



Official Plan Review

Our Town, Our Plan

MERIDIAN
PLANNING

8888 Keele Street, Unit #6,
Vaughan, Ontario L4K 2N2

STEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES

JANUARY 9, 2013, 9:30 AM TO NOON

Municipal Building Committee Room
32 Mill Street, Thornbury, ON
Steering Committee Meeting #10

PRESENT: John Corrigan, Duncan McKinlay, Scott Taylor, R. B. Waind,
Mark Stone and David Finbow.

ABSENT: Nick McDonald

1. Approval of Agenda

Moved by: Duncan McKinlay Seconded by: John Corrigan

THAT the Official Plan Review Steering Committee agenda for January 9, 2013 be approved, **CARRIED**

2. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

None at this time.

3. Approval of DRAFT Minutes of December 18, 2012 (Steering Committee Meeting #9)

Moved by: Duncan McKinlay Seconded by: Scott Taylor

THAT the Official Plan Review Steering Committee minutes of December 18, 2012 be approved, **CARRIED**

4. Review and Discussion of Steering Committee comments on draft Official Plan

Mark Stone thanked everyone for their detailed comments on the draft Official Plan and advised that we would have a mapping discussion at the end of the meeting today.

Mark suggested we go through Scott Taylor's comments line per line

Scott Taylor advised that his comments contained minor changes only.

David Finbow advised that he agrees with going through comments made by everyone.

John Corrigan advised that Schedule "A" in the current plan is a larger format and suggested it should remain at 11 x 17 with the balance at 8 ½ x 11.

David advised that all schedules will be 11 x 17. You will be able to access the PDF's via internet so one could zoom into the area they wish to see. David advised there will be a computer screen at the planning counter for Planners to help people with their questions.

David advised that there was some merit in exploring further sub-schedules similar to A-2, A-3, etc.

John advised that some people are on dial up and have problems pulling documents off and suggested a combination would be a good idea.

John advised that Schedule A1 is much better in the larger scale.

John expressed concern with Schedule "B" which is Roads and expressed a concern for the public in the urban area.

Duncan asked if we need Schedule "B" 1 & 2 on the transportation plan to show certain areas in better detail.

Mark suggested they can provide this but it can also be viewed on the internet in a PDF format.

R B Waind noted that Monterra Road is shown as a collector road. David advised that it currently is noted as a County Road and therefore, if anything, it is being downgraded re traffic.

John suggested a cross reference that they are available as a PDF file.

Mark advised that there is a meeting later today with David and Andy Sorensen from Grey Sauble to talk about the hazard lands to reconcile boundaries etc. and they will make the changes as needed.

R B Waind suggested there was some talk about The Depot being a gateway to the community as well and asked if it should be shown on the map.

Mark advised that the Committee agreed to add this circle.

Duncan asked where the constraint mapping came from and questioned the karst topography.

R B Waind noted it is fractured bedrock.

David advised it is thin overburden and underlying rock that is fractured to allow for seepage. David confirmed this is from the County.

Scott advised the karst mapping is the best they have and suggested that shallow overburden is less than 1 metre.

R B Waind suggested the County is good in their comments i.e. existing development and it has been looked at. Comments like a test hole might be required and not an Environmental Impact Study and suggested that a lot of existing development has had to deal with this.

David advised that OPA 80 changed the County policies with respect to karst and advised that it brings in the provisions that if it is a fully serviced subdivision you do not worry about them.

R B Waind suggested that the constraint mapping should reference the Provincially Significant Wetlands.

Mark advised that it can and he will add these onto the constraint map.

Duncan asked about Areas of Natural or Scientific Interest.

Mark suggested we put them on a legend as per Schedule “A”.

Duncan suggested we put them on the constraint mapping and then they are all in one place.

Mark agreed.

David advised that he will look at the Tyrolean Lowlands OMB hearing decision with respect to the final Board Order and wetlands.

David advised that on the current Official Plan for the fire hall in Craighleith it is shown as open space and if you go into GIS and remove the layer it will show as Institutional with the piece to the south being Open Space.

David noted we received numerous pieces of correspondence that are site specific and noted they will need to apply for site specific Official Plan Amendments and we will go through the merits of each.

John Corrigan’s comments.

Page 4 – the current County Plan has been approved so identify this.

Mark noted there is a general reference already and there is no need to say that it has been approved.

David advised that our population has decreased to approximately 6500 so 7000 is not accurate.

Mark advised that he has looked at County Growth Management work which talks about estimated number of seasonal dwellings.

Page 6 – get the PUDSS document included even though it has not been approved by Council.

David advised this was rolled into the Community Design Guidelines as part of the Official Plan and suggested there has been some word smithing.

Page 18 - talking about geographic area. John noted this does not apply to the rural area.

Mark suggested that in planning terms, it is talking about all types of housing so it is across the board. There are still housing needs in the rural area.

David suggested that the Provincial Policy Statement indicates the municipality should plan for a mix of housing and suggested this is a critical piece to fit the policies into the PPS.

Page 16 – new River Trail to Clendenin Dam should be identified.

David noted it is part of the trails system so it is covered already. David noted the need to add significance to the Georgian Trail.

Page 21 – this is okay as details are provided someplace else.

David noted the Old Lakeshore area is identified as a future secondary plan area and should be noted as a special policy area. A Secondary Plan is an area that is not within the current growth horizon and advised that Old Lakeshore is already designated for growth under our current OP.

Page 22 – what about other hamlets such as Redwing.

David suggested our wording should be consistent with the County of Grey document.

Scott noted there are a number of hamlets. Scott confirmed that when they did the 80 update, they did take a number off the map because they are not the focus of growth within the County. Some areas were put into a settlement plan area and some others got removed from the map.

John noted these are some that are identified in the County map.

Page 27 – appropriate minimum distance.

Mark noted that adult entertainment is an approved policy and that distances in the Zoning By-law sets out specific parameters.

Page 30 – Bed & Breakfast should be limited to 3 bedrooms.

David noted that the Zoning By-law tells people how many bedrooms they are restricted to and noted that the Ontario Building Code and the Fire Code may address additional requirements.

R B Waind suggested it be three rentable bedrooms.

David advised that the Collingwood Township Official Plan and the Thornbury Official Plan are different in this area.

Page 34 – infilling in stable residential areas. David and Mark have discussed this since our last meeting. David suggested we move forward with the current draft and include infilling policies for development within an established built up area.

David suggested that an example of an infill project would be a project bordered on 2, 3 or 4 sides by existing development.

Mark suggested we are looking for approval to circulate to the agencies at the Council meeting on the 21st.

Duncan suggested that multiples should be located where you can walk to grocery store and the bank.

David suggested that Page 34 talks about infilling and intensification in existing residential neighbourhoods and asked how do you do that? Do we refer to the Schedule for residential neighbourhoods and what do we include and what don't we include

John noted that affordable housing is a concern.

R B Waind suggested that we would have a bigger challenge if we put circles around it.

Duncan asked if we would have any new commercial development with an apartment above.

John suggested that Bruce Street North is approved for this.

Duncan suggested that this makes sense to buy a building and live above it.

David advised that on the Terrasan project, the Developer promoted residential units above commercial space. David suggested we leave our plan the way it is, define what an established residential neighbourhood is. Criteria looked up for current residential infilling designations and talk about lot fabric etc. Significant mapping exercise as they are caught by infilling policies.

David suggested we could go through the Town and do this.

Duncan noted it is likely what the public will demand is a map to see that my neighbourhood is safe.

David noted the need to justify why the land is drawn here and not here and noted we still need to define this.

John asked is it worth us trying to identify areas if we can do it but suggested we have to deal with affordable housing somehow.

Duncan suggested that the Bruce Street corridor is good and suggested we put it to the public and see where it goes.

John suggested that in 2013 we have some area set aside for affordable housing.

Duncan agrees but suggested we are not talking about this now. Duncan asked where is it infilling and where is it new development.

2.1 – page 11 – okay with specific policies.

3.2 – stable residential areas – okay with this.

R B Waind asked what the public comments on these documents were.

John suggested that emerging developments is an issue and suggested we identify these areas.

David advised that we are already there and noted the yellow tells you where people are going to live. David suggested that we now need to drill down to what kind of housing will be there. David suggested we discuss if they are emerging residential neighbourhoods or are they existing residential neighbourhoods and we also need to identify the criteria.

Duncan suggested the multiples should be focused around services.

David suggested the need have to plan for a range of uses and what is walkable.

Scott suggested setting a lot size for emerging development.

R B Waind suggested that is the way people are thinking in Thornbury.

Duncan said if you are still living at home but could pay rent for \$750.00 in Thornbury, young people would move out tomorrow.

John feels we need to eliminate question marks. John felt that the area which he lives could be an affordable housing area.

Mark noted that the Newmarket plan appears that they would call this area a stable residential area because of the area across the road.

David suggested townhouses need to respect the mass in the area and have collector or arterial road in close proximity.

R B Waind asked if we needed to include a parcel size.

Duncan suggested that if they want something different they would then need an Official Plan Amendment.

On page 38 the names should read Hillcrest Drive and Cedar Run.

On page 56 there is a mapping issue and it is hard to see.

John advised that he likes the way it is laid out. John noted the format is missing on Page 64, Page 56 needs locations and on page 67 there is a typing error. Page 70 identifies properties designated and they are hard to find and page 72 has a paragraph missing.

Mark noted that on page 79 the secondary plan area replaces the DD designation.

On page 139 it define the roads and OPA 24 provides details on construction, widths and sidewalks etc.

Duncan advised this is within the Engineering Standards.

David advised it is not captured on this plan and indicated that EPW are finding that 20 metres is too narrow for a local road. David further indicated that the Town's current OP indicates that local roads are 20 metres, collector roads are 26 metres with others being 30 metres.

Mark agrees there should be a new section here.

R B Waind suggested it is counterproductive to not deal with this now.

Mark will add it back in.

Page 140 and 154 is done, Page 178 requires the posting of signs on properties and we should add this into the Official Plan.

Scott suggested that many of his comments need not be discussed and if anyone had questions they could talk to Scott.

Mark agrees with comments in Scott's submission.

David questioned if we require a designation for Estate and Farm Winery.

Scott has no issue with the policies but advised it is not specifically outlined in the County Official Plan that a winery is a permitted use in the agriculture designation. Scott advised to get a small scale use in the County Official Plan you would need to be 50 acres. A winery would have lots less than 50 acres and advised they did not contemplate this in the Agriculture Designation but did in the Specialty Agriculture Designation.

Mark suggested we are trying to encourage farm related uses and asked Scott to look at this. Mark suggested he would talk to Scott where we do not conform with the upper tier on this matter.

Scott confirmed they are looking at the Speciality Ag. designation.

Mark asked if we proceed as is or think about it.

Scott suggested it is okay to go in a draft for now and he can raise again in future comments.

Secondary Apartments – Scott confirmed that Jordan and Randy are almost there at looking at apartments in houses, granny flats and garden suites. They are working through this into an OPA in the current OP and will bring into this OP.

Duncan's Comments

#1 has been covered.

#2 okay with it as printed.

Duncan asked if the Natural Environment is everything that is not farm land as noted on Page 12.

David suggested Duncan see 3.6 and advised he wants some prominence in the plan dealing with local Ag.

Duncan asked what our goal is. Duncan asked if we needed statements that say preserve land and promote it to the full potential.

Scott advised that on Page 15 under the goals statement, suggests we supplement this with a.6.2.

Duncan would be okay with this addition.

Duncan advised that Section 6.2 talks about land stewardship and asked if this can be done in the Official Plan. Duncan advised there is all kinds of good ground that needs to be tile drained which has 2 nine foot gates, 17' wide and no planters and the township will not give them a field entrance which is the only way to get into the farm. Duncan questioned the utilization of lands in spite of ownership.

David suggested we look at the Right to Farm Act wording.

Mark will come up with some wording on this.

Duncan is not sure we are promoting this in the Official Plan.

David noted that lands being developed for the 50 acre estates are designated rural instead of agricultural. David suggested that looking at the strategic objectives; they still may have capacity for agricultural purposes.

Duncan is talking more about a nutrient management plan etc. which the bank wants to see.

Duncan asked about nature cabins etc. and asked if we encourage outfitters and guides to take ownership of these lands.

Duncan asked about Section 3.7.16 – Thornbury serviced employments lands and asked if there was enough flexibility in our rural and hamlets that real service providers can locate into.

Duncan questioned Section 3.8.1 on Page 17 with respect to a sand dome.

David suggested he can put this in under Section 24.4 in the Planning Act and it will comply with the Official Plan.

Duncan suggested that a works yard is as important as the works in the ground.

David suggested we are well covered in the Official Plan and noted the implementing Zoning By-law needs to be looked at.

Duncan asked about mineral aggregate and asked how it applies to quarry rock.

Duncan asked if Section 3.10.2 is the Ministry's job.

David noted the need to have policies in our plan but provincial legislation will prevail. David asked how the County is doing this on a new or existing operation.

Scott advised that nobody has been successful on an existing one. A new operation is treated on a case-by-case basis, based on operational and road conditions. Scott advised the County is talking about coming up with a standard to say this is what we will ask for and what we need to see done. They can ask for capital upgrades with respect to the entrance and other upgrades they would be required to pay a portion of these. Delegations with the Ministry have heard that operators will pay more as long as everybody is paying the same.

David asked Scott if the County asked for anything for a recent pit operation that was approved at the local level.

Duncan has a problem with the whole Speciality Agriculture provisions being too narrow as outlined in Section 8.4.2.1.2 on Page 22.

David noted that lands that are designated rural will end up becoming agriculture because of what they have added.

Scott advised that Southgate did this when they did their Official Plan.

Duncan is okay with Rural Employment Lands.

Duncan asked why you cannot make a living in the rural area.

Scott noted the need to ensure they make sense there. Scott suggested a trucking yard could be used as you are not looking at additional services.

Scott suggested that we do not pre-designate these lands. If you have 6 trucks you can run a business here and Scott advised that he does see merit in this. Scott suggested this use is better suited in a settlement area.

Duncan advised our wording is more restrictive than the County wording.

David suggested we could remove the word exist.

Scott talked about secondary uses that go beyond small scale and suggested a high use of services is not appropriate but a limited use would be valid.

Duncan referenced Page 25 where we talk about putting stuff on the water towers. Duncan confirmed that The Ministry of the Environment is not happy with us doing this.

David asked about the current and proposed land use designation for Tomahawk and how we can address this so that our operations conform.

Duncan suggested that we do not change Garden Suites.

Duncan suggested that B.1.8 Home Occupation is too restrictive and suggested we add garage or accessory building.

Mark is okay with this and advised that the Zoning By-law will have restrictions on this as well. Mark and David will revisit this section.

Duncan suggested that Section B.2.4 - private recreational uses in the Agriculture Area is satisfactory as long as it does not take away from the Agriculture Designation.

Scott suggested this was difficult when it comes to PPS which allows for a secondary use in agriculture designation. Scott suggested this is defined in a broad fashion. People will think this is okay as long as it does not interfere with their orchard. Scott questioned what happens when this succeeds or he wants to expand. Scott felt that to allow it for recreation uses in the agriculture designation, they can take out their farm and allow a race track, which could be problematic.

Mark noted that farm related tourism establishments could be important to some farm operations.

Duncan asked what Section B.1.5.1 B3.1.5 views and vistas means. Duncan suggested that if you have an infill development area within an established residential area, the only view you have is straight up.

Mark advised that you can have policies in Official Plan for this.

R B Waind advised that the Niagara Escarpment Commission has set up a view shed analysis.

David agrees to remove this.

Duncan advised that he is worried about collector roads as it seems to get people worked up when they are talked about.

David advised that he would like to find a means to address larger built forms obstructing views of the Bay.

Section 3.1.5.2 – prohibits any multiples.

Duncan noted that on Page 36 we limit to 2 storeys and asked if you can build it as a 3 storey unit as long as this is not a full prohibition.

David questioned why we restricted this.

Duncan advised there will not likely be another nursing home in Thornbury as Provincial policy is detrimentally affecting current operators.

David noted that 11 metres for multiples in height and suggested we delete this all together.

Duncan asked what emergency housing is as noted on Page 37. This does not say the County cannot use the BVCC if needed but does prohibit motels, hotels and bed and breakfasts and asked if this would make it illegal.

Duncan asked if Section B.3.6 on Page 49 does this include doctor and chiropractors etc.

Duncan suggested that Section B.3.7.1 Resort Recreational should have different kinds of housing and should be more positive.

Mark suggests that we add what Duncan has written as a second bullet into the plan.

Duncan questioned if Section B.37.42 lot creation conflicted with Section 3A.4.23 on Page 52.

Duncan questioned if Section 41.41 is creating surplus farm dwellings and wondered if the County would allow this.

Duncan asked if Section 41.42 on Page 85 dealing with surplus farm consents and he does not agree with this.

Mark asked Scott if these are county policies.

Scott advised yes and it deals with the implementation when a farm house is set back from the road and there is 5 metres on either side of the driveway and you take out buildings at the back if you need to.

Duncan suggested we include a building envelope and buffer and questioned why an agricultural operation should have to provide the buffer.

Mark suggests we deal with the setbacks via the Zoning By-law.

Duncan asked on Page 86 why it has to be existing and why if cannot be serviced.

David agreed with Duncan's comment.

Scott suggested it should be within the farm building cluster and advised you cannot create 2 MDR areas. Scott advised the intent is not to discourage farm help by that and suggested that number c needs to be changed.

David advised that he likes this and we should put wording in for this.

Duncan suggested that on Page 92 rural area that we should protect the rural character.

Duncan questioned if a few of the new uses are compatible with the uses in the rural areas and advised that he has trouble with this. He suggested they be sustainable but does not have to be the same.

Mark suggested that if we take out a and b, it then should blend in.

David does not agree with taking it out.

Duncan suggests that we ensure in Section 1.3.4.5. that there are guarantees in place so the septic system does not fail and asked what act or authority could we manage those.

David advised that the Building Code Act talks about the ability of a re-inspection program if needed but advised he is okay with f & g coming out.

Duncan asked why not approve appropriate new uses or rezoning for a new use in hamlets in Section 4.5.1 on Page 99.

David suggested that you can also have a communal system.

Duncan asked if outdoor storage should be screened from the public on Page 100.

Mark suggested this would be a municipal decision.

Duncan agrees that some things will be out of site but you should be able to display a finished good.

Mark suggested we give flexibility to Council and suggested things can still be appropriately screened through the Site Plan Approval process.

Duncan asked why include highway traffic on Page 101.

Mark suggested that we remove it.

Duncan asked if the species at risk are endangered species with respect to Section B.5.2.1. on Page 108.

Scott indicated yes.

Duncan asked if in Section 5.7.3b permitted uses in open space if this would include nature cabins etc.

David advised that these are areas owned by the Province.

Duncan asked what about Kolapore Uplands.

David advised there is nothing that says you cannot have overnight camping and it would not preclude this.

David asked item d) Wildlife Management is it according to Ministry of Natural Resources or who.

Duncan questioned if it precluded harvest of that management as regulated by MNR.

Mark will check this out and advise.

David advised that Council needs a full update which will be a lengthy presentation specific to Council. This meeting would start at 7:00.

Duncan asked if we needed a special meeting or would it be a workshop. Duncan advised that a council workshop environment works well. Duncan advised that in this instance the public could gain insight for further follow-up in a public forum. Duncan suggested a Public Open House follow at a later date. Duncan advised that the public has access to this document the day it is presented to Council.

Duncan questioned the hazardous slopes on page 124 and noted it talks about setbacks from the top of the slope. Duncan asked what about the tow of the slope.

Mark advised that they will discuss matter with Andy Sorensen from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.

David advised that the Niagara Escarpment Commission have a proposed amendment to the Niagara Escarpment Plan which will run contrary to this provision.

Duncan suggested on page 131 where it deals with sensitive lands and noise that we add in the wording normal farming practices.

Section 13.2 should talk about hydro substations etc.

Duncan suggested that d.1.2 on page 134 talks about Clarksburg as a servicing area. Duncan confirmed that Council decided against servicing and questions if Clarksburg should be on the list.

David suggests that we delete the last sentence in first paragraph.

Duncan suggested that under Section D.2.3.1 Roads on page 140 there needs to be another category which talks about agreement roads and places where people use it like a road but it is not a road.

Mark suggested not assumed roads. Mark asked if the wording on the next page helps or do we want an additional policy.

David suggested that we are not giving them formal recognition.

Section B.5.5 on Page 155 again talks about views and vistas. Is this saying that hedge rows and existing farm fences will be maintained where possible?

Mark advised that is for Planning Act approvals i.e.: Consents, Zoning By-law and Official Plan Amendments. Mark confirmed this is speaking about farm uses and will make the change.

Duncan questioned the environmental requirements i.e. windbreaks. Duncan confirmed that our farmers have to compete with the Huron County guys who have larger acreages.

David advised that the current Official Plan encourage consents to follow a current features including fence rows and felt it was not critical to keep d. in and will look about policies.

Duncan questioned item d.5.5.e non-residential uses and talked about buildings set far back from the road and the need for trucks coming in and out.

Mark will delete this section.

Duncan asked if we are encouraging the Bruce Trail and discouraging other uses on page 158.

Section D.6.3.5f Trail ways should not limit adjacent land uses and these need to be stated.

David suggested the preamble needs to be minimized with conflicts.

This section comes out of the Sustainable Path document. It was suggested that we acknowledge it and move on.

Duncan suggested that Section D.8.6 water conservation discourages 2 water supplies on the same properties. Duncan suggested that the Building Code Act encourages harvesting rain water. Duncan asked if you can use grey water for food production.

Duncan asked about Section E.3.4.1 on page 183 and suggested we shall enact that the minimum standards be changed to enact a property standards by-law.

David suggested to change “shall” to “may”.

Duncan asked what discontinued means in Section 5.3.

Duncan confirmed that he is satisfied with the definitions.

With respect to Page 214 prime agriculture lands, Duncan asked about a treatment centre and asked why the Niagara Escarpment Commission would disallow this.

On page 36 where it deals with pre-zoning of certain lands, Mark suggested this is an area where you want to encourage other forms of housing and we could pre-zone parcels with policies to deal with it.

R B Waind asked what pre-zoning would do to Deferred Development and Development designations. The Deferred Development designation could

be one residential unit and Development designation would be an application.

David's comments

David advised that his comments are self explanatory. If upon reading his comments you have questions, please ask.

The Committee concurred that the next circulation to Council is on board for early February.