL staff recommend replacing this section with the following wording to clarify that the intent of this policy is to give direction to local municipalities regarding the identification and the protection of heritage resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local municipalities shall develop policies which encourage the conservation of heritage resources in land use and development decisions. Local municipalities will identify cultural heritage resources by establishing and maintaining a register of properties situated in the municipality that are of cultural heritage value or interest. Area municipalities will include on their register all properties designated under Part IV, V or VI of the Heritage Act and including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. properties that have heritage conservation easements or covenants registered against title</li> <li>b. cultural heritage resources of interest to the County</li> <li>c. cultural heritage resources identified in provincial or federal inventories</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Culture (MCUL) (con't)	<p>d. additional cultural heritage resources that the council of the Local Municipalities believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest</p> <p>e. areas of archaeological potential and archaeological and historical resources identified by the Province</p> <p>Subsection 3(4) makes reference to the "Ministry of Government Services". It is recommended that this be replaced with a reference to the "Ministry of Small Business and Consumer Services (Cemeteries Regulation Unit)", in order to reflect recent changes between these Ministries.</p> <p>recommend that the words "significant built" be deleted in Subsection 3(6), as MCUL staff feel this term could be seen as potentially excluding any sites that may come into the County's future ownership that are not buildings or structures.</p> <p>MCUL staff also recommend replacing the term "heritage impact assessment", in Subsection 3(8) with "archaeological assessment", in order to clarify that it is through this study that archaeological potential is confirmed.</p> <p>Section 6.15 (1) (Maintenance and Occupancy Standards) - In accordance with s. 35.3 of the Ontario Heritage Act, MCUL staff recommend adding a further (new) statement regarding the maintenance of heritage attributes as per the following wording:  (e) prescribing the minimum standards for maintaining the heritage attributes of a designated property and, should it not comply with those standards, requiring such property to be repaired and maintained to conform with the standards.</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Culture (MCUL) (con't)	<p>Section 6.16.2(f) Community Improvement Objectives - MCUL encourage the County to consider adding the words "and adaptive re-use", after "preservation" so as to encourage the continued viability of older building stock, particularly in main commercial areas.</p> <p><u>Section 6.19 Definitions</u>  <b>Adjacent Lands</b> - MCUL staff recommend the following as the PPS definition of adjacent lands also include protected heritage properties:  <i>"Those lands contiguous to a specific natural heritage or cultural heritage feature or area, where it is likely.. ."</i></p> <p>MCUL recommends that "protected heritage property" be added to the list adjacent land widths with a minimum distance provided from these properties, so as to capture development proposals that are within close proximity and may impact the heritage attributes of a heritage resource. For example, if the view to or from a heritage resource is recognized as a heritage attribute, and will be affected by a development proposal situated across the street, the proposal could be considered as being an adjacent land if it is located within 50 metres from the heritage resource.</p> <p>MCUL also recommends that a definition be added to Section 6.19 for "protected heritage property", as found in the PPS. This is an inclusive term and eliminates the need to refer to heritage resources individually (e.g. built, landscape, district, road, river, etc) so as to ensure that proposed policies cover all heritage resources and not just an individual type. Its inclusion also serves as a reference for "adjacent lands".</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Culture (MCUL) (con't)	<p><b>Section 7 Secondary Plan for Georgian Villas:</b> MCUL requests clarification between “Cultural Heritage Sites” and “Cultural Heritage Areas.” More specifically, MCUL suggests the distinction should include identifying if any of the sites designated under the Heritage Act (Part 4 or Part 5), and/ or if they meant to depict archaeological sites (Part 6). As currently written these policies would appear to refer only to built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscape, and not necessarily other sites designated under the Heritage Act e.g archaeological sites.</p> <p>Section 1.2.5 also makes references to "Ministry of Citizenship and Culture" and "Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation" . These references should be deleted and replaced with "Ministry of Culture".</p> <p>Further, the policies should ensure that for any proposed development with the Secondary Plan area, an archaeological assessment is required.</p> <p>Finally, regarding Section 2.7 Marina Development, the requirement for an archaeological assessment should be included in the list of required studies in subsection (b).</p>	NA – This secondary plan is in force and effect. No changes are being entertained.	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)
Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)	<p><b>Section 1.6.3</b> - The second last bullet of Section 1.6.3 addressing environmental objectives makes specific reference to aggregate extraction and impacts to groundwater. Groundwater and surface water features are addressed in the third bullet, and to avoid segregating aggregate extraction from other land uses, MNR recommends the last portion of the bullet referencing groundwater be deleted.</p>	NA	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) (con't)	<p><b>Sections 2.1.2, 2.2.2, 2.3.2</b> - These Sections provide policies on permitted uses in the Agricultural, Special Agricultural and Rural designations respectively. Clarification is needed as to the policy permitting only 'sand and/or gravel operations proposed within Aggregate Resource Areas identified on Schedule B' rather than the inclusion of all mineral aggregate resource operations.</p> <p><b>Section 2.6.2.5</b> - provides policies regarding settlement area urban boundary expansions. MNR recommends this section also consider potential impacts on significant natural heritage features, licensed aggregate operations and Aggregate Resource Areas, in addition to Special Agriculture and Agricultural Areas.</p> <p><b>Section 2.7.2(1)</b> - identifies permitted uses for lands designated 'Mineral Resource Extraction' on Schedule B. It is MNR's opinion that small scale energy generation systems should not be permitted within a licensed aggregate operation. It is MNR's view that such uses are not compatible with licensed aggregate operations which are regulated under the Aggregate Resources Act.</p> <p><b>Section 2.7.3(1)</b> - describes the policy to allow the local municipality to enter into a development agreement with the applicant of a mineral resources operation regarding capital improvements and haul routes beyond the applicant's land prior to the implementation of a zoning by-law amendment. It is this MNR's position that such agreements should not duplicate regulations or conditions that are included as part of a license issued under the ARA.</p>	<p>NA – Bedrock resources were not mapped as part of the Aggregate Inventory Master Plan and therefore staff are recommending that the Plan only permits sand and/or gravel operations as an 'as of right' permitted use within the Aggregate Resource Areas identified on Schedule B.</p> <p>A – already completed in October 2008 Version</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – County staff do not agree that these policies duplicate the regulations or conditions as part of the ARA license. The intent of the development agreement is to deal with required off-site improvements which are outside of the licensed area (i.e. haul route improvements, signage on haul route, etc.)</p>	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) (con't)	<p><b>Section 2.7.4 (3)</b> - describes the studies/reports to be provided for proposed mineral aggregate operations. It is recommended that the word 'justify' be deleted and replaced with 'support'.</p> <p>It is recommended that the language used in Sections 2.8.1(4<sup>th</sup> paragraph) and 2.8.6(1) be modified with respect to development and site alteration on lands adjacent to natural heritage features and areas to read, 'no development or site alteration is permitted unless ....' to be more consistent with Section 2.1.6 of the PPS.</p> <p><b>Section 2.8.1</b> - In discussing the mapping of the Provincially Significant Wetlands it would be helpful to make reference to Schedule A.</p> <p>The third last paragraph on page 71 discusses mapping available from the MNR. Mapping available from MNR's Natural Heritage Information Centre (NHIC) database shows generalized locations of endangered and threatened species, and under the new Endangered Species Act 2007, the Species at Risk in Ontario (SARO) list is updated on an annual basis. MNR also has mapping available for inclusion in the Official Plan with respect to core yards for deer wintering, considered part of Significant Wildlife Habitat under the Natural Heritage Reference Manual June 1999 and the Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide 2000.</p> <p>MNR staff recommend the following revisions to the Significant Woodlands text: "In order to be considered significant a woodland must be... If a woodland fails to meet those criteria, a woodland can also be significant if it meets any two of the following three criteria:" Further, criteria should be modified to be specific:</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>NA - County staff are of the opinion that with the addition of the Significant Woodland mapping as well as the other natural heritage features identified on either Schedule A or Appendix B (i.e. Significant Wetlands, ANSI's Hazard Lands, Other Wetlands, etc.) that the majority of the natural heritage features in Grey County will be protected. The missing natural heritage features will be identified as part of the Natural Heritage Study which is a proposed study as per Section 2.8.6(8).</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>



NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) (con't)	<p>(a) proximity to other woodlands - within 30 metres of another significant woodland, or (b) overlap with other natural heritage features - Provincially Significant Wetland or an Area of Natural and Scientific Interest, or (c) ...</p> <p>MNR recommends that a clearing clause be included which states that where clearing of a woodland in contravention of the tree cutting by-law occurs, the woodland continues to be considered significant.</p> <p>Section 2.8.7 (6) It should be noted within this section that that maps and site plans may also include other natural heritage features and areas including provincially significant ANSIs and generalized locations (element occurrences) of endangered and threatened species accessed from MNR's Natural Heritage Information Centre (NHIC) database.</p> <p>Section 5.1.3.1 1 permits small scale energy generation systems in all land use designations excluding Wetlands and Hazard Lands. MNR staff recommend that this section be modified to read. "Small scale energy generation systems shall be permitted in all land use designations excluding Wetlands and Mineral Resource Extraction". It is MNR's opinion that small scale energy generation systems should not be permitted within a licensed aggregate operation, as such uses are not compatible with licensed aggregate operations which are regulated under the Aggregate Resources Act.</p>	<p>NA – clearing of a woodland in contravention of the County Forest Management By-law should be dealt with under the by-law through penalties, fines, etc.</p> <p>A</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) (con't)	<p>In addition the Utilities Policy under Section 5.1.3(16)(i) should be amended to read, The Applicant shall consult with the Ministry of Natural Resources to ensure the location and design of the proposed generating structures provide for the protection of bird and bat populations.'</p> <p>Section 6.18 - with regards to the completed application policies, it should be noted that required studies related to mineral aggregate applications may include the following: Aggregate Potential Assessment and/or Aggregate Compatibility Assessment, Aggregate Studies related to and in compliance with requirements of MNR's license for new and expansions to existing aggregate operations.</p> <p><b>6.19 Definitions:</b>  <b>Aggregate Resource Area</b> - the term would be further clarified by stating it delineates areas of protected sand and gravel deposits.  <b>Woodlands</b> - MNR staff recommend that the definition of woodlands be expanded to indicate that the woodland boundary is generally coincidental with the drip line.</p> <p><u>Schedules and Appendix Mapping</u>  Appendix B - It is noted that the Provincially Significant Skipness Drumlins and Wetlands Life Science ANSI location is not identified on Map 1</p> <p>Schedule B - The licensed pits and quarries shown on Schedule B are accurate however the shapes of the polygons on MNR's database vary for some of the locations shown. Midhurst District GIS staff will be pleased to discuss these variances with County staff.</p>	<p>A</p> <p>NA</p> <p>A</p> <p>NA</p> <p>A – County staff will request the most recent mapping from MNR staff</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) (con't)	For clarity, it is suggested that the legend on Schedule B specify 'Licensed Pits and Quarries' rather than 'Mineral Resource Extraction' and further should indicate that 'Aggregate Resource Area' refers to only protected sand and gravel deposits.	A – County staff recommend putting the suggested wording in brackets after the term “Mineral Resource Extraction” both in the legend and at the heading of the Mineral Resource Extraction Policy.	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)	Section 2.1.2 - OMAFRA recommends the term "farming" be defined as per the PPS definition for "Agricultural Uses". Similarly "home rural occupations" should be more closely aligned with the definition of 'secondary' and more specifically, should include the word "secondary" and permit uses that produce value added agricultural products from the farm operation on the property.	NA	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)
	OMAFRA recommends the actual PPS definition of "Agriculture-related Uses" could be included in Section 2.1.2 to make it clear that these uses must be small scale, directly related to <i>the</i> farm operation and required in close proximity to <i>the</i> farm operation (not farm operations in the area).	NA	
	OMAFRA suggests that a wind turbine for farm use (less than 1 ha) can be considered a secondary use, however, larger scale projects would require an OPA and justification and locational analysis through PPS 2.3.5 (including PPS 2.3.51~) and 2.3.5.2). Small scale solar projects for farm use (less than 1 ha) are considered by OMAFRA as secondary uses. However, it is OMAFRA's view that large scale commercial solar projects need to be subject to the same requirements as wind projects. More specifically, an OPA, justification and alternative location analysis as per Section 2.3.5 of the PPS and further, mitigation measures need to be considered as per Sections 2.3.5.2 and 1.8.3 of the PPS.	NA	

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) (con't)	<p>Institutional uses for the County's rural community whose primary means of transportation is horse drawn vehicles, must still meet the justification, locational analysis, mitigation and MDS requirements of Sections 2.3.1, 2.3.3.3 and 2.3.5 of the PPS. On this basis, OMAFRA suggests Section 2.1.2.2 needs to be revised accordingly.</p> <p>According to Section 2.1.2 (2) the only non-farm uses permitted are limited to residential uses on existing lots or lots created in accordance with 2.1.4 (i.e. Farm parcels or legal or technical reasons or infrastructure). That said, section 2.1.3.2 states that the "minimum lot size within the Agricultural designation for non-farm uses, identified in Section 2.1.2.(2) shall be restricted to the minimum size required for the active aspects of the operation with as little acreage as possible take out of productive agricultural land". This suggests other non-farm uses are being contemplated. This needs to be clarified, and identify what other non-farm uses are being contemplated and how are they consistent with the PPS.</p> <p><b>Section 2.1.2(6)</b> - should be modified to state that all new non-farm development is subject to MDS and Section 2.3.5 of the PPS - Removal of Land from Prime Agricultural Areas.</p> <p>As drafted, Section 2.1.4 permits consents only where a lot is severed to create a farm parcel of generally 40ha. Sections 2.1.4.2 and 2.1.4.3 then go on to discuss severances for non-farm uses. Based on OMAFRA's review of Section 2.1.4, it appears the County is contemplating lot creation for other non-farm uses. As stated above (Section 2.1.3), OMAFRA is seeking clarification with respect to what other non-farm uses are being contemplated and how are they consistent with the PPS.</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>A – Section 2.1.2(5) already states this</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) (con't)	<p>OMAFRA suggests the PPS definition of Specialty Crop Area be included in Section 2.2.1 of the Official Plan.</p> <p>As noted the same as above Section 2.1.2, OMAFRA recommends the PPS definitions of Agricultural Uses and Agriculture-related Uses should be used in Section 2.2.2. Commercial scale alternative and renewable energy systems are permitted in prime agricultural areas in accordance with Sections 1.8.3 and 2.3.5 of the PPS as noted in their comments above.</p> <p><b>Wineries</b> should be deleted from Section 2.2.2 as they are only permitted in Prime Agricultural Areas or Specialty Crops areas if they are consistent with definitions of secondary uses and agriculture-related uses of Section 2.3 of the PPS. Wineries may be permitted by amendment, subject to satisfying the policy requirements of Sections 2.3.5 and 2.3.3.3 (MDS) of the PPS. Section 2.2.3(3) regarding wineries should be modified as per the comments related to Section 2.2.2 above.</p> <p><b>Section 2.2.3(4)</b> should be clarified that non-farm uses are also subject to Section 2.3.5 of the PPS and MDS requirements, if applicable, regardless of whether or not the lot on which the use is proposed if existing. Section 2.2.3(7) all non-farm development is subject to satisfying the policy requirements of Sections 2.3.5 and 2.3.3.3 (MDS) of the PPS.</p>	<p>A – already in the Definitions Section of the October version of the Draft OP policies – definition of Special Agriculture</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) (con't)	<p>As drafted, Section 2.2.4 allows for new farm parcels subject to both the severed and remnant parcels having a minimum lot area of 10 ha. The current provincial standard for minimum lot size in specialty crop areas is 40 acres (16.2 ha), as noted in the Greenbelt Plan area. The County should consider revising the minimum lot size policies in the Special Agriculture section of their OP to be more consistent with the provincial standard as applied in the Greenbelt Plan area and elsewhere in the province.</p> <p>Further discussion is warranted regarding the implementation of MDS at the local level (e.g. building permits for livestock operations in the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area.</p> <p>As drafted, it appears the policies of Section 2.8.3 require test holes to be dug for barns in order to address the need of providing an EIS. In accordance with Section 2.3.3.1 of the PPS, existing agricultural uses should be permitted as-of-right, and new agricultural uses should not be subject to a Planning Act application process.</p> <p>OMAFRA suggests, and MAH supports the suggestion, that the term 'Utilities' should be defined. More specifically, it is suggested the term 'utilities' be defined in accordance with, or similar to, the PPS definition of 'Infrastructure'.</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA/A – It was indicated in previous comments that OMAFRA would have discussions with NEC regarding this matter. County staff looks forward to the results of this discussion.</p> <p>NA/A – See Section 2.8.1</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) (con't)	<p>OMAFRA considers a small scale wind energy facility in an agricultural area as generally having a maximum name plate capacity of 500kW, not 50kW or less as per Section 5.1.3.10 (b). OMAFRA suggests 50kW may be more appropriate for a hamlet or village area, however, a typical farm scale for small energy generation systems is in the range of 1 to 300 kW. In light of this, OMAFRA suggests the County may wish to consider policies that deal with lot coverage rather than wattage with respect to defining small scale energy generation systems which are secondary to the farm use or agriculture-related uses.</p> <p><b><u>6.19 Definitions - OMAFRA staff recommend the following changes:</u></b></p> <p><i>Agriculture-related Uses</i> - this definition needs to be modified to be consistent with the PPS definition. That is the farm-related commercial or industrial uses must be small scale, directly related to the farm operation and required in close proximity to the farm operation not to farm operations.</p> <p><i>Commercial Scale Energy Generation Systems</i> - this definition should reflect our previous comments. That is, change 300kW to 500kW or define these systems as primarily intended to supply electricity to the electrical transmission grid.</p> <p><i>Prime Agricultural Area</i> - this definition could be read to preclude the designation of additional prime agricultural areas in the County. The definition should be changed to be consistent with the PPS definition.</p> <p><i>Prime Agricultural Land</i> - this definition is not consistent with the PPS and should be changed to the PPS definition for prime agricultural land.</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA – Prime Agricultural Areas have already been mapped as part of Schedule A (Agricultural and Special Agriculture designations)</p> <p>NA – County staff are of the opinion that the definition provided is consistent with the PPS definition.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) (con't)	<p><i>Small Scale</i> - to be consistent with the PPS, this definition needs to be modified to include the words "agriculture-related" in front of the words "commercial" and "industrial" for prime agricultural areas.</p> <p><i>Small Scale Energy Generation Systems</i> -this definition should reflect our previous comments. That is, change 300kW to 500kW or define these as non-commercial systems primarily intended to generate electricity for the property owner.</p> <p><i>Utilities or Infrastructure</i> - should be defined in accordance with the PPS.</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>
Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing (MAH)	<p><b>Section 2.3.3(f)</b> relating to "resource-based recreational uses" should be clarified. The County may want to consider moving Section 2.3.3(j) forward to follow 2.3.3 (f) as this may assist in clarifying the intent of the earlier policy.</p> <p>The definition of "resources-based recreational uses" lists the designations where the use is permitted. It is recommended this list be removed from the definition and included in the appropriate permitted uses policies of the OP.</p> <p><b>Section 2.6</b> defines and distinguishes between 'primary settlement areas', 'secondary settlement areas' and 'tertiary settlement areas'. MAH notes the 'primary settlement area' definition addresses servicing. However, the 'secondary' and 'tertiary' settlement areas definitions do not address servicing. For consistency purposes, MAH staff recommend that servicing should be addressed as part of the definitions for 'secondary' and 'tertiary' settlement area.</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>NA – the servicing types for Secondary and Tertiary Settlement Areas vary and therefore it would be difficult to address specific's with respect to servicing.</p>	



NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing (MAH) (con't)	<p>MAH suggests the County ensure the intensification targets contained in the Official Plan are established in consultation with the area municipalities.</p> <p>To satisfy the requirements of Section 1.4.3 of the PPS, a minimum affordable target must be established in the County of Grey's Official Plan.</p> <p><b>Section 2.6.5.3</b> - The Ministry recommends that the County consider adding a third condition: c) providing the development is within the existing urban area; as Section 1.6.4.5 of the PPS only allows for new development on partial services for infilling and rounding out of existing development.</p> <p><u>Section 2.6.7 (Recreational Resort Area)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Ministry recommends avoiding the use of the term "new settlement area" as this could suggest that the County has undertaken a process including a comprehensive review to recognize these areas.</li> <li>- the first paragraph of this section and subsection <b>(1)</b> appear to be the same, and to prevent repetition one should be deleted.</li> </ul>	<p>A – local municipalities have been involved and consulted with throughout the process of the five year review.</p> <p>- See Section 1.8 (Housing Policies) – more discussion with the Province needs to occur with respect to the Housing policies</p> <p>NA – this policy only applies to lands designated as Tertiary Settlement Area and therefore the suggested condition would not be necessary</p> <p>A</p> <p>A</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing (MAH) (con't)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subsection <b>(2)</b> states that "new development in the designation must serve the public interest by contributing to the provision of... accommodating existing un-serviced development areas and areas with development potential". It is recommended that the phrase "within the existing designation or settlement area" be added to the end of this statement; as it would appear to Ministry staff, that as currently drafted, this statement could be seen as promoting future settlement area expansions to nearby rural/agricultural lands that may be considered to be 'unserviced development areas' and/or areas to have 'development potential' given there close proximity.</li> <li>- Subsection <b>(3)</b> - It is recommended that the County clarify the intent of these policies, specifically regarding the acquisition of new lands and the promotion of urban boundary expansions. In addition it is unclear how the Residential Resort Area designation differs from a "resource based recreational use". Clarification is required.</li> <li>- Further it is also noted that there are no policies for Section <b>2.6.7</b> that speak to any of the following: permitted uses; servicing; applicability of site plan control; minimum lot size, other development criteria, etc. It is recommend that the County consider developing additional policies to address these types of matters.</li> </ul> <p>The Ministry recommends that until such time the County becomes a prescribed municipality, that Section 6.16.1 (Community Improvement Plans – Implementation) be deleted in its entirety.</p>	<p>A</p> <p>NA – Recreational Resort Areas will be on full services. Development associated with resource based recreational use development could be developed on private services and would be on a much smaller scale than the Recreational Resort Area development</p> <p>NA – The Recreational Resort Area designation only exists in the Town of The Blue Mountains and the Municipality of Grey Highlands. Detailed policies regarding the designated areas will be developed as part of the Local Official Plans for these municipalities.</p> <p>A – Already changed in October Version. It should be noted that the criteria included is for local municipalities.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
<p>Ministry of Municipal Affairs &amp; Housing (MAH) (con't)</p>	<p>The Ministry recommends that Section <b>6.16.3</b> be changed to state the following "Community Improvement Plans will be submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for review and comment."</p> <p>Section 6.18 (Complete Application) provides details regarding the required information or studies on the basis of the type of application being submitted. Other municipalities have incorporated complete application policies on the basis of the physical environment. For example, if development is proposed within 120 metres of a provincially significant wetland, an Environmental Impact Study is required. The County may wish to consider this alternative approach.</p> <p><u>Section 6.19 – Definitions</u>  <i>Adjacent Lands</i> - It is noted that the proposed definition for adjacent lands also includes general adjacent land width distances for various features. It would appear that this list is in fact policy. It is recommended that the list of adjacent land widths be moved into the main policy sections of the O.P, a possible location could be within the complete application policies.</p> <p><i>Resource Based Recreational Uses</i> - As mentioned previously this definition appears to include policy content. More specifically the definition lists the designations where the use is permitted. It is recommended that this list be removed from the definition and included in the appropriate permitted uses policies of the OP.</p> <p>it is recommended that the County add a policy to the Official Plan giving direction to the lower tier municipalities to be able to prepare and adopt a property standards by-law</p>	<p>A</p> <p>NA – County staff’s opinion is that there would be too many scenarios with the suggested method. The requirements for studies are covered off through the policies found throughout the Plan.</p> <p>A – County staff recommend that the setback distances be included in the appropriate policies in Section 2.8.</p> <p>A</p> <p>A – Already added in the October version of the draft OP policies (Section 6.15 – Maintenance &amp; Occupancy Standards)</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
<p>Ministry of Municipal Affairs &amp; Housing (MAH) (con't)</p>	<p>Employment Land policies - as drafted it, does not appear that the proposed amendment specifically identifies what is considered to be an employment area for the purposes of the County of Grey, which is required under Section 1.3 of the PPS.</p> <p><b>Settlement Boundary Changes</b> - It is understood that the County is proposing certain reductions for some settlement areas on partial or private services and certain expansions for some fully serviced settlement areas. More specifically it is understood that settlement area expansions are now being proposed for the City of Owen Sound, the Town of Hanover, and the Town of Meaford, among many others. Section 1.1.3.9 of the PPS permits planning authorities to identify a settlement or allow the expansion of a settlement area boundary only at the time of a comprehensive review, and only where a number of criteria have been satisfied. As previously discussed, the PPS does not permit the 'swapping' of settlement area lands, either within an existing settlement area or between settlement areas. The Ministry has little concern with the removal and/or reduction of current settlement area boundaries. With respect to proposed settlement area boundary expansions, while the Ministry understands the rationale for the proposed expansions, the policy requirements of Section 1.1.3.9 of the PPS must be addressed. In order to satisfy these requirements the Ministry will require documentation in the form of a comprehensive review to support the proposed amendments. Ministry staff would be please to discuss the scope of the comprehensive review with Grey County Planning Staff.</p>	<p>A – definition of Employment Lands has been included and staff will recommend changing the policies related to Employment Lands</p> <p>NA/A – County staff agree that a comprehensive review is required for expansions to settlement areas. However, some of the expansions merely reflect revised settlement area boundaries as a result of previous annexations (i.e. City of Owen Sound and Town of Hanover). It should also be noted the proposed changes to the Town of Meaford boundary reflect the settlement area boundary changes approved in the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan.</p>	<p>No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)</p>

NAME of Individual or GROUP	Comment or Concern	County Staff Response (for consideration by P & CD) A=Agree/NA=Not Agree	P & CD Response (January 15, 2009)
Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing (MAH) (con't)	<b>First Nations Consultation</b> - The Ministry understands and encourages the County to continue efforts to consult with the Chippewas of Nawash, and/or the Chippewas of Saugeen or other First Nations in the area that you may be aware of and which may have an interest in Grey County's land use planning matters.	A	No action required, except for where staff indicate A (Agree)

## **1.8 HOUSING POLICY**

It is a policy of the County to encourage a wide variety of housing by type, size and tenure to meet projected demographic and market requirements of current and future residents of the County. These policies may be elaborated upon within local municipal official plans.

The County supports:

- a) intensification and redevelopment, primarily within Settlement Areas, and within other areas where an appropriate level of physical and social services are available subject to the policies of Section 5.3.  
In this regard the County will require that the intensification targets as set out in Table 7 be met;
- b) the provision of alternative forms of housing for special needs groups, where possible. Special needs groups may include, but are not limited to, seniors, physically or mentally challenged and low income earners;
- c) the maintenance and improvement of the existing housing stock. This will be encouraged through local maintenance and occupancy standards by-laws;
- d) the utilization of available programs and/or funding, if any, from applicable levels of government for assisted housing for households, including those with special needs, as well as programs to rehabilitate older residential areas; and
- e) housing accessible to lower and moderate income households. ~~In this regard the County will require that 20% of all housing be affordable. In the case of ownership housing, the least expensive is considered to be housing for which the purchase price is at least 10% below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area. The benchmark figure will change over time as a result of fluctuating mortgage rates, utility rates and stability of the housing market, over which the County has no control. The County will however monitor the benchmark on an annual basis.~~ In this regard accessory apartments, semi-detached, duplex, townhouse and low rise apartment units will provide the bulk of affordable housing opportunities and will likely be provided within settlement areas with appropriate levels of servicing being available. Outside of the settlement areas accessory apartments will be the most likely means of increasing housing affordability.

The County will encourage local municipalities and the building and development industry to develop innovative housing designs that stress flexibility in use, mix of compatible land uses, good environmental practices, and public safety to maintain a mix of housing by both type and tenure. ~~to reinforce the County's housing policies.~~

Local official plans shall include policies and designations to implement the policies of this Plan and the following:

- i) appropriate criteria for intensification and redevelopment including site plan provisions, locational and land use compatibility criteria;
- ii) policies to permit the conversion of larger single detached dwellings into multiple units
- iii) policies to preserve, improve, rehabilitate or redevelop older residential areas; and
- iv) policies which permit, subject to appropriate criteria and conditions, apartments in houses

To ensure that sufficient land is designated and available to accommodate the population and unit growth projections as well as to provide a range of housing types and densities, the County and/or the local municipalities shall maintain at all times the ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 10 years through residential intensification and redevelopment and if necessary, lands which are designated and available for residential development. Where new development is to occur, municipalities shall maintain land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a 3 year supply of residential units available through lands suitably zoned to facilitate residential intensification and redevelopment and land in draft approved and registered plans.

The County will, in conjunction with the local municipalities, monitor and maintain a data base indicating consumption rates of residential lands and residential growth.

The County may undertake a Housing Study in order to develop a comprehensive strategy to deal effectively with affordable housing.