August 28th,  2019

Mr. Nathan Westendorp,
Director of Planning and Development Services,
Town of the Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, Box 310
Thornbury, Ontario
N0H 2P0

RE: Staff Report # PDS.19.94
Preliminary Property Options for Attainable Housing

Dear Mr. Westendorp,

We own property located at Carmichael Crescent in the Town of Blue Mountains. I am writing to you in regard to the above noted Staff Report.

First let me say we are all wholly supportive of the Town’s efforts to promote attainable housing in Blue Mountains. We realize that all residents of various income segments require a place to live.

We note the Attainable Housing Corporation in conjunction with staff have identified for preliminary consideration several potential sites. Option # 3 located at the intersection of Jozo Weider Blvd and Gord Canning Drive is an open space block adjacent to our homes.

This site is located across from the Blue Mountain Village Resort Area Core and it is designated Blue Mountain Village Resort Area Open Space.

The Blue Mountain Village is a master planned community wherein the prominent use of land is for residential and recreational uses. The Open Space designation is intended for public and private parks, recreational and cultural facilities. Open space is an integral component of this master planned community. Open space blocks encourage passive and active recreational uses and they support the pedestrian linkage system which connects the compact Village Core to the adjacent residential communities.

The total number of residential, commercial resort units and hotel/motel units planned for Blue Mountain Village can reach up to 1290 units.
Within the Blue Mountain Village Resort Core designation alone the total retail and service commercial space can reach up to 9,300 metres square and 300 residential units.

Access to high-quality public open space is a key ingredient of healthy livable communities particularly in areas with higher density such as Blue Mountains Village. This need for abundant open space adjacent to higher density communities has long been recognized in government planning policy. The need for open space is based on a large body of academic research showing that accessible green spaces lead to better health outcomes.

Understanding how best to achieve these benefits, and the trade-offs involved in delivering them, is particularly important today.

Blue Mountain Village is growing rapidly toward the ultimate end state of over 1200 residential units. Preserving these designated Open Space blocks within Blue Mountain Village is a critical component to achieve the community vision and guiding principles upon which the master plan was conceived.

For these reasons, and other established “good planning” objectives, the site selection criteria in Report PDS:19.94 clearly and unequivocally states that potential sites for attainable housing should “avoid parkland or open space lands”.

We agree and we respectively request that Option Number 3 located at the intersection of Gord Canning Drive and Jozo Weider Boulevard be omitted from potential sites under consideration for attainable housing.

As set out above we support the Town's efforts to promote attainable housing in Blue Mountains and we look forward to actively participating in the public process leading to site selection.

We respectively request that we be notified of all future meetings and reports concerning this matter and that we received notice to any decisions made by Town Council concerning site selection for attainable housing.

Yours truly,

Mark Godman

copy Ms. Corrina Giles
Town Clerk
To Town of Blue Mountain Council and Planning Department

We strongly object to the inclusion of Option 3 Gord Canning Drive Parkland as an option for any development. This public land is the ONLY open public parkland available to the Taxpaying Residents and the Area Visitors. All the other 'space' is privately owned by the Alterra Corporation owned by Aspen Skiing Company and KSL Capital Partners, LLC. Thus, we the voting, tax paying residents, have no where else to throw a football, run with our children etc. other than the Gord Canning Park. As well, it is the ONLY public space where visitors can picnic, since they are no allowed to do so on the Corporation owned property.

The nearest next public space available to us is more than 2 KM away, over on Kandahar (which you are also looking to destroy). Building attainable housing on this Gord Canning Parkland is a travesty.

You should be looking to support Attainable Housing through Income Supplements. People who can't afford housing in the area have an income problem, not a housing problem. Government should be subsidising their income and just let them rent in the market.

This is clearly CORPORATE WELFARE for a multi-billion dollar AMERICAN corporation. The Proprietors should increase their wages such that their employees can afford housing and transportation.

Alterra Corporation should build its own housing, just as the Corporation had its own Staff Housing down the end of Arlberg Crescent [not that long ago]. Make the Multi-Billion Dollar Corporation pay to house its workers, not the Taxpayer.

And make Blue Mountain Resort put in some sidewalks before some gets killed.

kind regards,
Randy Milthorpe
Carmichael Cres,
ToBM
To Whom it May Concern and Councillor Rob Sampson

This email is in regards to the a proposed site for Attainable housing at Heritage Park.

I own 2 properties in this area, Settlers Way unit and Pioneer Lane. I use this park at least twice a day every day all year long. That this park is underused by the public is misinformation. There is no other public green space and park lands in this area. There are green spaces in abundance, the golf course, Blue Mountain Resort, Tyrolean village soccer fields, but they are all privately owned lands.

Based on this fact alone I am horrified that the Committee is even considering robbing the current owners and renters in this small community of its one and only park.

Kids are constantly playing in the jungle gym and groups of young men and women utilize the basketball court that was just a year ago installed.

I agree that Attainable housing is very important, but I am sure the Committee could find a more suitable location that doesn’t take away recreational green space from this small community. We have challenges already in this neighbourhood with Tyrolean village noise levels and the abundance of renters, but this park helps to moderate the situation. People play and gather here. I would love to see the Town consider the baseball diamond area for a dog park. (There is a tiny one for the guests at Blue Mountain Inn.) We do not have one dog park in this area and should not have to drive into another municipality to have our dog off leash. Dog parks bring a community group together and given that the baseball diamond does not get used as much as the other areas of the park I think this would be an ideal addition to Heritage Park. Many people that I have spoken to agree and now we hear that it will be just another development going in does not sit well.

Note, I pay close to $9,000 in taxes, have no children, and value both a place to gather with friends and a place to walk my dog. When I look around this community I am the norm. Please value our opinion.

So I am appealing to the Committee to reconsider the Heritage Park Site for the Attainable Housing.

Please add my email to be kept up to date with all pertinent information regarding this matter.

Regards
Susan Lee
Dear Mr. Sampson et al,

I am a homeowner and full time resident at [Settlers Way] and it has recently come to my attention that the Kandahar Park has been recently mentioned as a proposed site for new “attainable” housing.

This strikes me as odd as not long ago based on a simcoe.com news story (which I have provided the link to) suggested that “established” park properties had been stricken from the list in a motion passed by council.


However, members of council didn’t think it was a good idea to include parkland as part of the property search. They passed a motion to remove parkland from consideration for an attainable housing site. Staff will also work with the Attainable Housing Corporation to look at a list of potential sites, including private or government-own land.

If this motion was in fact passed how can the Heritage/Kandahar Park still be on the proposed list?

“Our parkland is a precious resource for our citizens,” said Deputy Mayor Odette Bartnicki.

Coun. Rob Sampson said “It doesn’t make any sense to me, to get rid of an already established park and move it somewhere else.”

In fact you were quoted in this article “It doesn’t make sense to me, to get rid of an already established park and move it somewhere else”. You then apparently contradicted your own statement in the attached “Heritage Park Article”... “Sampson said the park has a ball diamond and play area that is rarely used”.... “I would argue that we should leave it in.” Does this suggest that you don’t think that Heritage/Kandahar Park is an established park because I can assure you that the residents of the area certainly consider it as such and I believe it is zoned as such in the Town Plan. There is a multitude of activity that takes place in this park, with the (so called) under utilized area being very well utilized by children, young, middle aged and older adults alike playing games such as baseball, football, frisbee, soccer, as well as the most important (have you read about obesity in Children specifically and others in general) just having land to “play” on, etc. In addition there are many people who run their dogs in this park. Do you live close to this park, if not how often are you there to suggest that it is rarely used?

I can understand the need for attainable housing and this should be a joint project with the private sector. The organization (the largest employer in TBM) that will benefit most from this attainable housing is “Blue Mountain Village”. Perhaps an onus should be placed on them to develop more affordable property for their current and potential employees. We can be assured that they are not going to abandon this very highly sought out recreational property.

If it is felt that more “sustainable” housing is required in this “specific” area perhaps a joint project between Tyrolean Village, Blue Mountain Village and the Town of Blue Mountains make sense. Tyrolean
Village has a significant amount of undeveloped property that would certainly be a better option than an established park, the only one within walking distance of the many properties already in this residential area.

My family uses this park on a daily basis in the spring, summer and fall just for the open space and in winter it is part of our “out the door” cross country snow shoeing and I know many of our neighbours in the area use the park as a park... it is not a preferred site for more housing.

Thank you all for your service to the community.

Sincerely,

Gavin

Gavin M. Laws,

Phone: 

@rogers.com
BLUE MOUNTAINS EYES FIVE PROPERTIES FOR ATTAINABLE HOUSING PROJECT

JOHN EDWARDS
jedwards@simmoo.com

The Town of the Blue Mountains has five potential sites for its first attainable housing project.

A staff report on the properties was presented at a special committee-of-the-whole meeting on July 29.

Staff was directed last year to develop a list of criteria and properties that could be used for an attainable housing project.

The first property is the former school board lands, a 10-acre parcel of land located on Grey Road 19. The second property is the former waste disposal site located at 330 King St. in Thornbury. The third site is located near Blue Mountain Village on Gord Canning Drive, with the fourth being Heritage Park, located on Kandahar Lane.

All of these properties are owned by the municipality, but the fifth property is private land and the address has not been revealed.

Last year residents raised concerns when Moreau Park, the location of baseball diamonds in Thornbury, was included as a potential site for attainable housing.

While it was expected parkland to be off limits, director of planning Nathan Westerndrop said Heritage Park meets a number of the criteria for attainable housing.

Coun. Rob Sampson, chair of the Attainable Housing Corporation, felt the property should remain on the list.

The corporation will be developing a request for information (RFI) in the coming weeks in hopes of getting proposals from developers.

Sampson said the park has a play area and a ball diamond that is rarely used.

"I would argue we should leave it in," he said. "Developers may come back and say, 'It's too small.'"

Staff will be developing a parks master plan next year to look at all of the parkland in the municipality.

Coun. Rob Potter feels the town should "look for the highest and best use of the land."

Council is expected to debate the sites at a future meeting. The corporation is hoping to start construction on an attainable housing project next year.

The municipality has taken an aggressive stance on housing as it was a major issue in the last election.
Blue Mountains council says no to parkland for attainable housing site

NEWS Dec 10, 2018 by John Edwards  Collingwood Connection

An overflow crowd was on hand for the Committee of the Whole meeting on Monday. - John Edwards/Metroland

The Town of the Blue Mountains is moving forward with attainable housing.

But it won’t be built at Moreau Park.

Town staff brought forward a report that looked at town-owned land that could be used for the site of an attainable housing project.

The report included five sites, a former board of education property on Grey Road 19, a property on King Street, a property on Jozo Weider Boulevard, Heritage Park on Kandahar Lane and Moreau Park on Alfred Street, currently home to several baseball diamonds and a dog park.

An overflow crowd showed up to a committee of the whole meeting on Monday, many of whom were there to voice concerns over Moreau Park being on the list.

A group of about a dozen youngsters in baseball uniforms were in the front row, holding up signs.
Shawn Everitt, interim chief administrative officer (CAO) for the municipality, said staff was asked by the previous council to put together a list of potential sites and there were not any restrictions.

Everitt said they recognize the importance of the park and historical significance.

“The criteria is simply looking at properties that the town owns that are big enough to have an attainable housing project,” he said. “This report is only the beginning of a long process.”

However, members of council didn’t think it was a good idea to include parkland as part of the property search. They passed a motion to remove parkland from consideration for an attainable housing site. Staff will also work with the Attainable Housing Corporation to look at a list of potential sites, including private or government-own land.

“Our parkland is a precious resource for our citizens,” said Deputy Mayor Odette Bartnicki.

Coun. Rob Sampson said “It doesn’t make any sense to me, to get rid of an already established park and move it somewhere else.”

Mayor Alar Soever said a whisper campaign gave rise to the idea that Moreau Park was already picked as the site for attainable housing.

“It’s caused a lot of stress in the community,” he said. “There were some really malicious rumours and it caused a lot of sleepless nights.”

Attainable housing has been identified as a priority for the community and the town is looking at solving the issue.

Soever said the municipality is looking to Whistler as a model for attainable housing. He said British Columbia has a median house price of about $2.4 million and attainable house price is $750,000.

The report included potential prices for attainable housing units, ranging from $550 a month for one-bedroom apartments to $1,500 for a three-bedroom house.

Everitt said the town is in the early stages of an attainable housing plan, but they have received interest from the development community.
"I think attainable housing for The Blue Mountains is not one specific product," Everitt said. “What works in Craigleith may not work in Thornbury. This whole discussion about attainable housing is about opportunity.”

The Tourism Labour Supply Task Force has identified attainable housing as a barrier to attracting employees to the region.

Comments from Heather Macnaughton and David Dunphy

Full Time Residents/Owners in the Town of the Blue Mountains

Settlers Way,
Blue Mountains, ON
L9Y 0N9

Dear Councillor Sampson:

We are writing to express our views on one of the proposed sites for the Town of the Blue Mountains Attainable Housing Initiative. One of the possible sites has been identified as Heritage Park, a lovely park at the end of our street. Our area is known as Heritage Corners.

At the moment, besides the very small park at Crossan Court there are no other parks in the immediate area. It is the only public park outside of the urban areas of Collingwood and Thornbury with all of jungle gym and swing area for children, a baseball diamond and a basketball court as well as lots of land for picnics and other recreation.

Heritage Corners is a subdivision that was envisioned and built in the late 1980’s. The housing that was built then are single family chalets on good sized lots that are increasingly becoming permanent residences. Also there were several townhouse complexes built as well mainly for weekend use but again there are more and more people moving up and making this area their permanent homes. There are no 100% rental complexes in the area.

As well, the area backs onto Tyrollean Village which is mostly short term rentals but also has increasing numbers of owner occupied residences. Almost half of the chalets are owned by Tyrolean Village resorts with the other half owned by a couple of other rental companies or individuals. Many of the chalets are used on a seasonal basis, either by owners or renters.

We believe this parkland, Heritage Park, was donated to the Township of Collingwood (now part of the Town of the Blue Mountains) by the developer when the Heritage Corners subdivision was developed (after Tyrolean Village). This would be a likely scenario since developers are required to either donate parkland or cash in lieu of.

If this is the case, we do have a question as to whether the Town has the right to now use it for any kind of housing or must it remain a park.
**Current Usage of Heritage Park**

The park is used on a regular basis. We attach photos of people (likely visitors) using the baseball area to play cricket. Most times we go by (especially when good weather) there is one or another area being used by residents and visitors alike. Visitors, who are renting short term in the area in either nearby Tyrolian or other rental locations use the use the basketball court as well as the baseball diamond for either baseball or cricket.

We also see residents and visitors with children or grandchildren using the children’s play area and walking their dogs.

In the winter the park is also used for dog walkers as well as tobogganin and other winter sports.

Although Tyrolean has outdoor space to offer to their clientele, Tyrolian’s is private park space (not encouraged in the town official plan) and the many other short term rental units in the area are banned from using the Tyrolean space (wristbands required to use the Tyrolean space). Therefore this park is ideal for short term renters to use their energy towards healthful activities and they use the facilities extensively.

One of the reasons this park may not be getting as high usage as the town would like at the present time is because it is a well-kept secret. In the recent publication of the Blue Mountain Review, all of the parks in the area were highlighted. In this publication, there was NO mention of the jungle gym and swings for kids, the baseball diamond or the basketball court. With these facilities being advertised more effectively, it is highly likely people would make this a destination park just for the unique facilities.

As far as we are aware the people who know Heritage Park exists either live in the area and drive past the park or visit our area on a short term vacation.

**Future Development**

We believe this park, being close to many new, approved or in stages of being approved, housing subdivisions (Parkbridge Craigleith, Home Farm and the new Tyrolian single family subdivision east of Brooker Blvd) may be used extensively in the future. There is currently approval for over 500 housing units, in the three aforementioned subdivisions, which will likely be built over the next several years.

The various Developers may donate new parkland which is encouraged when building a subdivision, and it should be open to the public, but we also know there is the option of donating cash to the TBM in lieu of parkland. Also, because all three properties are on steep grades, it is unlikely there will be tableland as we have at Heritage Park which is required for the children’s area, the basketball area and the baseball diamond.

For this reason we believe it would be a planning error to eliminate the best park in the whole area with so many new housing units already being planned in the vicinity.

**TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS OFFICIAL PLAN (TBM - OP) – GROWTH PLANNED FOR THORBURY/CLARKSBURG AREA**

The OFFICIAL PLAN of the Town of the TBM OP Section PART A COMMUNITY VISION, STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND LAND USE CONCEPT, envisions growth in the Thornbury/Clarksburg area.
It specifically states “Between the years 2011 and 2026, it is anticipated that the permanent population in the Town of The Blue Mountains will increase by approximately 2,850 residents (1,370 units). It is estimated that 80 to 85 percent of these 1,370 units will be provided in urban areas (i.e. the Thornbury/Clarksburg Settlement Area).”

With already over 500 units planned for our area (well outside the growth area TBM envisions) using Heritage Park for new housing does not conform to the TBM OP, Part A quoted above.

ATTAINABLE HOUSING - LOCATION

Essential Services

One of the objectives of the Attainable Housing Corporation is to provide housing close to Essential Services. Heritage Park is not close to essential services. Yes, the Blue Mountain Village is nearby but the Village caters to tourists, not full time residences. There is not a full range grocery store, no pharmacy, gas stations or schools. There is bus service but not to Thornbury. It is to Collingwood and is not very frequent.

As well, with the additional housing on this park the density of the area would not be appropriate for Rural Residential.

The TOWN OF BLUE MOUNTAINS OFFICIAL PLAN (TBM OP) states in section D4.3 SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT POLICIES:

“...Prior to the consideration of an application for Plan of Subdivision, Council shall be satisfied that: a) the approval of the development is not premature and is in the public interest; b) the lands will be appropriately serviced with infrastructure, schools, parkland and open space, community facilities and other amenities, as required; c) the density of the development is appropriate for the area; d) the subdivision, when developed, will be easily integrated with other development in the area;...”

We therefore believe putting Attainable Housing on Heritage Park DOES NOT CONFORM to Section D.4.3 of the TBM Official Plan For density and essential services reasons. We also do not believe it will easily integrate with other development in the area.

PARKLAND AND RURAL SPACE

The TBM Official Plan also states:

A3.5 RURAL AND OPEN SPACE CHARACTER A3.5.1 Goal To preserve and enhance landscape amenities wherever possible to maintain the visual quality and open space character of the Town.

D6 PUBLIC PARKLAND AND OPEN SPACE D6.1 OBJECTIVES It is the objective of this Plan to: a) establish and maintain a system of public open space and parkland areas that meets the needs of present and future residents; b) enhance existing parkland areas wherever possible to respond to changing public needs and preferences; c) ensure that appropriate amounts and types of parkland, and land along the shoreline and for access thereto, are acquired by the Town through the development process;

D6.2 GENERAL POLICIES APPLYING TO ALL PUBLIC PARKLAND D6.2.1 Leisure Activities Plan The Leisure Activities Plan (LAP) adopted by Council in 2006 informed the policies in this section of the Plan. The LAP is intended to enable the Town to effectively deliver leisure services for its residents and visitors. The LAP shall be updated, as required, to respond to changing needs and circumstances.
We believe, based on the above sections of the Official Plan, building housing where a very unique park currently exists does not conform and directly contradicts the TBM OP A3.5, D6, or D6.2.

MINIMUM PARKLAND PER RESIDENT

The official plan goes on to say:

D6.2.2 Overall Public Parkland Standard Council shall encourage the provision of public parkland to achieve a minimum ratio of 1.2 hectares of local parkland per 1,000 residents (permanent and seasonal) and 2.5 hectares of non-local parkland per 1,000 residents (permanent and seasonal). Specific requirements respecting local and non-local parkland are set out in Section D6.3. The only other local park would be Crossan Court which is very small so not very usable except for the tennis courts which are in need of repair or resurfacing.

Based on the above ratio requirements, to eliminate Heritage Park and add housing units, the TBM will not meet their minimum ratio of 1:2 hectares of local parkland per 1,000 residents (permanent and seasonal) and using the Park will not conform to Section D6.2.2 of the TBM OP.

PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT – PARKLAND

The Ontario Provincial Policy Statement says under section 1.5.1 Healthy active communities should be promoted by:

“planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publicly accessible built and natural settings for recreation including facilities, parklands, open space areas…”

We therefore believe putting further housing in our subdivision by taking away the little parkland we have, is NOT consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, Section 1.5.1.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to our concerns. We look forward to attending the meeting on September 5th.

Respectively,

Heather Macnaughton and David Dunphy
August 8, 2019

Shawn Postma
Senior Policy Planner
Town of Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, PO Box 310
Thornbury, ON, N0H 2P0

Re: Report PDS.19.75
Zoning By-law Amendment:
Short Term Accommodation Uses

Mr. Postma;

On behalf of the Owners of Grey Condominium Corporation # 8; being comprised of 32 units, please be advised that this Corporation, is opposed to the expansion of the allowed area to accommodate Short Term Accommodation (STA) being permitted on its site.

The corporation reserves the right to have the Town of Blue Mountains assist in maintaining the taxpayers right to existing quiet enjoyment.

On behalf of the owners, it is requested that this objection to STA be recorded in any report re this proposed amendment.

Respectfully:

[Signature]
Silvana Azzolli, President
On behalf of the Board of Directors
August 8, 2019

Shawn Postma
Senior Policy Planner
Town of Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, PO Box 310
Thornbury, ON, N0H 2P0

Re: Report PDS.19.75
Zoning By-law Amendment:
Short Term Accommodation Uses

Mr. Postma;

On behalf of the Owners of Grey Condominium Corporation # 15; being comprised of 35 units, please be advised that this Corporation is opposed to the expansion of the allowed area to accommodate Short Term Accommodation (STA) being permitted on its site.

The corporation reserves the right to have the Town of Blue Mountains assist in maintaining the taxpayers right to existing quiet enjoyment.

On behalf of the owners, it is requested that this objection to STA be recorded in any report regarding this proposed amendment.

Respectfully;

Bruce Heagle, President
On behalf of the Board of Directors
August 8, 2019

Shawn Postma
Senior Policy Planner
Town of Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, PO Box 310
Thornbury, ON, N0H 2P0

Re: Report PDS.19.75
Zoning By-law Amendment:
Short Term Accommodation Uses

Mr. Postma;

On behalf of the Owners of Grey Standard Condominium Corporation # 52; being comprised of 28 units, please be advised that this Corporation is opposed to the expansion of the allowed area to accommodate Short Term Accommodation (STA) being permitted on its site.

The corporation reserves the right to have the Town of Blue Mountains assist in maintaining the taxpayers right to existing quiet enjoyment.

On behalf of the owners, it is requested that this objection to STA be recorded in any report regarding this proposed amendment.

Respectfully;

Mary McGrath, President
On behalf of the Board of Directors
August 14, 2019

Shawn Postma  
Senior Policy Planner  
Town of Blue Mountains  
32 Mill Street, PO Box 310  
Thornbury, ON, N0H 2P0

Re: Report PDS.19.75  
Zoning By-law Amendment:  
Short Term Accommodation Uses

Dear Mr. Postma;

On behalf of the Owners of Grey Condominium Corporation # 20; being comprised of 16 units, please be advised that this Corporation is opposed to the expansion of the allowed area to accommodate Short Term Accommodation (STA) being permitted on its site.

The corporation reserves the right to have the Town of Blue Mountains assist in maintaining the taxpayers right to existing quiet enjoyment.

On behalf of the owners, it is requested that this objection to STA be recorded in any report regarding this proposed amendment.

Respectfully;

Greg Chelliew, President  
On behalf of the Board of Directors
Grey Condominium Corporation 22  
Units 30-43, 55-57 Louisa Street,  
Thornbury, ON, N0H 2P0

August 12, 2019

Shawn Postma  
Senior Policy Planner  
Town of Blue Mountains  
32 Mill Street, PO Box 310  
Thornbury, ON, N0H 2P0

Re: Report PDS.19.75  
Zoning By-law Amendment:  
Short Term Accommodation Uses

Dear Mr. Postma;

On behalf of the Owners of Grey Condominium Corporation #22; being comprised of 14 units, please be advised that this Corporation is opposed to the expansion of the allowed area to accommodate Short Term Accommodation (STA) being permitted on its site.

The corporation reserves the right to have the Town of Blue Mountains assist in maintaining the taxpayers' right to existing quiet enjoyment.

On behalf of the owners, it is requested that this objection to STA be recorded in any report regarding this proposed amendment.

Respectfully;

David Caldwell, President  
On behalf of the Board of Directors
The Three Pillars of Sustainability

Prepared for The Council of The Town of The Blue Mountains
By The Sustainability Committee, September 2019.

In response to a request for information “on the four (4) pillars of Sustainability including the source and what is intended to be considered.”
July 2019.

Since the 1980s, the notion of sustainable development being comprised of three interconnected pillars of economy, environment and society, has become widely accepted (Purvis et al. 2019). This three part description is often presented in the form of three intersecting circles, with sustainability being placed at the intersection, as shown in Fig. 1 below. This approach recognizes that economic, environmental and social factors need to be integrated in order to achieve sustainable development. As a 2012 resolution of the UN asserts, “We therefore acknowledge the need to further mainstream sustainable development at all levels, integrating economic, social and environmental aspects and recognizing their interlinkages, so as to achieve sustainable development in all its dimensions” (UN 2012).

The notion of sustainability being comprised of three interconnected pillars or circles emerged from a growing awareness of the environmental and social costs of economic development in the 1970s and 80s. In the 1980s, ecological and social critiques of economic development led to international efforts to balance economic growth with social and ecological sustainability. In 1987, the UN-appointed World Commission on Environment and Development published ‘Our Common Future’ (UN 1987). Our Common Future is widely credited with popularizing the concept of “sustainable development,” and called for “a new era of economic growth—growth that is forceful and at the same time socially and environmentally sustainable” (UN 1987). The institutionalizing of ‘sustainable development’ occurred through the 1992 UN Earth Summit in Rio, which led to the adoption of Agenda 21, a plan consisting of 27 principles to guide ‘sustainable development’ efforts. Agenda 21 called on local governments around the world to implement Local Agenda 21 plans, and reinforced the essential need to reflect the interconnectedness of the environment, economy and society in local decision making (UN 1992).

In 2005, the Canadian federal government initiated a New Deal for Cities and Communities. The program, which involved federal-provincial agreements, promised substantial funding to municipalities to promote integrated community sustainability as it recognized the important role municipal governments and their communities have in planning and implementing sustainability initiatives. Funding was provided and administered through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities’ Green Municipal Fund which encouraged the preparation of Integrated Community Sustainability Plans (ICSPs). To be eligible for funding, the plans needed to reflect the integration of the three components of sustainability, and be community-based, with significant public and stakeholder involvement.

In 2009, The Town of The Blue Mountains initiated a 2-year process of developing our sustainability plan. The Town facilitated the engagement and support of over 100 community partners. The “Sustainable Path” followed the international framework of sustainability advanced through the UN, and was based on three key pillars – Environment and Ecological Integrity, Community Vibrancy and Economic Prosperity (TBM 2010: 6).

In 2015, the United Nations adopted a new 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This new approach built on the work of the past 30 years, and identified 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SGDs), and 169 measurable targets. According to the UN, the new SGDs “are integrated and indivisible and balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social and environmental” (UN 2015). Canada has since incorporated the SGDs into its Sustainable Development Plan, released in 2019. The Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) Canada and the University of Waterloo are developing the Sustainable Development Goals Index for Canadian Municipalities to benchmark municipal progress on the SDGs. The Waterloo SDG Index is planned to launch in the fall of 2019.
Works Cited:


**Figure 1** –Interplay of the environmental, economic, and social aspects of sustainable development pillars. Source: Purvis, B., Mao, Y., & Robinson, D. (2019).
July 11, 2019

Dear: Mayor, Council and Staff

I am writing to let you know that my family has decided to sell Harold Sutherland Construction Ltd. to another family-owned business, Walker Industries Holdings Ltd., effective today.

After nearly 60 years since I started the company, we have come to recognize that additional resources are needed to continue our growth. These include human resources and management expertise, and support in navigating the complex regulatory environment for the aggregates and construction industries.

I have known the people at Walker for most of my working life and we share the same values. We're both family-owned Canadian businesses that care about our employees, communities and the environment. I know that Walker will treat our employees, customers, suppliers and government officials very well.

Harold Sutherland Construction Ltd. will become an operating unit under Walker’s Aggregates division. All of our employees will be kept on. This includes my daughter Jennifer Prentice, who has served as vice-president of finance and administration, and son Mike Sutherland, our vice-president of operations. I will continue working for the company as a consultant.

You may be aware that Walker is headquartered in Niagara Falls, and owns pits and quarries in nearby Simcoe County, as well as in the Niagara Region and Essex County. It also has a Niagara-based road construction business. The purchase of Harold Sutherland Construction will allow Walker to expand its construction projects to include sewer and watermain work, as well as local government infrastructure contracts.

I have enjoyed our business interactions over these past 59 years and will certainly miss working with our local municipal and provincial governments and agencies. Walker has a reputation as a company that works constructively and cooperatively with government, and I know this will continue with a new executive team at the helm of Harold Sutherland Construction.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Jennifer at [Redacted]@hsc-ltd.com or Ryan Wall, vice-president Walker Aggregates Simcoe & Essex at [Redacted]@walkerind.com.

Yours truly,

[Handwritten Signature]

Harold Sutherland
President
July 30, 2019

TO: Mayor and Members of Council of the Town of The Blue Mountains

FROM: Suzanne Craig, Integrity Commissioner

The enclosed Integrity Commissioner Memorandum responds to Town Council's July 29, 2019 direction to provide Council with recommendations for a general policy, as to whether a Council Member may submit a correspondence to Council as a member of the public. In the construct of my response, I did not conduct a substantive review of the actions of any individual Member of Council. As a general principle, Members of Council have a role to play to enhance and build the public trust in the Town’s decision-making. In consideration of the Council’s question contained in the July 29th Motion B.4.1, I offer the following comments. The review set out below is provided to Council as general guidance.

The Council direction to me is set out in Appendix 1 to this Memorandum.

**Relevant sections of the Town Procedural By-law:**

Section 12 and 13 respectively of the Town’s Procedural By-law set out the rules regarding *Correspondence and Communications from the Public and Deputations and Public Comment Periods*. Sections 16 and 17 contain the rules governing the process by which Members of Council may bring forward questions or information for consideration and debate by Council. Finally, section 18 of the Procedural By-law set out the Rules of Debate, and in particular, the process that every Member must follow prior to speaking to any question or motion or for a matter to be recognized by the Chair.

**Relevant Code Rules:**

The Code is a municipal by-law. It contains a number of principles which guide the application and interpretation of its rules. The enforcement mechanism is complaint-driven. As such, each Member is master of his or her own actions and must decide whether their actions are in line with the Code key principles. While the Integrity Commissioner can give comments on a Councillor’s actions outside of the Formal
Complaint process, only following the receipt of a Formal Complaint and an investigation by the Integrity Commissioner, can there be a determination that a Member has breached her or his obligations under the Code of Conduct.

Rule 1 of the Code sets out the key principles that underline the rules of the Code. In particular, this Rule states that:

A written Code of Conduct helps to ensure that the Members of Council, Committees and Local Boards of the municipality share a common basis of acceptable conduct.

These standards are designed to provide a reference guide and a supplement to the legislative parameters within which the Members must operate. These standards for Members exist to enhance public confidence that The Blue Mountain’s elected and appointed representatives will serve the public with integrity, justice and courtesy.

Members are responsible for making honest statements. No Member shall make a statement when they know that statement is false. No Member shall make a statement with the intent to mislead Council Members and the public. The Town of The Blue Mountain’s Code of Conduct is a general standard that augments Provincial laws and municipal policies and by-laws that govern conduct. It is not intended to replace personal ethics.

All Members to whom this Code of Conduct applies shall serve their constituents in a conscientious and diligent manner. No Member shall use the influence of office for any purpose other than the exercise of his or her official duties. Members shall seek to avoid conflicts of interest, both apparent and real. Members shall perform their duties and arrange their private affairs in a manner that promotes public confidence and will bear public scrutiny.

Rule 1 prohibits members from the improper use of the influence of their office. Careful consideration of this Rule confirms that the prohibition is broader than circumstances of pecuniary interests. It intends that Members of Council will have a common understanding that they will neither contemporaneously wear two hats nor participate in activities that grant, or appear to grant, any special consideration, treatment, or advantage to an individual which is not available to every other individual.

**Role of a Councillor:**

The *Municipal Act* does not set out any specific role of a municipal councillor. In a leading decision of the Ontario General Division court (University Village (Guelph) v the
City of Guelph\(^1\), the court stated that in Ontario, the decision-making authority of municipalities lies with the municipal council and that council, as a whole, exercises executive, legislative, administrative functions. Section 5 of the *Municipal Act* states, that powers of the municipality must be exercised by its council, according to approved by-law unless otherwise stated. The Province of Ontario's *Municipal Councillors Guide* sets out the role of a councillor generally, however, clarifies that the policy, fiduciary and representative role of a councillor, is carried out as a collective.

It is a generally accepted principle held by Ontario municipal accountability officers that when a Member of Council is elected, they cease to represent a particular group or matter of interest and become one part of Council which is the governing body recognized by the *Municipal Act*. Members carry out their official activities in a way that will foster and enhance respect for government. Importantly, they will not participate in activities that grant, or appear to grant, any special consideration, treatment or advantage to an individual or group which is not available to every other individual in their municipality. From time to time, Members of a municipal council wear many hats. “They are expected to represent their communities, to fully and frankly speak their minds and to take positions on issues both mundane and controversial. But to what extent, if any, are they entitled to have prejudged matters that are before them for consideration? Traditional administrative law principles, including natural justice and procedural fairness, would dictate that a decision maker cannot be biased or, indeed, be perceived in any way to be biased”.\(^2\) While an elected official is allowed to have personal views and perspectives, a Member of Council’s comments can only be considered in their official capacity, in accordance with the rules of the Procedural By-law.

There is no doubt that an elected member of The Blue Mountains Council could champion a community cause: for example, to advocate for the municipal support of community preservation of parkland. However, promoting or championing the position of one site over another for the location of attainable housing development, may result in violations of the Code of Conduct, as this action may be perceived as prejudgment or bias. Members of Council are required to attend duly constituted meetings which are statutorily required to be open to the public, except in the circumstances set out in section 239 of the *Municipal Act* and the By-law governing Council procedure. Where a Member cannot or does not attend a meeting of Committee or Council, neither the *Municipal Act* nor the Procedural By-law contemplates a circumstance in which the Member may participate in a Council debate as a private citizen.

While a Member of Council who cannot attend a Committee or Council meeting, may wish to nonetheless have their views on the matter considered by Council in their


absence, in order to conscientiously carry out their statutory and official role to collectively make decisions and uphold the oath of office, a Member of Council is required to obey the rules contained in all of the governing legislation of the municipality and cannot arbitrarily remove their official status for the purposes of consideration of a matter. Generally speaking, at the municipal level of government in Ontario, the remedy for a Member of Council who will not or cannot be in attendance at a Council meeting, is to submit their comments in the form of a motion at the next meeting when they attend Council or have an attending Council Member bring forward their motion. It will be through the approved process of the Town, that Council, in accordance with the approved process of the Town, that Council, in accordance with the Procedural By-law, can vote on whether to receive the motion and debate on the same. Each municipality may differ in the rules regarding receipt of a motion or Member’s resolution. A Member of Council cannot circumvent the rules of the Procedural By-law by, with the effect of wearing both the hat of a member of the public to make submissions for Council consideration and the official decision-making hat of a Member of Council.

**Integrity Commissioner’s Conclusions:**

Based on my review of the question as to whether a member of Council may submit correspondence to Council as a member of the public, it is my position that generally:

> It is not permissible under the Code for a Member of Council to participate in a matter before Council, through the submission of correspondence as a member of the public. To do so, would be tantamount to the Member participating in the debate at Council in the capacity of a private citizen. A Member of Council cannot wear two hats contemporaneously. In other words, a Member of Council cannot participate as a decision-maker in their official capacity and contemporaneously submit correspondence as a member of the public. This participation will create a perceived conflict with the Member’s role as a Town councillor.

A Member of Council cannot wear two hats in the decision-making process of Council. To be clear, the *Municipal Act* sets out the statutory role of Council and the Town’s Procedural By-law sets out the rules for Committee and Council meeting management, including how information will be received from members of the public. The rules that govern the process of how the Town receives public communications are distinct and separate from the rules that govern a Councillor’s participation and her or his comment at meetings. Generally, a Member of Council will be afforded an opportunity to comment on a matter at a Council meeting during the comment portion of the debate, by way of motion or by way of a Member’s resolution. Outside of these processes, which would require Council approval according the rules of the Procedural By-law, generally municipal rules do not contemplate a Councillor commenting on a matter before Council by way of public correspondence to the Town Clerk. It is a basic premise of decision-making at the municipal level that Council decisions be fair and that
they appear to be fair to the informed and reasonable observer. Impartiality is a statement of mind in which the Councillor is personally disinterested in the outcome and is open to persuasion by the staff reports and public submissions and all information that comes before Committees and Council. The Municipal Act and the Procedural By-law, in their wording and purpose, do not contemplate that a Member of Council will participate both in their personal/private capacity as a member of the public who makes submissions to be considered by Council, and also in their official capacity as a Member of Council and decision-maker.

The above is not a ruling or a finding of compliance or contravention under the Town’s Code of Conduct, but rather is submitted as general guidance to Council in respect of the question posed at the July 29th meeting. As Integrity Commissioner, I cannot state whether a Member is in compliance or contravention of a Code rule except or unless I have received a Code of Conduct complaint and conducted a complaint investigation.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Craig
Integrity Commissioner
Appendix 1 – Motion

B.4.1 Odette Bartnicki, Resident

Re: Response to Attainable Housing Options

Moved by: Rob Sampson Seconded by: Andrea Matrosov

THAT Council defers consideration of the July 26, 2019 correspondence from Odette Bartnicki to the August 1, 2019 Special Meeting of Council pending receipt of an opinion from the Integrity Commissioner as to whether a member of Council may submit correspondence to Council as a member of the public, Carried.
July 31, 2019

TO: Mayor and Members of Council of the Town of The Blue Mountains

FROM: Suzanne Craig, Integrity Commissioner

The enclosed is the Integrity Commissioner Addendum to the Memorandum dated July 30, 2019, which responded to Town Council’s July 29, 2019 direction to provide Council with recommendations for a general policy, as to whether a Council Member may submit a correspondence to Council as a member of the public. Following the publication of the July 30th Memorandum, the question was raised as to whether the general guidance contained therein for Members of Council also applies to Members of Town Committees and Local Boards who have been appointed by Council.

In respect of the authority of the Integrity Commissioner, section 223.2 of the Municipal Act states that “A municipality shall establish codes of conduct for members of the council of the municipality and of its local boards.” This particular section does not provide guidance on what is considered a local board. Accordingly, the operative definition is the one set out in section 1 of the Act. This definition states that “local board” means a municipal service board, transportation commission, public library board, board of health, police services board, planning board, or any other board, commission, committee, body or local authority established or exercising any power under any Act with respect to the affairs or purposes of one or more municipalities, excluding a school board and a conservation authority; (“conseil local”).

The Town Council Code of Conduct sets out that Local Board means a local board established or exercising any power under any Act with respect to the affairs or purposes of one or more municipalities but does not include The Blue Mountains Police Services Board or The Blue Mountains Public Library Board, a school board, a hospital board or a conservation authority.
In addition, the Council Code of Conduct states that the rules contained therein apply to:

Members of the Council of The Corporation of the Town of The Blue Mountains in the performance of their duties and responsibilities as elected community representatives, as well as Members of Town Committees and Local Boards.

It is my understanding that Town staff are working on revisions to the Council Code of Conduct and are developing a new Committee and Local Board Code of Conduct. In the coming weeks, both draft documents will be sent to my Office for review and comment. At that time, I will have an opportunity to provide guidance to the specific scenarios faced by members of the public who are appointed by Town Council to serve on Town Committees and Local Boards.

At this time, it is my position that the rules of the Council Code of Conduct apply to members of local boards and committees generally. As such, the general guidance provided in the July 30th Memorandum applies to Members of Council as well as Members of Town Committees and Local Boards.

I reiterate at this time, as Integrity Commissioner, I cannot state whether a Member (of Council or Local Board) is in compliance or contravention of a Code rule except or unless I have received a Code of Conduct complaint and conducted a complaint investigation. With reference to specific circumstances, Members of Town Council and appointed Members of Town Committees and Local Boards are encouraged to seek advice from the Integrity Commissioner on the application of the rules of the Code of Conduct.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Integrity Commissioner
July 19, 2019

Town of the Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, Box 310
Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0

Dear Corrina,

Re: Correspondence Received July 2, 2019.

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the Town of the Blue Mountains letter to the Ministry of Transportation regarding Sideroad 26/27 and County Road 91.

The Council of the Municipality of Grey Highlands passed the following resolution at the July 17, 2019 Council meeting:

2019-462
Moved by Paul McQueen, Seconded by Dane Nielsen

That Council receive the Blue Mountains letter to Ministry of Transportation regarding CR 91 for information and;
That Council support the correspondence sent to the Ministry of Transportation.

Should you have any questions at all, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jerri-Lynn Levitt
Deputy Clerk
Council and Legislative Services
Municipality of Grey Highlands
July 16, 2019

Town of The Blue Mountains,
c/o Ruth Prince,
Director of Finance and IT Services,
32 Mill Street, P.O. Box 310
Thornbury ON N0H 2P0

Dear Members of Council and Staff,

We recently received a letter from Ruth Prince enclosing a cheque for $20,000. As mentioned in my deputation to Council last year, the money will be applied to the mortgage on our new home at 54 King Street.

On behalf of Beaver Valley Outreach, I would like to thank all of you for the support that we receive from Council and Staff.

We look forward to continuing our relationship with you, so that we can achieve our common goal, which is to make this community the best that it can be.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

C.J. Innes, Chair,
Beaver Valley Outreach Board of Directors
July 25, 2019

Town of Blue Mountains,
Thornbury, Ontario

The members of the Red Knights Motorcycle Club Ontario 3 wish to thank you and your staff for your generous support of the Ontario Association 6 Convention this July 19, 20, and 21. The bags and pins were a real hit.

We had a total of 106 registrations and 67 motorcycles at the convention from all over Ontario. Many comments were received about the natural beauty of our countryside and the good hospitality of the Grey Bruce area.

Thanks again for your donation.

Ray McComb, President,

David Kell, Secretary Treasurer,

RKMC Ontario 3
Notice of Public Meeting

Committee of Adjustment

Application for Consent for New Lot

Property Location: 173 Arlberg Crescent

Public Meeting: July 17, 2019 at 4:00 PM
Town Hall, Council Chambers
32 Mill Street, Thornbury, ON

What is being proposed?

The purpose of these applications is to consider a request for new lot creation. The applications propose to create two new lots for the purpose of constructing one semi-detached residential unit on each new lot.

The effect of application B07-2019 is to create one new lot which is approximately 739.7sq.m. in area with 20.9m of frontage onto Kandahar Lane. The retained lands are proposed to have an area of approximately 355.8sq.m. in area with 11.77m of frontage onto Arlberg Crescent, and will retain the existing semi-detached residential unit.

The effect of application B08-2019 is to further sever the lot created by application B07-2019 to create a second residential lot approximately 383.9sq.m. in area with 9.0m of frontage onto Kandahar Lane. The retained lands are proposed to have an area of approximately 355.6sq.m. with 11.9m of frontage onto Kandahar Lane.

Municipal sewer and water services currently front the subject lands. The resulting parcels would satisfy the minimum lot area and frontage requirements of the R2 zone.

The legal description of the subject lands is Concession 2, Part Lot 19, Part 1, Registered Plan 16R-4601.

What happens at a Public Meeting?

The public meeting is your chance to hear more about the proposal and make your views about it known. You may also speak at the meeting or submit written comments. Information from the public will help the Committee in their decision-making process, so make sure to have your say!

Any person or agency may attend the Public Meeting and/or make verbal or written comments either in support or in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Where do I find more information?

Visit us in Planning Services, Town Hall during regular office hours Monday to Friday 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. or contact the planner for this file.

Where do I submit my comments?

Your written comments may be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment:

By Mail or in Person:
32 Mill St. Box 310,
Thornbury ON, N0H 2P0
Fax: (519) 599-7723
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca

Written comments are requested by July 12, 2019 so that they may be read at the public meeting for the benefit of everyone in attendance.

Want to be notified of a decision?

If you wish to be notified of the decision of the Committee of Adjustment of the Town of The Blue Mountains with respect to the proposed consent, you must make a written request to Town of The Blue Mountains at the address provided above.

Your rights to appeal a decision:

If a person or public body that files an appeal of a decision of the Committee of Adjustment with respect to the proposed consent does not make written submissions to the Town of The Blue Mountains before a decision is made, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal may dismiss the appeal.

Travis Sandberg, Planner I
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext 283 or Toll Free (888) 258-6867
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca
Applicant’s Severance Sketch

Severance #2: Consent Application B08-2019

Severance #1: Consent Application B07-2019

A Note about information you may submit to the Town:

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario’s Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), all information provided for, or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record, including resident deputations. This information may be posted on the Town’s website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable upon request.
Notice of Public Meeting

Committee of Adjustment

Application for Consent for New Lot

Property Location: 242 Bruce Street South, Thornbury

Public Meeting: July 17, 2019 at 4:00 PM
Town Hall, Council Chambers
32 Mill Street, Thornbury, ON

What is being proposed?

The purpose of this application is to consider a request for new lot creation. This application proposes to re-create a residential parcel which inadvertently merged on-title with the adjacent lands as a result of a previous application for consent and lot addition completed in 2012.

The application would have the effect of re-creating a lot which would be approximately 1,150sq.m. in area with approximately 15.28m of frontage on Bruce Street South, an open and year-round maintained municipal road. Municipal sewer and water services currently front the subject lands.

The legal description of the subject lands is Town Plot, Part Park Lot 3, South-West Duncan Street, Part 1 and 2 Registered Plan 16R-9465.

Where do I find more information?

Visit us in Planning Services, Town Hall during regular office hours Monday to Friday 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. or contact the planner for this file.

Where do I submit my comments?

Your written comments may be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment:

By Mail or in Person:
32 Mill St. Box 310,
Thornbury ON, N0H 2P0
Fax: (519) 599-7723
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca

Written comments are requested by July 12, 2019, so that they may be read at the public meeting for the benefit of everyone in attendance.

Want to be notified of a decision?

If you wish to be notified of the decision of the Committee of Adjustment of the Town of The Blue Mountains with respect to the proposed consent, you must make a written request to Town of The Blue Mountains at the address provided above.

Your rights to appeal a decision:

If a person or public body that files an appeal of a decision of the Committee of Adjustment with respect to the proposed consent does not make written submissions to the Town of The Blue Mountains before a decision is made, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal may dismiss the appeal.

Questions? Want more information? Ask the Planner!
Travis Sandberg, Planner I
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext. 283 or Toll Free (888) 258-6867 Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca
A Note about information you may submit to the Town:

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario’s Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), all information provided for, or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record, including resident deputations. This information may be posted on the Town’s website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable upon request.
Notice of Public Hearing

Committee of Adjustment

Application for a Minor Variance to Zoning By-law 2018-65

Property Location: 177 Bayview Avenue

Public Meeting: July 17, 2019 at 4:00 PM
Town Hall, Council Chambers
32 Mill Street, Thornbury, ON

What is being proposed?

This application requests relief from the provisions of Zoning By-law 2018-65 in order to construct a 438sq.m. single detached dwelling on the subject lands. After submission of a building permit, a mapping error was discovered where the provisions of recently approved Zoning By-law 2018-65 applied both a special hazard setback from Georgian Bay, per Section 4.33.2 of the By-law, as well as a Hazard zone to the subject lands. While the proposed dwelling conforms to the special hazard setback from Georgian Bay, it is proposed to be partially located within the Hazard Zone.

Should this application be approved, it will permit the construction of the proposed single family dwelling to be constructed on the lands in accordance with the special hazard setbacks from Georgian Bay, as required by Section 4.33.2, and the standard zone provisions applicable to the Residential R1-1 zone.

The legal description of the subject lands is Lot 2 to 3, Plan 440.

What happens at the Public Hearing?

The public hearing is your chance to make your views about the proposal known. Information from the public will help the Committee in their decision making process, so make sure to have your say!

Where do I find more information?

Additional information is available during regular office hours in the Planning Division of the Planning & Development Services Department at Town Hall. You may also request a copy of this notice by contacting:

Secretary-Treasurer,
Committee of Adjustment
Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, PO Box 310
Thornbury, ON NOH 2P0
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext.263
Toll Free: (888) 258-6867
Fax: 519-599-7723
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca

A note about information you may submit to the Town:

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario's Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), all information provided for, or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record, including resident deputations. This information may be posted on the Town’s website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

Questions? Ask the Planner!

Travis Sandberg, Planner I
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext. 283 or
Toll Free (888) 258-6867
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable upon request.
Notice of Public Hearing

Committee of Adjustment

Application for a Minor Variance to Zoning By-law 2018-65

Property Location: 90 King Street East

Public Meeting: July 17, 2019 at 4:00 PM
Town Hall, Council Chambers
32 Mill Street, Thornbury, ON

What is being proposed?

The proposed variance seeks relief from the General Employment (M1) zone provisions in order to construct a 444sq.m. addition to the existing building. The proposed addition is intended to facilitate the growth of the existing business to also include a brewery in addition to the existing craft cidery operation.

The purpose of the minor variance application is to facilitate further development on the site consistent with the existing building setbacks and character of the building. The applicant requests the following relief in order to permit the proposed addition:

1) To permit a front yard setback of 1.0m, whereas a minimum of 15.0m is required in the M1 zone;
2) To permit an interior side yard setback of 3.0m, whereas a minimum of 5.0m is required in the M1 zone;
3) To permit a rear yard setback of 4.3m, whereas a minimum of 9.0m is required in the M1 zone; and
4) To permit a minimum of 33 required parking spaces, whereas a minimum of 38 spaces are required for the use.

What happens at the Public Hearing?

The public hearing is your chance to make your views about the proposal known. Information from the public will help the Committee in their decision making process, so make sure to have your say!

Where do I find more information?

Additional information is available during regular office hours in the Planning Division of the Planning & Development Services Department at Town Hall. You may also request a copy of this notice by contacting:

Secretary-Treasurer,
Committee of Adjustment
Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, PO Box 310
Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext.263
Toll Free: (888) 258-6867
Fax: 519-599-7723
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca

A note about information you may submit to the Town:

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario's Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), all information provided for, or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record, including resident deputations. This information may be posted on the Town’s website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

Questions? Ask the Planner!

Travis Sandberg, Planner I
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext. 283 or
Toll Free (888) 258-6867
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable upon request.
Applicant’s Site Plan Sketch
Notice of Public Hearing

Committee of Adjustment

Application for a Minor Variance to Zoning By-law 2018-65

Property Location: Lots 71-78 in Draft Plan of Subdivision 42T-94004 (Second Nature Ph.3)

Public Meeting: September 11, 2019 at 4:00 PM
Town Hall, Council Chambers
32 Mill Street, Thornbury, ON

What is being proposed?

The purpose of the application is to permit the creation of lots with reduced lot frontages and to construct single detached dwellings on the subject lands with reduced side yard setbacks.

The effect of the application is to provide the following relief from the R1-1-32-h6 zone:

1) To permit an interior side yard setback of 1.5m, whereas 2.0m is required by Table 6.2.1 of the By-law;

2) To permit minimum lot frontage of 17m, whereas a minimum of 18m is required by Table 6.2.1 of the By-law.

The subject lands are located within draft plan of subdivision 42T-94004.

What happens at the Public Hearing?

The public hearing is your chance to make your views about the proposal known. Information from the public will help the Committee in their decision making process, so make sure to have your say!

Where do I find more information?

Additional information is available during regular office hours in the Planning Division of the Planning & Development Services Department at Town Hall. You may also request a copy of this notice by contacting:

Secretary-Treasurer,
Committee of Adjustment
Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, PO Box 310
Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext.263
Toll Free: (888) 258-6867
Fax: 519-599-7723
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca

A note about information you may submit to the Town:

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario's Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), all information provided for, or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record, including resident deputations. This information may be posted on the Town’s website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

Questions? Ask the Planner!

Travis Sandberg, Planner I
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext. 283 or Toll Free (888) 258-6867
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable upon request.
Applicant’s Site Plan Sketch

Option 2

POTENTIAL RE-LOTTING
Second Nature Lands
Grey County

Area of Comparison
Notice of Public Hearing

Committee of Adjustment

Application for a Minor Variance to Zoning By-law 2018-65

Property Location: 218 Craigleith Road

Public Meeting: September 11, 2019 at 4:00 PM
Town Hall, Council Chambers
32 Mill Street, Thornbury, ON

What is being proposed?

The purpose of this application is to permit the construction of a two-storey multi-use facility partially within the Open Space Exception zone applied to the lands.

The effect of this application is to provide the following relief from the Open Space Exception (OS-48) zone:

1) To permit 149sq.m. of ground floor area, whereas a maximum of 50sq.m. is permitted; and
2) To permit a maximum height of 6.6m, whereas a maximum of 4.5m is permitted.

The proposed development is also subject to site plan control and will require site plan approval prior to construction.

What happens at the Public Hearing?

The public hearing is your chance to make your views about the proposal known. Information from the public will help the Committee in their decision making process, so make sure to have your say!

Where do I find more information?

Additional information is available during regular office hours in the Planning Division of the Planning & Development Services Department at Town Hall. You may also request a copy of this notice by contacting:

Secretary-Treasurer,
Committee of Adjustment
Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, PO Box 310
Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext.263
Toll Free: (888) 258-6867
Fax: 519-599-7723
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca

A note about information you may submit to the Town:

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario's Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), all information provided for, or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record, including resident deputations. This information may be posted on the Town’s website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

Questions? Ask the Planner!

Travis Sandberg, Planner I
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext. 283 or Toll Free (888) 258-6867
Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca

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