



Minutes

The Blue Mountains Special Meeting of Council

Meeting Date: September 16, 2020
Meeting Time: 10:00 a.m.
Location: Town Hall, Council Chambers, Virtual Meeting
32 Mill Street, Thornbury, ON
Prepared by Corrina Giles, Town Clerk

A. Call to Order

Mayor Alar Soever called the Council Meeting to order with all members of Council present, save Councillor Uram. Councillor Uram joined the meeting at 11:35 am. Councillor Hope vacated the meeting at 4:00 pm.

Also in attendance Chief Administrative Officer Shawn Everitt, Director of Finance and IT Services Ruth Prince, Planner Travis Sandberg, Director of Planning and Development Services Nathan Westendorp, Planning Administrative Assistant Tanya Staels, Planner Denise Whaley, Director of Operations Shawn Carey

- **Traditional Territory Acknowledgment**
- **Council Member Attendance**

The Town Clerk noted that all Council members were in attendance, save Councillor Uram

- **Approval of Agenda**

Moved by: Rob Potter Seconded by: Andrea Matrosovs

THAT the Agenda of September 16, 2020 be approved as circulated, including any items added to the Agenda,

Councillor Bordignon	Yay
Councillor Hope	Yay
Councillor Matrosovs	Yay
Deputy Mayor Potter	Yay
Councillor Sampson	Yay
Councillor Uram	Absent
Mayor Soever	Yay

The motion is Carried.

- **Declaration of Pecuniary Interest and general nature thereof**
NOTE: In accordance with the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act* and the Town Procedural By-law 2019-56, Council Members must file a written statement of the interest and its general nature with the Clerk for inclusion on the Registry.

None

B. Public Meetings

Under the authority of the *Municipal Act, 2001* and in accordance with Ontario's *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (MFIPPA), The Corporation of the Town of The Blue Mountains wishes to inform the public that all information including opinions, presentations, reports and documentation provided for or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record. This information may be posted on the Town's website and or/ made available to the public upon request.

NOTE: The Town of The Blue Mountains continues to be in a declared state of emergency, and that Council and Committee Meetings will continue to be held virtually during this time. Comments received from the public that have not been included on the Agenda, will be read at the meeting by the Town Clerk.

None

C.1 Public Meeting: Application for Zoning Amendment, 20 Alice Street East, Thornbury

Mayor Alar Soever read the Notice of Public Meeting regarding application for Zoning Amendment for 20 Alice Street East, Thornbury.

Mayor Soever noted the purpose of this application is to consider a site-specific zoning amendment to permit the conversion of the existing structure into eleven (11) residential apartment dwelling units. The amendment proposes to re-zone the subject lands from the existing R1-1-1 residential zone into an R3 exception residential zone in order to permit an apartment building.

Mayor Soever noted the amendment does not propose to alter the limit of the existing Hazard zone boundary currently applied to the property. The lands are also subject to concurrent site plan application P2878.

Mayor Soever noted the legal description of the subject lands is town plot part Lot 4 Alice E/S.

Mayor Soever noted the public meeting is your chance to make your views about it known. Information from the public will help Council in their decision-making process, so make sure to have your say.

Mayor Soever noted a decision on this proposal has not been made at this point and will not be made at the Public Meeting.

Mayor Soever noted after reviewing the application and any comments received, Town staff will bring a recommendation on this project to a future council meeting.

Mayor Soever noted you must make a request in writing if you wish to receive a notice of any decision of Council on this proposal.

Mayor Soever noted if a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to Town of The Blue Mountains before the by-law is passed, the person or public body is not entitled to. If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting, or make written submissions to Town of The Blue Mountains before the by-law is passed, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Tribunal, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

Mayor Soever further noted 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. All

public meetings may also be recorded, and the information may be posted on the Town's website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

The Town Clerk spoke, noting that the Notice of Public Meeting was given in accordance with the *Planning Act* and in response comments were received from Bell Canada, County of Grey, Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, Ministry of Transportation, Niagara Escarpment Commission, Jennifer Roberts, Kevin Wright, Ian White, Darcy McCarney, Lori and Gary Carscadden, Don Green, Sherry Vissers, Yvonne Weltch and Ted Sivell and Jennifer Glover.

Town Planner, Travis Sandberg spoke noting this is the Public Meeting to discuss the application for a zoning by-law amendment for 20 Alice Street East. Travis noted that the application is also subject to a concurrent site plan application, however, approval of the site plan application cannot be considered until a decision is made on zoning by Council. Travis noted that the applicant is Susan Min, the authorized agent is Andrew Pascuzzo from Pascuzzo Planning Inc., the location of the property is 20 Alice Street East, Thornbury. Travis noted that the Town received the applications in April, 2020 and they were deemed complete in May, 2020, further noting that due to COVID-19, the public meeting was delayed. Travis noted that the lot area is approximately 2200 square metres.

Travis identified the lands within Thornbury, noting it is in close proximity to the Bruce Street, Marsh Street corridor. Travis reviewed the current official plan designations applied to the lands noting that the lands are currently designated as Community Living Area (Primary Settlement Area), noting that this designation applies to the Thornbury Clarksburg settlement area and is generally the main focus for growth and development in the Town. There is also a portion of the property identified as having Significant Woodlands, to which the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority has commented. Travis noted that the current zoning of the property is R1-1-1 which is a low density, residential zone, and it also has a site specific exception to allow the existing funeral home use. Travis noted that the R1-1-1 zone permits single detached dwellings and home occupations and accessory dwelling units as well. Travis noted that the proposed application is proposing to rezone the subject lands from the R1-1-1 zone to the R3 Exception zone (R3-X) to allow apartment dwelling units and recognize existing non-compliant aspects of the property such as the existing driveway width and setback from the adjacent property. Travis noted that additional considerations may be considered in that exception zone through the review of the application.

Travis reviewed the proposed draft site plan, noting that the intent is to increase the number of residential dwelling units within the existing structure to a maximum of 11 units, further noting that at this time the applicant is not proposing any significant exterior alterations, and there is also some improvements to the existing parking proposed in order to allow for 16 parking spaces, whereas the zoning by-law requires 15, including an accessible parking space. Travis noted that there is also some improved or enhanced buffer landscape strips along the rear yard property lines which includes plantings and fencing. Travis noted as part of the development there will be a need for updated service laterals for municipal sewer and water services.

Andrew Pascuzzo, of Pascuzzo Planning consultant for the applicant, processing the zoning amendment that is before Council today. Andrew noted that with respect to the building, it has been utilized as a funeral home, and it is not the intent of the applicant to make modifications to the exterior of the building, further noting that there is a lot of character in this building.

Andrew introduced the development team, being Applicant Susan Min, Architectural Design Custom Cadd Inc., Engineer Capes Engineering, Planner Pascuzzo Planning Inc. Andrew noted that Susan Min and her team are not the current owners of the property, they are proceeding through this process without having ownership of the property yet.

Andrew noted that the lot is .22 hectares in size with 24 metres of frontage on Alice Street East, full services within Alice Street East including full municipal water and sanitary sewer. Andrew noted that with respect to the building itself, it is an existing three storey brick building with an attached garage at the back, with two existing apartments on the second and third floor. Currently the building has 232 square metres of ground floor area, 173 square metres on the second floor, and 79 square metres on the third floor. The building has been operated as a funeral home from 2002 until last year. There is an existing gravel parking lot at the rear of the property which maintains approximately 15 spaces which are not clearly identified on the property currently. The property gains access via a driveway from Alice Street East and a sidewalk to the front door. To the east of the property are single detached family homes as well as to the south, across to Alice Street, and to the west is the Errinrung Nursing Home complex, and to the north is the additional single family homes and the Bruce Street corridor.

Andrew spoke regarding the walkability of the property and its location within the community of Thornbury, noting that this property lends itself to a great intensification project. Andrew noted that this property is within a number of amenities, including downtown shops and restaurants, potential employment opportunities for residents, Post Office, Beaver Valley Community Centre, Town Hall, Pharmacy, Grocery Store and the Harbour and Parks. Andrew noted that there is a high probability that would reside in this potential apartment building may not require a vehicle.

Andrew spoke regarding the proposal, being a conversion of the existing funeral home and a conversion of the two existing residential apartments on the second and third floor into 11 residential apartments. Andrew noted that the proposal is for 9 bachelor apartments, 1-one bedroom apartment, and 1-two bedroom apartment. Seven bachelor apartments proposed for the first floor with murphy beds, two bachelor units and a one bedroom unit on the second floor, and a two bedroom unit on the third floor.

Andrew noted that the units will range in size from 250 square feet to 800 square feet, with no changes to the exterior of the building, and no additions to the building.

Andrew then explained the existing layout of the building currently, and the proposed changes to the interior as conceptually proposed. Andrew noted that no building permit has been submitted at this time as this layout is conceptual. Andrew noted that some of the units have access from common areas, and some have access from the west or front side of the building

Andrew noted that much thought has gone into the design of the interior of the building at this stage, recognizing that this needs to be a well thought out project from the outset. Andrew reiterated that the drawings are conceptual at this point, and noted that as part of the zoning by-law amendment are requesting a maximum unit count of 11 units, with the potential to reduce the number for a different design for the interior of the building.

Andrew spoke regarding the site servicing noting that the existing infrastructure on Alice Street has the capacity to handle the intensification project proposed. What is proposing in terms of changes would all occur on 20 Alice Street, including the lateral connections between the infrastructure that exists under Alice Street and that connect to the exterior of the building. Andrew noted that the Engineer has completed a review of the laterals and has suggested that there would be upgrades required from the 100 mm to 200 mm diameter for sanitary sewer, and an upgrade of the water from 19 mm to 50 mm, further noting that the additional units and fixtures within the unit require the upgrades. Andrew confirmed that those costs would be borne by the applicant

Andrew noted that with respect to stormwater, sandy soils and shallow ponding at the north end of the site, there is opportunity for onsite infiltration. Andrew noted that they have submitted a functional servicing and stormwater drainage drawings with the site plan

application. Andrew noted that 50% of the site is to be landscaped impervious, which is a 2% increase in impervious surface from the existing situation. Andrew confirmed that garbage collection would be collected curbside.

Andrew reviewed the background of the schedule of the project, noting it has been impacted due to the review process and the public meeting schedule.

Andrew spoke regarding why this application is good planning and why this is a great intensification project for Thornbury in the Town of The Blue Mountains. Andrew noted that the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan permits the proposed apartment use and density within its community living are designation, proposed density on the .22 hectare property is 11 units which is a density of 50 units per hectare. Technically, with respect to the density chart within the Official Plan, multiple and apartment units can go to a height of three storeys as well as a density of 60 units per hectare. Andrew confirmed that the official plan would allow 13 units on the property. Andrew noted that the proposed apartments provide an alternative housing option within the downtown area, including the opportunity for the residents to walk to do everything. The building façade will maintain as is, the interior will be renovated and used for its original residential purpose, municipal infrastructure is immediately available and parking standards are being met.

Andrew spoke regarding short term accommodation, noting that it is not the applicant's intent to use the site for short term accommodation recognizing that there is a lot of uncertainty and discomfort with short term accommodations and the compatibility of them. Andrew noted that this information has been relayed to the applicant and, for a number of reasons, it is important to address short term accommodation. Andrew noted that the applicant sees the potential for short term accommodation in this property from a financial standpoint, and noted that the applicant would like to know if there are any concerns from the neighbours regarding short term accommodation. Andrew noted that the location would be attractive for tourists and offer a great opportunity for tourists to come in, while the smaller unit size would provide a reduction for potential for noise and compatibility issues as the small bachelor units do not allow large parties that tend to create noise and add to compatibility issues that come out of short term accommodation in other locations.

Andrew spoke in response to the comments to date, noting that three letters were received in support of the application, and nine letters with concerns. Andrew noted that the applicant is proposing more units that mean lower rental rates, larger units allow more individuals to gather and may allow incompatible situations. Andrew noted that there is no ability for anyone to rent bachelor apartments in the Town, and noted that it appears that single individuals that are renting are having to team up and room with others. Andrew noted that there are many professionals that are trying to find one bedroom apartments.

Andrew spoke regarding traffic concerns, and noted that most of the amenities are within walking distance. Andrew noted that the site has the capacity to allow many more cars than what is being proposed by the application today. Andrew noted that the applicant is not considering maintaining the site as a single family home, as it is an underutilization of the site as it can provide rental options.

Andrew noted that comments have been received by neighbours to the east and north regarding very specific site plan items, including fencing, lighting in parking lot. Andrew confirmed that there is no plan for lighting in the parking lot, so light pollution will not be an issue. Andrew noted that the trees along the northern property line is an option for the application that is before staff now in the site plan.

Andrew confirmed that there will be no decisions made today, and that the applicant will consider the concerns raised by Council, staff and the public and potentially make modifications to the site plan.

Councillor Bordignon spoke questioning reference to short term accommodation and noted this is concerning and questioned the intention of the developer as it relates to short term accommodation in this location. Andrew noted that the applicant's intent is to use the site for residential apartments, not for short term accommodation units, further noting that they are of the understanding that one short term accommodation unit would be permitted here if the applicant went through the process for applying for a short term accommodation license permit. Andrew noted that they understand that there are concerns with the compatibility of short term accommodations, further noting that there is potential for the applicant to have one short term accommodation unit and it is not their intent to ask for any more than the one permitted short term accommodation unit. Andrew clarified that one of the 11 units would have a short term accommodation permit associated with it.

Councillor Bordignon questioned if the intent, from the beginning of this project, is to use any of the units for short term accommodations. Andrew spoke in response noting that the intent of the application is to consider one short term accommodation at this stage.

Councillor Sampson questioned if the proposed amendment is to change the zoning by-law to the category that would allow short term accommodation units, as the current zoning by-law would not permit short term accommodation units. Travis spoke in response noting that this is correct, the proposed zoning of R3 allows for short term accommodation, but this site, because it is not in the exception area, would be subject to the 120 metre separation which would then limit the ability of that site for short term accommodation to only one of the 11 units.

Councillor Sampson noted that by right, this or any future owner would also have the ability to have one short term accommodation unit at this site. Councillor Sampson then referenced bed and breakfast applications, and questioned if this site would be eligible for a bed and breakfast use. Travis spoke in response noting that bed and breakfast uses are only permitted in single detached dwellings, not in apartment dwellings. Travis noted that if the zoning were changed to an R3, there would be no potential for a bed and breakfast in the R3 zone. Councillor Sampson questioned if the zoning were R1 if the entire building could be a bed and breakfast, Travis replying correct, to a maximum of three bedrooms.

Councillor Sampson then referenced the affordability of the units on what is being proposed. Andrew spoke in response noting that the applicant has requested relief from the development charges and cash in lieu fees, noting that there is a challenge on what affordable housing thresholds are within The Blue Mountains. Andrew noted that it is difficult to state a number as to whether this fits into the affordable category or not, but noted that with the size of the unit, the units will be attainable for individuals to get into. Councillor Sampson noted that what is attainable has been publicized by the Blue Mountains Attainable Housing Corporation, and questioned what portion of the units will fall into the attainable housing category values listed on the Blue Mountains Attainable Housing website, if any. Andrew spoke in response noting the applicant is trying to achieve attainable housing goals, but noted the applicant has to go through the project, renovate, etc.

Deputy Mayor Potter spoke questioning if there are any other short term accommodation and bed and breakfast uses in apartment buildings. Travis noted that there are situations in Town where there is a short term accommodation in a higher density zone category in an apartment building, further noting that it is first past the post situation, in that a unit owner would submit a licence application which would go through the appropriate review. Once the licence is issued (if it can be issued), it would then be tracked through By-law Enforcement Short Term Accommodation program and then, if any other unit requested a short term accommodation licence, it would be denied as it would be within the 120 metre separation distance from a current short term accommodation licence.

Deputy Mayor Potter noted that short term accommodation units are not popular with neighbours. Travis spoke in response noting that the short term accommodation licence would be attached to a specific unit in the building, and the occupant load would be based on the number of bedrooms and available parking for that unit.

Councillor Bordignon referenced the zoning by-law amendment application needs to be done for this application to proceed and questioned if there is a way to change the zoning that would not permit short term accommodations in this location. Travis spoke in response noting that this can be considered through the zoning process, further noting that this has been done in previous occasions, with a site specific zoning amendment. Travis noted that as part of the site specific exception, short term accommodations have been strictly prohibited for a site in previous occasions, and Council can consider this.

Councillor Matrosovs spoke regarding parking on Alice Street and noted that parking is a concern along Alice Street. Councillor Matrosovs noted that the application notes 15 parking spaces plus one accessible parking space, and questioned if this is sufficient for the units proposed. Councillor Matrosovs questioned what is accessible for overflow parking onto Alice Street, and what is the contingency for the additional cars for guests that will be involved with this type of density coming from one building. Travis noted that the zoning by-law provides the parking requirements for multi-use residential buildings, specifically apartment buildings and multi-dwelling units, the zoning by-law requires one space per studio or bachelor unit, 1.25 spaces per one bedroom units, and 1.75 spaces per two bedroom units, further noting that additional parking spaces are accounted for visitors. Travis noted that through the preliminary review of the file, it appears that the parking is compliant with the requirements. Travis noted that with respect to overflow parking, noting that if there is any street parking, this would be a by-law enforcement matter.

Councillor Matrosovs questioned what the applicant's plan is for the one and two bedroom units, noting that there is a good probability that renters may wish to rent these units and require two parking spaces. Councillor Matrosovs noted that this would limit the extra spaces for visitors. Andrew spoke in response noting that it will come down to the fact that they believe many individuals that rent these units will not have a vehicle and this will alleviate any concerns with regard to parking. Andrew noted that the lease agreements set up with each of the renters will stipulate that they can only park in their parking space, and no other. Andrew noted that yes, there could be two renters in one unit that both have cars, further noting that the appropriate number of parking spaces has been allocated for each unit. Andrew noted that the application confirms with the zoning by-law as stated by Planner Travis Sandberg, and if anything, the applicant believes that the number of cars will be less than that required.

Councillor Hope spoke noting that much of the presentation expressed a concern with traffic and questioned if this has been reviewed. Councillor Hope questioned if there are any plans to address traffic in the area. Travis spoke in response noting on preliminary review and feedback from Development Engineering and commenting agencies, no concerns with respect to the increase in traffic has been raised, but noted this question can be posed back to the Town's Development Engineering division for further comment in the followup staff report

Pat and Ralph Jamieson, residents 40 Alice Street East, spoke noting that their questions have been addressed, but want it noted that they do object to the application and have concerns with particularly short term accommodation and traffic. From what they have heard today, no one has provided a definite answer or has the right answer for them sitting back looking on to this application, and noted that he would like to see the next meeting with some definite proposals.

Lynn and Tom Horlor, residents 59 Bruce Street South, spoke noting they are the residential property to the north of the subject application, further noting that their backyard is on the The Blue Mountains

south side, and borders the back yard of 20 Alice Street for about 39 metres. Ms. Horlor noted that they have provided their comments in writing, but want to spend a few minutes summarizing their major concerns. Ms. Horlor noted that this proposed development appears to follow the official plan, but is a dramatic change in use to build 11 apartments within an old single family home. Ms. Horlor noted that the proposed density is very high at 50%, with 11 units on .22 hectares of land. Ms. Horlor noted that this density is very high for a single family home in a residential neighbourhood, further noting that they do understand the need for provincial, county and municipal intensification goals, but they feel that their particular block has overcontributed with the existing Errinrung and two other R3 properties which are about six units each. Ms. Horlor noted that there is also future development land within the block calling for even more density, some of which borders their backyard to the north and east of their property. Ms. Horlor noted that in addition to the density of the 11 units, one of their largest concerns is that 9 of the 11 units are proposed to be bachelor units, with the smallest at 242 square feet and the largest at 422 square feet. Ms. Horlor expressed concern with the preliminary designs, noting the units are packed in too tightly in this home. Ms. Horlor does not understand the full strategy of the attainable housing initiative, but upon a quick review of the on-line documents, it appears that the applicant is not considering bachelor units in The Blue Mountains local market rate. Ms. Horlor questioned who will be attracted to units of this size, noting the units more resemble university dorm rooms or hotel rooms, than apartments for long term occupants. Ms. Horlor noted with such small units, and no interior common space, outdoor space will be critical for the residents, further noting that with the required parking spaces, the outdoor space will be limited. Ms. Horlor noted that they do not believe the applicant has completed their due diligence, further noting that they have not reached out to the surrounding properties most effected by the application, or to the other neighbour. Ms. Horlor noted that the lack of interest in this neighbourhood and how the proposal is received may also reflect their concerns on how they will be dealt with in the future. Ms. Horlor noted that they are very disappointed with the applicant's expectations and their request to Council to exempt this property from development charges and cash-in-lieu even though their application calls for considerable growth on the property. Ms. Horlor thanked Council for following the staff recommendation to defer this request until the attainable housing plan community improvement plan is underway, and until this public meeting has taken place. Ms. Horlor noted that they worry that the applicant is using the attainable housing needs to try and push this development through, yet do not appear to be concerned about building units that will not be attainable, and questioned if the development will attract the right, long term tenants, and potential employees to support our local businesses. Ms. Horlor noted that this is a business venture for profit, which will make it very difficult, if not impossible for the owners to rent these units at lower than market rates. Ms. Horlor noted that they request that Council deny this application based on the 11 units. Ms. Horlor noted that they are not opposed to a fence, but are concerned about losing the trees, one of which is protected, by putting the fence up.

Deputy Mayor Potter spoke noting that the property was most recently a funeral home currently, and questioned how adjacent neighbours were effected by traffic and noise over the years. Ms. Horlor noted that they have resided here since May, 2018, and believe that the funeral home was wrapping up operations at this time, noting that there may have been just two visitations during this time. Ms. Horlor noted that their biggest concern has been this past summer when the current owners have rented the apartments out, noting that the OPP has visited the site because of parties at the property.

Jenifer Glover, resident 24 Alice Street East, spoke noting that Ms. Horlor covered many of the issues that she has, noting that she resides on the east side of the subject property. Ms. Glover was confused by the developer and the planner today regarding the attainable housing reference noting that she does not believe that this application fits within the blanket of attainable housing and believes that it is over-densification of the area itself. Ms. Glover noted that 11 units, including the size of the units, are not acceptable, further noting

that the units are not in keeping with what is going on in the neighbourhood. Ms. Glover noted that if the units were two bedroom units for professional couples or small families, that they would completely blend into the neighbourhood, but as it stands, the proposed units will not blend into the neighbourhood. Ms. Glover noted that there has been a significant amount of noise coming from the subject property this summer created by the renters, further noting that it has been quite noisy, with just two rented units. Ms. Glover noted that there were so few funerals in the home that they were not effected by noise, noting that many patrons would park on the street, as opposed to in the parking lot. Ms. Glover noted that there are children on the street, and expressed concern for their safety with the increased traffic. Ms. Glover noted that it is proposed that 8 of the 11 units will now be using the side entrance of the house, which entrance does not exist currently, instead of the front of the house. Ms. Glover noted that this will create a lot of noise and issues.

Susan Min, spoke thanking Council for taking the time to consider the project today. Susan noted that four young families are invested in this project, all of which are full-time residents who have lived here for the past five plus years. Ms. Min noted that they all live in the community and send their kids to schools in the neighbourhoods so they completely understand the concerns of the area residents. Susan noted that the development group decided to pursue this project because they felt that there was a need for it, further noting that two of them have businesses in the area, and they are all self-employed entrepreneurs, noting that one of the challenges they experienced and have heard from other businesses is the issue of being able to hire service people, support staff, and people who work to provide care to seniors at Errinrunga. Susan noted that the lack of transit to Thornbury, as well as the lack of rental opportunities in general, is a huge issue. Susan noted that part of the reason they embarked on this project, and the way they decided to build this project, was based on feedback they received from the owners of Foodland and the Executive Director of Errinrunga. Susan noted that the Executive Director of Errinrunga noted that when recruiting care workers, the biggest issue is the fact that many of the careworkers are international employees who do not always have drivers licences and are unable to commute from Meaford or Wasaga Beach for work. Susan noted that the development team could retain the home as a single family home, and make a profit from it, but this is not their intention. Susan noted that their intention is to try to create a product that will address the concerns heard in the neighbourhood, from the community, and from Councillors regarding the need for rental opportunities. Susan noted that in terms of the type of product they are proposing, they understand the concerns from neighbours regarding the number of units and size of the units, but noted that their architect has made a concerted effort to try to push the number of units to create a project that will be financially viable. Susan spoke regarding the layout of the bachelor units, noting each unit includes a bedroom and a separate living space, noting that they did not want the building to feel like an apartment building, with everyone entering through one door and one common space, what they wanted to do was to create four or five entrance points for the units. Susan noted that a number of the units have their own self-contained separate entrance. Susan noted that because of the lack of rental opportunities that many people are renting bedrooms and sharing kitchen and washroom facilities. Susan noted that their view was that yes, the units are smaller, but provides an option for people to have their own private self-contained unit. Susan noted that she is not sure that renting a bedroom in a house and sharing kitchen and washroom facilities is better than being able to rent your own self-contained private unit, particularly in the current pandemic situation.

Susan then spoke regarding reference to short term accommodation, and noted that it is not their intent to turn this property into 11 weekend short term accommodation rental units, further noting they are not interested in running a hotel. Susan noted that they had not initially applied for short term accommodation, but when completing their planning pre-consultation with the Town, the question arose as there is an option within the planning by-laws, to include short term accommodation as one of the requests. Susan noted that they

liked the flexibility of being able to rent a vacant unit as a short term accommodation until a long term renter can be found to occupy the space. Susan noted that they have no interest in short term accommodations, and confirmed that if this is a deciding factor for Councillors and the neighbours, she understands, and that their preference would be to take the request for a short term accommodation unit off the table.

Susan then spoke regarding reference to attainable rents, noting that she has discussed this with Councillor Sampson and other Board members of The Blue Mountains Attainable Housing Corporation and noted that one of the questions is what qualifies as attainable housing rental rates. Susan noted that the biggest challenge is understanding market rent, noting that rent in The Blue Mountains area is significantly inflated because of seasonal renters. Susan noted that they do not have reliable market rent numbers, so they took the standard that CMHC and banks use that indicates that people should be spending no more than 30% of what a household income is. Susan noted that The Blue Mountains Attainable Housing Corporation specifically states that the salary ranges or household income ranges that they are targeting is anywhere between \$40,000 and \$100,000 on an annual basis. Susan noted that their rental numbers fall well within 30%, or the bottom end of the attainable housing target of household income factors.

Susan noted that she does not know what parking will look like when the property is rented out, though noted that their intent is to meet the needs of employers like Foodland and Errinrunga who have commented on how difficult it is to hire employees because of the fact that they cannot find places to live within walking distance of their workplace.

Susan reiterated that they are looking to make a profit, noting that they are four young families who looking to ensure they are investing in a project that is financially sustainable.

Deputy Mayor Potter spoke questioning what the range of rental rates is expected to be. Susan spoke in response noting that local market rates are inflated, further noting that she is hesitant to provide actual rental rate figures as they still have project costs, including the cost to renovate, pay development charges, and noted that soft charge fees are high.

Donald Green, resident 36 Alice Street, spoke noting that his concern and the concern of most of the neighbours, is compatibility with the neighbourhood. Alice Street is a single family detached home street, further noting that an 11 unit apartment building is not compatible in their opinion. Mr. Green referred Council to the Gateway Project where one of the comments in that material points out that the Gateway Project will not infringe or affect any existing residential neighborhoods, and noted that the same logic should apply to this application. Mr. Green noted that the project does not meet the attainable housing standards in that, the Gateway Project does not have any bachelor apartments, and it seems that the Gateway Project would be a better location for bachelor apartments if they are to be allowed at all. Ms. Green noted that in his opinion, and that of most of the neighbours, is that bachelor apartments are transient. Mr. Green noted that there has been much discussion about people with no cars and the walkability of the site, noting that a 350 square unit is going to attract transients. Mr. Green noted that transients do not belong in a single family detached area. Mr. Green noted that this application is not good planning because of its location, and it fails the test as it is not really attainable housing. Mr. Green noted that it is his understanding that attainable housing is aimed at attracting people who will become permanent residents, further noting that a bachelor apartment is, at best, going to attract people who are looking to be here for a short term. Mr. Green noted he has neighbours that have already complained because of the noise coming from two units in the subject lands, and questioned what happens when there are bachelor units which will be single, probably young people, who are looking to have fun, but does not feel this is the right area. Mr. Green does not oppose anyone wishing to have fun, but does not feel that this is the right area for the development.

Mr. Green noted that regarding the traffic from the funeral home, he confirms that over the last number of years, the funeral home held at most, two to three funerals per month. Mr. Green noted that the funerals would be short term visitations, and confirmed that people parked on the street but confirmed it was not a big problem. Mr. Green noted that the funeral home did not create any issues with noise or traffic in the area. Mr. Green noted that he and the neighbourhood residents are concerned that this really is going to be a transient haven for people to come and go, further noting that this is a single family detached home neighbourhood, and noted that anything that is done with this property should take this into account. Mr. Green noted that there has been great emphasis on the fact that the exterior of the building is not going to change, and he supports this, however, he notes that the big issue is the “use” of the building noting the use is more important than the façade.

Councillor Uram joined the meeting at 11:35 am.

Jennifer Roberts, resident 32 Alice Street East, spoke noting she is two doors down from the proposed apartment building. Ms. Roberts noted that she is good friends with the neighbours that have already spoken and they have captured all of the issues that she would speak to.

Ms. Roberts noted that this is a business concept that is sold conditionally on the property being rezoned from what we have all bought into which is R1, single family dwelling, to be an R3 zone. Ms. Roberts noted that this is a very clever business concept, the design is well done in that it maximizes every square foot of utilities so that the owner gets the biggest return on investment. Ms. Roberts noted that she would argue that this application is without regard to the quality of life of the residents of the apartment building, and the quality of life of the neighbours. Ms. Roberts noted that this is a special little space, noting that Alice Street East is a dead-end street to a pond and river and has a mix of houses of different sizes of retirees and young families with most living on the street fulltime. Ms. Roberts noted that this area is one of those little places that make Thornbury really special. Ms. Roberts noted that they have been buffered from intensity of Errinrung, by the funeral home. Ms. Roberts noted that there is other intensity that Ms. Horlor has spoken to, further noting that her concern is that if the developer really does care about providing walkable accommodation for people who work at Foodland, etc. then why not give a better quality of life, or choose a property that is already appropriately zoned, or where the cost structure allows them to develop profitably without crowding. Ms. Roberts referenced the proposed floor plan and noted that seven bachelor units on one floor is visually crowding to the eye and cannot imagine what it will feel like for its residents. Ms. Roberts noted that the garbage coming from 11 units will be significant, and the pedestrian traffic to the proposed sidedoor entrance will be imposing to the neighbour. Ms. Roberts noted that there are young children in the neighbourhood, and that parking along Alice Street is already significant because of Errinrung visitors. Ms. Roberts respectfully requested that this application not be approved and that the funeral home can then go back on the market and be purchased by another purchaser who will be more respectful of the neighbourhood and provide quality of life for people inside and outside.

Planner Andrew Pascuzzo spoke in response to Ms. Roberts and the ability to find other properties in The Blue Mountains that are already zoned for apartments, noting there are none. Andrew noted that this is the mandate of this Council, and that he recognizes that the neighbours do not want to see this in their neighbourhood, but it has to go somewhere within the municipality, and that is why the developer is going through the rezoning process.

Deputy Mayor Potter spoke noting that we need to look at more intensification if we are ever going to have attainable housing, further noting that we have had 30 to 40 years of not allowing intensification in our community. Deputy Mayor Potter noted that this been true

across Ontario, and this is why we are in the crisis we are in now where there is nowhere for our younger families to get their first home. Deputy Mayor Potter noted that intensification still has to be well managed and done the right way, noting that Council has to look at this proposal in that light as Council would any other proposal to intensify.

Councillor Matrosovs spoke in response to Planner Andrew Pascuzzo, and questioned if there are any concluding comments from the Planner or Ms. Min in response to the collective concerns regarding the concentration of the units, and if there are further comments regarding the transient nature, and if they will be seeking one year lease options from tenants. Susan Min spoke in response noting that their intent is to have one year leases, further noting that their group has been reviewing the financials and that fewer units would constrain them financially, and noted that 11 units provides the numbers that they need. Susan noted that larger units means higher rents, and fewer units, further noting that they continue to look at the layout.

As no one further wished to speak, the Mayor declared the Public Meeting to be closed.

C.2 Public Meeting: Plan of Subdivision Application, Abbotts Subdivision, County File No. 42T-2019-02, Lots 35 to 39, Southwest of Bay Street, Town Plot of Thornbury

Mayor Alar Soever read the Notice of Public Meeting regarding the County and Town are seeking input on development applications within 120 metres of your property that would create a total of 22 lots for 22 semi-detached residential dwellings.

Mayor Soever noted Lots 35 to 39, Southwest Side of Bay Street, Town Plot of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains

Mayor Soever noted the County received a plan of subdivision application known as the Abbotts Subdivision (County file number 42T-2019-02) that proposes to create lots for 22 semi-detached residential dwellings. The draft plan seeks to create 11 lots that would be further divided into 22 lots, through Part-Lot Control at a later time. Access to the lots would be from extensions of Bay Street West and Victoria Street North. The new road extensions are proposed to be a one-way road. The proposed subdivision would be serviced by municipal water and sewer services.

Mayor Soever noted the effect of the zoning by-law amendment application is to rezone the subject lands from the Residential One (R1-1) zone to the Residential Two (R2) zone to permit the semi-detached dwellings.

Mayor Soever noted the public meeting is an opportunity for members of the public to learn more about the proposed development. A brief presentation will be made about the development. Those who have preregistered with the Town Clerk can ask questions, and/or make statements either in favour of, or in opposition to the development.

Mayor Soever noted within Ontario the planning and development process is an open and transparent process, where opinions from all individuals and groups are welcomed. By law a municipality must hold a public meeting, and this meeting is just one of your chances to learn about the development proposal and offer your opinions. Under the legislation governing this development process, which is sections 34 and 51 of the *Planning Act*, you have the following rights:

1. Any persons may attend the public meeting and/or make written or verbal representation either in support of or in opposition to the proposed zoning by-law amendment or plan of subdivision.
2. If a person* or public body would otherwise have an ability to appeal the decisions of the Town of The Blue Mountains or the County of Grey to the Local Planning

Appeal Tribunal but the person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to Town of The Blue Mountains before the zoning by-law amendment is approved or refused, or to the County of Grey before the plan of subdivision is approved or refused, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decisions.

3. If a person* or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Town of The Blue Mountains before the zoning by-law amendment is approved or refused, or to the County of Grey before the plan of subdivision is approved or refused, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Tribunal, there are reasonable grounds to do so.
4. If you wish to be notified of the decision by the Town of The Blue Mountains in respect to the approval or refusal of the zoning by-law amendment, or the County of Grey in respect to the approval or refusal of the plan of subdivision, you must make a written request to the Town or the County, at the addresses noted on the previous page. Please note application P2832 for the zoning by-law amendment when directing comments to the Town and plan of subdivision application 42T-2019-02 when directing comments to the County.
5. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact County or Town staff, who would be happy to answer any questions on the matter.

Mayor Soever noted notwithstanding the above, only a 'person' listed in subsection 51(48.3) of the *Planning Act* may appeal the decision of the County of Grey to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) as it relates to the proposed plan of subdivision. Below is the prescribed list of 'persons' eligible to appeal a decision of the County of Grey related to the proposed plan of subdivision as per subsection 51(48.3) of the Planning Act. These are recent changes that have been made to the Planning Act by the province. A link to the revised Planning Act can be found at <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13>. For more information about these recent changes, please visit the LPAT website or contact LPAT - <https://elto.gov.on.ca/tribunals/lpat/about-lpat/>.

Mayor Soever noted the prescribed list of 'persons' eligible to appeal a decision of the County on the proposed plan of subdivision as per subsection 51(48.3) of the Planning Act is as follows:

1. A corporation operating an electric utility in the local municipality or planning area to which the plan of subdivision would apply.
2. Ontario Power Generation Inc.
3. Hydro One Inc.
4. A company operating a natural gas utility in the local municipality or planning area to which the plan of subdivision would apply.
5. A company operating an oil or natural gas pipeline in the local municipality or planning area to which the plan of subdivision would apply.
6. A person required to prepare a risk and safety management plan in respect of an operation under Ontario Regulation 211/01 (Propane Storage and Handling) made under the Technical Standards and Safety Act, 2000, if any part of the distance established as the hazard distance applicable to the operation and referenced in the risk and safety management plan is within the area to which the plan of subdivision would apply.
7. A company operating a railway line any part of which is located within 300 metres of any part of the area to which the plan of subdivision would apply.
8. A company operating as a telecommunication infrastructure provider in the area to which the plan of subdivision would apply.

Mayor Soever further noted 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 or County websites, and/or made available to the public upon request.

The Town Clerk spoke, noting that the Notice of Public Meeting was given in accordance with the *Planning Act* and in response comments were received from Andrew Pascuzzo on behalf of Bayside Villas, Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association, Cecile and David Turnbull, Dave Shoots / 1536732 Ontario Inc, Don and Helga Chapman, Eniko Herceg, Harry Burkman, Helmut Hock, Catherine Howell Isabel and William Thornhill, Krista Currie, Paul and Sue Roberts, Peter Samson and Cathy Williamson, Peter Snelling, Rob Robinson, Sue and Paul Roberts, William Thornhill, Tom Downer, Kim Harris Gardner, David Small, June Porter, Christine Eaton, Historic Saugeen Metis (HSM) Lands, Resources and Consultation Department, Bell Canada, Union Gas, Bluewater District School Board, Canada Post and Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.

Nathan Westendorp, Director of Planning and Development Services, spoke noting the proposal has been around since prior to his arrival at The Blue Mountains and prior to this Council's election in 2018. Nathan noted that there has been many conversations between Town staff and the engaged community, and noted that the level of engagement in today's public meeting is indicative of how closely and passionately people feel about their individual neighbourhood and community within Thornbury and within the Town as a whole. Nathan noted that planning staff determined that it was necessary to move the process, under the Planning Act, forward and noted this is why we are before Council today to hold a legislated and statutory public meeting. Nathan noted that this is the official opportunity for people to provide their verbal comments, further noting that written comments can continue to be received even after this public meeting. Nathan noted that staff, after this Public Meeting, will take into consideration the comments and information received from the public and Council, further noting that the Town's review of this application is not complete yet as they continue to review technical matters along with the consulting team retained by the owner. Nathan noted that this is one important part of the process, as this development, if approved, will become part of this neighbourhood.

Town Planner, Denise Whaley, spoke noting that Grey County Planner, Scott Taylor is also present today as this is a joint public meeting with Grey County. Denise noted that the zoning by-law amendment is considered by Town of The Blue Mountains Council, and if a by-law is passed, Grey County is the approval authority for the plan of subdivision and therefore this meeting is also the statutory meeting for the plan of subdivision and that is why the meeting is a joint meeting.

Denise reviewed the details of the application, owner is Tammy Abbotts, consultant is Kristine Loft of Loft Planning, the location is Town Plot 35-39, fronting on the open portion of Lansdowne Street North, but also Bay and Victoria Streets road allowances. Denise noted that both applications were deemed complete on December 20, 2019, but due to COVID-19 the public meeting was delayed. The lot area is 1.1 hectare.

Denise displayed an area photo of the property showing the road allowances on the Northeast and Southeast sides, and Lansdowne Street the open street. Denise noted that two of the lots are landlocked, but the one lot directly fronts onto Lansdowne. Denise reviewed the surrounding neighbourhoods, including Bayside Villas on the Southeast Side, and the single detached units and some vacant properties nearby. Denise noted on the western portion of the aerial photo, is the former landfill, further noting that it is not operating, but anyone developing within proximity of the former landfill lands needs to study if there are any impacts to that new development.

Denise reviewed the current official plan designation, noting there is one designation for all of the residential lands in Thornbury being Community Living Area, and that encompasses a number of types of residential development, including single family, semidetached, apartments, and townhouses. Denise noted there is hazard lands adjacent to the Little Beaver River.

Denise noted that the property and adjacent properties, other than Bayside Villas, are all zoned R1-1, which is single detached zoning type. Denise reviewed the H3 zone, which is the buffer surrounding the former landfill site, and the H4A buffer that applies to most of Thornbury that relates to the Source Water Protection Area as it is near an intake of source water from Georgian Bay.

Denise noted that the application is requesting to rezone the lands from the R1-1 to the R2 zone to permit semidetached dwellings. Denise noted that semi-detached dwellings are not permitted in the R1-1 zone and noted that the application is for a straight R1-1 to R2, and is not for an exception at this time.

Denise noted that the proposal is for 11 initial lots, and noted that the proposal includes a part lot control by-law in the future, so that if semidetached units were built then the lot would be split along the common wall. Denise noted that this is the typical way this is done as it difficult to build along the exact lot line after the fact. Denise noted that the subdivision is proposed to be on full services, further noting that the water and sewer would have to be installed at the cost of the developer. Denise noted that the units are proposed to front on Bay Street West, with a oneway street coming in from Bay and Victoria Street, further noting that staff are currently reviewing this. Denise noted that all of the studies are available on the County's website, and is available to the public.

Deputy Mayor Potter spoke questioning what upgrades are required to Lansdowne Street as it is narrow, has a hill, and increased traffic may be problematic, and what would the developer's contribution to that be. Denise spoke in response noting that at this time, staff have not completed a full review of the required upgrades.

Deputy Mayor Potter questioned what is the status of short term accommodations in this project, Denise spoke in response noting that at this time the developer has not mentioned short term accommodation at all, but noted that the R2 zone permits one short term accommodation unit every 120 metres to be established. Denise noted that because the developer has not asked for short term accommodations, they may not have been aware that this is built into the zoning at this time. Denise noted that this is the time to discuss short term accommodation and add any conditions in the zoning that would be appropriate, as desired by Council, in working with the developer.

Councillor Sampson spoke noting the development has three lots with two of them being landlocked as the road allowances are not opened. Councillor Sampson questioned if the road allowances would have to be opened to get access to the two landlocked lots, and if the only lot that could be developed at this time is the westerly lot that fronts on Lansdowne, Denise replying correct.

Councillor Uram questioned if staff could provide a summary of how conditions are applied within the subdivision process, noting that when the draft plan of subdivisions are applied that likely the zoning will be applied at the same time. Denise spoke in response noting that there is a concurrent process, noting that the Town, working with the County and Agencies review the subdivision along with the zoning requested after the public meeting. Denise noted that draft plan conditions are drafted and are included in a recommendation to Council for approval of the draft plan conditions, Council considers the recommendation and if approved, it then goes to the County for review and consideration. Denise noted that there are multiple steps, further noting that staff are still reviewing all studies received.

Councillor Uram noted that most conditions will be applied to the subdivision agreement once that comes forward.

Councillor Bordignon spoke noting that it is important to be cognizant of what has to happen to make the transition smoother, further noting that Council needs to consider things like short term accommodation and tree preservation, and that Council needs to consider adding conditions to satisfy everyone before we get too far, and be aware of the public comments.

Councillor Sampson spoke questioning what the open space requirements of this application, and if there are any, how are they being met. Denise spoke in response noting that there are no open space requirements specifically, noting that no park is proposed on these lands. Denise noted that there was no identified need for parkland on this site, so it is assumed that cash-in-lieu of parkland would be an opportunity to put the funds towards other parkland rather than having a park on this property. Denise noted the Community Services Department, through the consultation process, it was identified that there is no specific need for parkland in this area on this property.

Councillor Sampson then spoke questioning if the roads will be public or private, Denise spoke in response noting that the proposal is for public roads, maintained as public roads.

Kristine Loft, Loft Planning, Planning Consultant for the applicant, Tammy Abbotts, spoke noting that George Cooper, Engineer of CF Crozier is also present to answer engineering questions. Kristine noted that the additional studies submitted are monitoring studies that have been ongoing which include groundwater monitoring.

Kristine noted that the purpose and effect of the application is to create 22 semi detached lots, noting that the draft plan identifies 11 lots that would then be divided through part-lot control at a later time through the process. Kristine noted that the access would be from extensions of Bay Street West and Victoria Street North, further noting they are proposed as one-way municipal roads, with municipal water and sewer. Kristine noted that the proposed zoning would implement the zoning from the R1-1 to R2 zone which would permit the semi-detached units.

Kristine noted that the lands have frontage now on Lansdowne Street North and the unopened Bay Street road allowance, and noted the property is vacant, and is abutted generally by residential uses that front on Lakeshore Drive and Huron Street, with Bayside Villas to the east. Kristine noted that the land area is just over one hectare with 50 metres of direct frontage onto Lansdowne, with a depth on the Bay Street road allowance of 205 metres.

Kristine noted that the proposal is for 22 semi-detached lots, with each semi-detached lot having a 9 metre frontage, and 10.4 metre frontage for the corner lots. Kristine noted that the access to the lots would be onto Bay Street, or an extension of, then turning onto Victoria Street North right of way. Kristine noted that each unit would have direct frontage onto Bay Street, would be freehold units, not a condominium, with a proposed density of 22 units per gross hectare.

Kristine noted that the lands are designated primary settlement area in the County of Grey official plan, and confirmed that plan does permit semi-detached residential units and provides minimum density of 20 units per net hectare. Kristine noted that the housing policy supports a wide range of housing, including detached, semi-detached, towns and apartment units, and as well provides policies for affordable housing including secondary units.

Kristine noted in the local official plan, the lands are designated community living area, which permits semi-detached units and, as well permits secondary unit permissions.

Kristine noted that to work towards providing additional units, there is the potential for secondary units to be constructed, further noting it is included in the planning report being an accessory structure in a coachhouse style. Kristine noted that the proposed R2 zone would permit these units and, based on their review, would meet all of the zoning provisions that are provided and therefore there are no exceptions requested to the R2 zone. Kristine noted that the density within the local official plan in the community living is represented between 15 and 35 units per gross hectare and a height of 2.5 stories, further noting that the proposed development is proposing 22 units per gross hectare and no greater than 2.5 stories.

Kristine noted that the lands are currently zoned R1-1 and the proposal is to go to R2 zone which would permit semi-detached units. The proposed lot frontages per unit would be 9 metres, 10 metres for the corner lots, with depth of lots being 50 metres. The proposed lots would meet the R2 zoning provisions and the minimum R2 lot area is 350 square metres, so the lots are larger than the requirements within the R2 zone primarily because of the depth. Kristine noted that the R2 zone would be the same as the Bayside Villas development located to the east of the subject lands.

Kristine reviewed the draft plan of subdivision, and proposed one way road access from Lansdowne Street and exiting on Huron Street. Kristine noted that the proposed 20 metre road section has been applied for and is before engineering staff for review, reiterating that the access as proposed is a municipal right of way, with a 2.5 metre landscape buffer, 6 metre drainage buffer, 6 metre one-way lane, and a 5.5 metre service corridor that includes a 1.5 metre sidewalk. Kristine noted that this same road section is also proposed for Victoria Street.

Kristine spoke regarding the tree preservation plan submitted, noting it can also be reviewed online. Kristine noted that there is vegetation proposed to be removed as part of the development, and that existing vegetation will be evaluated, further noting that further work on the landscape plan and tree preservation would be required through the draft plan approval conditions and that this work would then evaluate in greater detail the existing tree coverage within that 2.5 metre buffer, and from there, trees will be maintained and additional trees of similar types would then be augmented in to that 2.5 metre landscape buffer.

Kristine noted that a number of technical reports were submitted as part of the application, and highlighted the requirement for the D4 assessment and a geotechnical investigation, and since that time there has been additional monitoring which has now been supplied to the Town, further noting that this included the groundwater monitoring.

Kristine spoke regarding the technical reports, noting that there were no archeological sites or resources that were found during the stage 2 study, and noted that the Ministry has now entered that report into the public registry, with the Town, County and Kristine receiving a copy of the correspondence. Kristine noted that the functional servicing report provided a servicing strategy for water and sewer connections and this included an internal watermain loop from the 400mm diameter watermain on Lansdowne Street to the 400mm diameter watermain on Huron Street. Kristine noted that the fireflow protection will be provided via existing fire hydrants on Lansdowne as well as additional proposed fire hydrants on site, and gravity sewer connection to the existing manhole on Lansdowne. Kristine noted that the stormwater management provided an internal drainage buffer that has the capacity to convey internal and external runoff to the site. Kristine noted that there is drainage on the road profile as well.

Kristine noted that access to the site is from a proposed one-way road network from Bay and Victoria Streets, and confirmed the roads will remain municipal roads.

Kristine noted that she has received comments from the public as they are received by the Town and noted in response to the comments regarding the location of the former landfill site to the southwest, and information that the site was once used as a gravel pit, Kristine noted that they are not aware that the site was used as a gravel pit. Kristine noted that the geotechnical report and the D4 report were completed, including the groundwatering program and additional testing for the D4 study. Kristine noted that the geotechnical investigation included chemical testing of the soils, which did meet the site condition standards. Kristine noted that specific to the comments regarding the gravel pit, she suggests that in order to review the gravel pit comment that a Phase 1 ESA could be requested as a condition of draft plan approval, which the outcome would then respond to those gravel pit comments.

Kristine spoke in response to the comments regarding landscape buffering to the residences fronting onto Lakeshore and backing onto the Bay Street road allowance as well as existing drainage issues, noting these have been the common comments since they began discussing draft plan of subdivision on the site in 2018. Kristine noted that the draft plan that was submitted formally included the utilization of the Bay Street and Victoria Street road allowances for access as municipal roads, and that an alternative right of way be proposed, which was the reduced road platform in order to include the buffering and the drainage. Kristine noted that the 2.5 metre landscape buffer and the 6 metre drainage buffer was in direct relation to those comments heard early on in late 2017 and 2018 when concept plans were provided for preconsultation.

Kristine noted that it is her opinion that the proposed development is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conforms to the County of Grey Official Plan and the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan and generally complies with the zoning by-law amendment. Kristine noted that there has been a lot of history on this site, noting that in 2017 they requested that Council review the road allowances, further noting that the applicant was interested in purchasing a portion of the Bay Street road allowance that abuts the site, as well as potentially the Victoria Street lands that abutted the parcel as well. Kristine noted that, at that time, the proposal was that the applicant would purchase those road allowances and merge them with the subject lands and that an internal road be proposed. Kristine noted that in late 2018, it became very apparent that the ratepayers were not supportive of the municipality stopping up, closing and selling the road allowances, and it became clear that Council was not likely going to support that proposal, so the request was withdrawn and moved forward with the draft plan that is before Council today. Kristine noted that they have reviewed all comments received from the ratepayers and are happy to work with staff on details and resolving the concerns of the public.

Mayor Soever spoke questioning if the traffic study completed included pedestrian traffic, Kristine spoke in response noting that yes, the traffic study does include a sidewalk proposed along both Bay Street and Victoria Street. Mayor Soever questioned if the traffic study counted pedestrians, further noting that the question will be raised at some point as to how many people were using the sidewalks and whether one or two sidewalks are needed. George Cooper, Crozier & Associates, spoke noting that the traffic opinion letter that was submitted did not include any pedestrian counts, but it did comment on the active transportation through the site and noted that there is the existing sidewalk on the existing Bay Street, west of the site. George noted that the sidewalk proposed within this development would then connect that sidewalk link with the existing sidewalk on Huron, just south east of the property.

Deputy Mayor Potter spoke questioning how the traffic will flow, and questioned why the traffic would move from Lansdowne along Bay Street to Victoria and then Victoria toward the highway, with the traffic entering onto Highway 26 from Victoria. Deputy Mayor Potter questioned why they are creating a new entrance onto Highway 26 from Victoria rather than going the opposite direction with a left and right turn lane onto Victoria Street, further

noting this area is already very congested. Kristine spoke in response noting that the traffic is one-way down Bay Street, then turning right onto Victoria Street and exiting onto Huron Street, clarifying that it is not Highway 26, but Huron Street.

Councillor Bordignon referenced the proposed one-way street and noted he assumes that it is because there is not enough room for a two lane road, Kristine spoke in response noting that there is enough room for a two-way road, but there would be not enough room for the drainage and landscape buffer. Kristine noted that the whole idea of the revised road section was to incorporate those two pieces which has been important through all of our consultation.

Councillor Sampson then spoke with respect to affordability and questioned the proposed market unit price point, Kristine spoke in response noting that it is too early to have pricepoints set, but noted in her opinion, she does not believe that they would meet affordable housing rates. Kristine noted that they are providing semi-detached units and they are providing the potential for a secondary unit. Kristine noted that the units are proposed as freehold units, with the plan being that the architectural design would allow for accessory structures that could have an accessory unit in them, but that will be up to the landowner as to whether they move forward with a secondary unit on their property.

Councillor Sampson then questioned if the owner would be prepared to accept limitation on the zoning as it relates to short term accommodation, ie. a prohibition, and to have that registered on title. Kristine spoke in response noting that there has been no discussion regarding short term accommodation on the site, as this is a draft plan of subdivision for freehold units on a municipal road. Kristine noted that short term accommodation is not proposed, and noted in response to placing a prohibition on title regarding short term accommodations, that she will have to respond to staff regarding this question.

Planner Denise Whaley spoke in response noting that the original Ontario Municipal Board approved zoning would not permit short term accommodation units here, however, because we are going through the discussion, she pointed out that the Town has policies that were approved last year and the provisions that would be updated to match those policies are currently in the works.

Harry Burkman, resident 81 Huron Street West, spoke noting that he submitted a letter, further noting that the Municipal Act requires an official policy of the Town to be able to sell or dispose of its land, and it appears that the Town has an official plan with respect to the sale of land, but not with respect to the disposition of land. Mr. Burkman noted that what is happening in this instance, is a disposition in that the Town is proposing to give a perpetual right of way, but there is no Town policy that requires an appraisal, a bidding situation, notice, etc. so the Municipal Act, s. 270 appears to be violated. Mr. Burkman noted that in order for this development to proceed, the Town would need to either amend its policy, or it would have to introduce a new policy through a public process. Mr. Burkman noted that to give the right in perpetuity to a subdivision to use property on an ongoing basis is the equivalent of a sale but, by not describing it as a sale, the Town plan has been violated. Mr. Burkman noted that the official plan requires a policy with respect to tree canopy and noted that he has been unable to locate such an official policy of the Town and asked that be provided, together with the commentary, on how a tree canopy policy is being followed by virtue of what is proposed. Mr. Burkman noted that the Town's official plan states that it is a policy of the Town to implement measures to protect, enhance and expand the tree canopy of the Town, whereas in the subject lands, just under two acres of old growth trees are proposed to be clearcut to facilitate the developer's plans. Mr. Burkman noted that once the road allowance has been clearcut, the trees in the landscape buffer are not protected because they will be marked and those described as hazard will be removed. Mr. Burkman noted that the dedication of land was raised, noting that the Town requires 5% of the land being developed, or cash-in-lieu thereof, further noting that it was mentioned that

the developer would provide cash-in-lieu, but noted what is happening is that the land is being developed to the maximum with 22 lots, and 22 coachhouses. Mr. Burkman noted that 44 units are being jammed into a landlocked area, with zero recreational land. Mr. Burkman noted that the development does not advantage the community, further noting that it completely flies in the face of what should be the Town's official plans and policies. Mr. Burkman noted that he is shocked that there is no financial disclosure provided, further noting that the public are being asked to comment on a proposed subdivision where the key financial terms are not set out. Mr. Burkman questioned how much the Town is getting in return for giving the road allowances to the developer, further noting that the Town will have an ongoing obligation. Mr. Burkman questioned who will build and pay for the private works, including the road, sidewalks, buffers, sewers and noted that, once it is built, the Town will continue to own the works and have to maintain it. Mr. Burkman noted that section 44 of the Municipal Act requires that the Town has a high standard of maintenance, further noting that the Town will then have a high standard of maintenance on what will effectively be a private one-way road. Mr. Burkman noted that he has asked for a financial analysis, and the commentary from both the Town and Grey County, and believes that Council should be mindful as it appears that the ongoing costs to the Town, irrespective of the fact that it is giving free land, is going to be more than the amount it will receive in development fees and taxes.

Nathan Westendorp, Director of Planning and Development Services, spoke in response to Mr. Burkman noting that the Town does have a Sale and Other Disposition of Land Policy, POL.COR.07.02, further noting it is approved by Council and the Town has used it from time to time. Nathan noted that with respect to the development utilizing the right of way, to be clear, Planning staff have not taken a position on this, however, if the development proceeds, it will be a public road within a public right of way. Nathan noted that the road would not be a private road within a public right of way, so there is no transfer of lands. Nathan noted that there is direct benefit for these lots from the opening and improving of this right of way for a public road, it is no different than other streets in and around the Town where there are vacant lots where houses are built on an existing road. Nathan noted that in this situation the developer is willing to construct the road, further noting that it is the Town's position that the road and all of the infrastructure will be constructed by the developer in accordance with the Town's engineering standards, and as approved and confirmed by the Town. Nathan noted that the Town would only assume the works at such point as the Town determine that they are in good condition and have been installed as per the engineering standards. Nathan noted that with respect to the trees, this Council is very familiar with the tree matter in this location, further noting that the tree preservation by-law initiative that Council undertook several months ago was delayed by Covid, but noted that staff will be working with Councillor Matrosovs as the Council liaison on that matter and will be restarting the community engagement on the rewrite of the tree preservation by-law. Nathan noted that when the Municipal Act was amended to require a tree canopy policy, this Council accepted staff's recommendation that section D.8.2 of the official plan was satisfactory to meet the needs of the Municipal Act, to rest as a Town policy for the time being regarding tree canopy.

Mr. Burkman spoke in response noting that the Town's policy refers to the prior sale of land or conveyance of land, and it requires an appraisal if the land is to be sold or conveyed, further noting that there is nothing in the policy that refers to what the Town practices shall be should there be a disposition such as is proposed in this application. Mr. Burkman noted that it appears that this has been overlooked. Mayor Soever spoke in response noting that there is no disposition of land as the Town owns the road allowances that are currently unopened at this time. Mayor Soever noted that the Town is following the Town's process through the planning process, further noting that the roads are not private roads, they are the same as any other street, i.e. Huron or Lansdowne Street, further noting they will fronting properties and those people will be paying property taxes. Mayor Soever noted that this is a standard process when developments front on public roads, further noting that

the roads will be built by the developer at their expense and, and the Town will assume the ownership of the works once the Town is satisfied that the works have been built to a standard that will last.

Douglas MacCon, President of Grey Condo Corp #11, Bayside Villas, at 63 Bay Street West, noting that they are the immediate large adjacent land owners abutting the entire east side of the proposed development. Mr. MacCon noted that considering this project, while it may be easier to try to compare Bayside Villas to what is being proposed as an R2, there are significant differences and what is being proposed, namely, that Bayside does not have any public roads that are within Bayside, and Bayside is a condo corp that maintains their property and areas around their facility. Mr. MacCon noted that their property is approximately the same size, but Bayside has recreational areas on their land including a tennis court, a pool and a grassy area. Mr. MacCon supports the letter of Mr. Pascuzzo dated January 10, 2020 filed on behalf of Bayside Villas. Mr. MacCon noted that this development will have significant effects on the enjoyment of their property if not addressed. Mr. MacCon requested confirmation on what is proposed by the developer and the Town with respect to the streets, noting that the opening of the eastern portion of Bay Street on their north side would have considerable effects on their property. Mr. MacCon noted that density is a concern, further noting that the inclusion of the 22 accessory units, known as coach houses, in the proposal, will have a density of 44 units. Mr. MacCon noted that parking is a concern for 44 units, noting a one-way street will also create a parking issue. Mr. MacCon then spoke regarding emergency vehicles, garbage trucks and winter maintenance vehicles may have issues access the development with parking issues. Mr. MacCon spoke regarding increased noise and light pollution, noting that currently this area is a pleasant quiet area, further noting that short term accommodations are also a concern. Mr. MacCon noted that he would like to see a lighting report noting the type of lights proposed and the location of the lights to limit the light pollution in the area so as not to change the experience of their property. Mr. MacCon spoke regarding the tree canopy and buffering is a concern as well Mr. MacCon then spoke regarding the small creek to the rear of Bayside Villas noting it will be impacted, further noting that runoff and drainage is a concern. Mr. MacCon noted that Bayside Villas has proposed to purchase the northeast portion of the unopened Bay Street road allowance, and noted that they continue to be interested in this property to attach to their property.

Lawrence Bell, 63 Bay Street West, spoke noting he supports Mr. MacCon's comments.

Jeffrey Swartz, 116 Lakeshore Drive, spoke noting that he and his wife are concerned residents and are part of the harbour west residents group, and note he is speaking on behalf of a group of incredible neighbours and concerned residents. Mr. Swartz noting they have lived in this location since 2017, and spoke regarding the unique character of these two streets and the harbour community in general, further noting that this area is a jewel of Thornbury. Mr. Swartz noted that this is a beautiful waterfront community that many come to visit and cherish its splendor. Mr. Swartz noted that this community embodies history of the early beginnings of this Town and captures a character in its cottage type architecture. Mr. Swartz noted that the original owner of his property was a marine merchant carpenter named Arnold Ferris, noting that this is not just another R1 residential zone, but rather a very special community with streets that have names with faces and residents that have protected the sacred charm and beauty for not only its residents, but for all visitors alike. Mr. Swartz asked Council to reflect on the history of this harbor community and carefully protect what little is left for future generations to come and enjoy. Mr. Swartz noted that the Black Tusk design had it right in its original proposed development site plan in February 2006, proposing ten single family dwellings with a private road and a hammerhead turnaround and did not attempt to leverage on the backs of the Town to use their unopened road allowances, and uniquely fit in the fabric of this community that respected the existing community, its natural vegetation with an appropriate low impact development. Mr. Swartz questioned how we moved from that ten

single family dwelling concept to a 22 unit semi-detached development with an additional potential 22 coach houses which could ultimately be an additional 22 rentable units, thus impacting this tiny site to a potential of 44 units. Mr. Swartz noted that the 2006 Black Tusk proposal is not too much different than what has been recently proposed by the Town in the past few years and has worked extremely well within its neighbouring communities, ie. Ashbury Court and Thorncroft Court. Mr. Swartz noted that this type of development is a much more appropriate fit for the proposed site that we are discussing today. Mr. Swartz asked Council to direct planning staff and other related departments to complete a further study of their area and to designate their area as a R1-Harbour Community, like it has with its commercial harbour to reevaluate how this special residential pocket gets further developed going forward including this application. Mr. Swartz recommended that this area's character and history be preserved in every way possible and that policy be developed to address the residential fabric of this small pocket of houses. Mr. Swartz noted that the density is too high, and recommended that comparing units per hectare of this development to other Town development is not an appropriate exercise as it undermines the significance of this special pocket of housing with historical character and undermines its true unique value to both the history of Thornbury and its natural heritage that ultimately needs to be preserved. Mr. Swartz noted that rezoning from an R1 to an R2 is totally ridiculous and does not stand the test for division of the official plan, nor does it address any of the environmental and infrastructure concerns that this Town needs to carefully consider. Mr. Swartz noted drainage concerns with the development, and the lack of environmental issues identified including tree/vegetation issues, soils investigation. Mr. Swartz noted the developer should provide a Phase 2 environmental audit as this site was used as a landfill previously. Mr. Swartz noted that coach houses double the number of units to 44 units, and though this is permitted in R2, believes that this was included to provide homeowners the ability to construct a storage shed or a garage for their own use, notwithstanding zoning compliance, and noted that he does not believe it was intended for accessory apartments. Mr. Swartz noted that he recognizes that affordable rentals for our working community that supports services that we rely on so heavily is a big issue, but believes that the Planning department needs to develop an overall strategic plan to address this issue and not piggy-back off a new residential development to accomplish this goal. Mr. Swartz noted that he has not seen proof that stormwater management is being implemented on this site to address any of the stormwater/drainage issues. Mr. Swartz urged Council to send this proposal back and ask for a more appropriate development that this community will embrace.

Gavin Zealey, resident 69 Huron Street West, spoke regarding the additional 22 rental coach houses that may be developed, the maximum of 66 parking spaces and the shortage of visitor parking, and noted that he would like to point out that the traffic opinion reports, servicing and stormwater reports, are based upon just the 22 semi-detached units, and it does not include the impact of the additional potential rental units. Mr. Zealey noted that the reports then represent the minimum impact of the proposed development, and not the actual total potential impact. Mr. Zealey noted that the impact on other resources, including health care, emergency resources and internet access are also not analyzed. Mr. Zealey noted that the application does not take into account, the impact that the unprecedented COVID 19 worldwide pandemic is placing upon our facilities and resources. Mr. Zealey noted that Mayor Soever recently stated following a recent survey, that many property owners in The Blue Mountains intend to spend more time in The Blue Mountains, will be unexpectedly remaining in The Blue Mountains for the winter, intend to make The Blue Mountains their primary residence, further noting that the population could rapidly increase and have an impact on infrastructure. Mr. Zealey noted that these facts contrast rapidly with the intensification target of 10% for Thornbury. Mr. Zealey noted that Council should refuse the application as it is incomplete, because of the absence of correct technical reports, and it does not consider the needs of the surrounding users, the development is not compatible with adjacent residential areas, and that any decision on the Abbots

development should be delayed until the huge impact of COVID-19 on our community is fully assessed.

June Porter, resident 85 Lakeshore Drive West, spoke noting that Thornbury West faces major drainage challenges that she is focusing on the Abbotts development lands. Mrs. Porter noted that Thornbury West has had significant reports and studies in 2016 and 2019, and that the Abbotts lands reside in the areas of concern. Mrs. Porter reiterated that the Director of Planning noted that the staff coordinates its efforts across Town Departments to make sure that the Town's infrastructure is not overextended with respect to services and infrastructure, further noting that this statement was noted in the "On The Bay" magazine in 2020. Mrs. Porter noted that there has been discussion about a number of issues, but noted that the Thornbury West Master Drainage Plan Environmental Assessment both 2016 and 2019, are not referenced at all in this application, further noting that this is very important when the zoning application is going from an R1 to R2 zone. Mrs. Porter noted that the studies and reports from the Operations Department identified deficiencies in current drainage systems. Mrs. Porter noted that she is surprised that the Town has had reports come through from the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Reports for the Abbotts Subdivision after these reports have been published in public record, but they are not referenced in any part of the document. Mrs. Porter noted that she feels very strongly that developer proposed solutions should be part of the overall master drainage plan and also serve to protect the Town from future financial risk arising from development. Mrs. Porter noted that the significant reports outlined that existing minor drainage systems are deficient, further noting that this is directly out of the reports, and that they are deficient under existing zoned land use conditions. Mrs. Porter noted that the land in question resides in a minor drainage system that is already deficient for R1, and the developer is asking for the lands to be zoned R2. Mrs. Porter noted that future development intensification applications requesting rezoning, when they are reviewed in the context of known outdated 2009 engineering standards will only serve to increase the runoff to each of these deficient drainage systems and magnify the known deficiencies in the Town owned and managed minor drainage systems. Mrs. Porter referenced a recent meeting where Mayor Soever and Councillor Sampson outlined financial and infrastructure capital expenses, and noted that she was disappointed to see that the capital spend on projects pushing out to 2024 are subject to change, and saw nothing being pushed to 2024 that would be related to stormwater improvements in this area. Mrs. Porter noted that when the reports were done, that the funding was available to complete the reports and studies, but that there was no money identified to action and fix the identified deficiencies, so the deficiencies remain as they stand. Mrs. Porter noted that she understands that under this Council, that this will not be the case. Mrs. Porter noted that from the three reports it is known that there are known deficiencies, further noting that it is of great concern that there will be intensification, more units, more pavement, which will put unnecessary strain on these systems. Mrs. Porter noted that the developer is held to very outdated engineering standards, referencing the road diagram by Loft Planning. Mrs. Porter noted that she is aware that the engineering standards are in the process of being updated by Shawn Carey, Director of Operations by the end of this year. Mrs. Porter noted that what is being considered is an application that is far below the threshold, with nothing included regarding climate change and how low impact design is addressed. Mrs. Porter noted that there is an undocumented drainage system within the subject area, and that there are three significant networks of undocumented stormwater conveyance structures, that result in ponding, flooding being noted. Mrs. Porter noted that there is ponding on roads in Lakeshore Drive following storms that travel from the Abbotts lands to Lakeshore to the water aligned properties. Mrs. Porter noted that a hydrogeologic analysis of the Lansdowne Street and Lakeshore Drive culvert crossings confirm that the crossings do not have sufficient capacity to convey the 25 year design storm peak flows downstream without overtopping the road. Mrs. Porter noted that she presented to Council in June 2020 advising that people no longer look at the 25 design for storm, that they would rather look at the five year storm, as studied by the University of Toronto. Mrs. Porter noted that there

are an abundance of trees on the unopened road allowance, adjacent to the Abbotts lands, further noting that the larger mature trees act like a pump and serve to improve drainage, and reduce stormwater runoff by capturing and storing rainfall in canopy. Mrs. Porter noted that she is very familiar with the tree inventory that was done last year without permission under the direction of Crozier. Mrs. Porter noted that the number of trees that were left will greatly impact stormwater issues, further noting that she feels very strongly about retaining the trees in the area, further noting there is already deficient stormwater runoff systems in the area. Mrs. Porter noted that municipalities can be held liable for flooding damage that results from negligent operational decisions, further noting that relying on outdated standards can be negligent if new information suggests that they should be reconsidered. Mrs. Porter noted that Council should not ignore information that suggests that there may be a risk to people and property, as in doing so, is likely to be considered a valid policy decision and likely will not meet the standard of care for a municipality. Mrs. Porter noted that to minimize risk, she encourages Council to turn their minds to stormwater related standards, processes and infrastructure if information suggests that there may be increased risk to persons or property from those standards, processes or infrastructure. Mrs. Porter noted that we know that the current standards are outdated, further noting that there are reports that indicate that the reports are outdated. Mrs. Porter spoke regarding her June 16 deputation to Council, further noting that the followup report to her deputation is to be released September 22, and that one of the points in her deputation included the challenges in rezoning R1 to R2 will bring to the proposed and future development proposals in the context of drainage noting that this is still a very important question to ask considering that there are significant drainage problems and deficient systems in Thornbury West. Mrs. Porter asked that Council not support the zoning by-law amendment application from R1 zoning to the R2 zone to permit semi-detached dwellings and everything else that has been applied for with that application.

David Small, 92 Lakeshore Drive, Thornbury, spoke noting that his family has owned his house for over 75 years, and that he grew up here, and asked that Council think ahead, and plan for the long term consequences of any development. Mr. Small noted that the nature of the most recent development proposal seems to have morphed into one driven by profit alone, including density of units, destruction of ancient cedars, opening of road allowances, and not taking into consideration the nature of the existing housing layout, and the character of the neighbourhood in question. Mr. Small noted that previous plans had a much different layout and seemed to be more in line with, and respect, the existing housing layout. Mr. Small referred to Mr. Swartz' earlier comments regarding the "Black Tusk" development proposal from 2006 for this property. Mr. Swartz noted that he loves where he lives and the old cedars that still stand are not only beautiful and provide shade, oxygen and privacy, and serves as a home and refuge for all sorts of creatures, but they also provide a service that is invaluable with respect to drainage and erosion mitigation. Mr. Small noted that clearcutting the ancient cedars, and opening up the road allowance for the sake of the present development proposal, can and should be avoided by simply allowing for a development plan that accommodates this, than one that already exists. Mr. Small spoke regarding the Black Tusk proposal, and noted that it is not unreasonable to ask of this Council or any developer, and noted the Black Tusk development respected the existing home owners and the character of the neighbourhood as well as preserving the tree canopy and all that it brings. Mr. Small noted that this Council has a duty to consider the long term consequences, not just tax dollars, when making any development decisions, further noting that the trees along the road allowances will stand for seven generations if allowed. Mr. Small noted that the Black Tusk proposal took this into consideration, referencing our energy, water, natural resources ensuring that the decisions of Council are sustainable for seven generations into the future. Mr. Small noted that the Ontario Professional Planners Institute recognizes this, noting that "Indigenous perspectives can inspire the future of planning by strengthening and adapting its tenants, structures and functions". Mr. Small spoke regarding the drainage issue, noting that he has reviewed the assessment done in 2018, as referenced in the presentation of Mrs. Porter. Mr. Small noted that he is more

than seriously concerned of the lack of proper drainage plans for this area, further noting that he has seen what one housing development can do to drainage on Lakeshore Drive and how it can effect resident's properties and basements in proximity. Mr. Small noted that the assessment illuminates the need for proper drainage, further noting that the density of the most recent development proposal, and the opening of the road allowance and clearcutting of the cedars will only exacerbate an already serious situation, further noting that he is not ruling out legal action against Council if the present plan is allowed to proceed and property damage and basement flooding is a result. Councillor Bordignon called a point of order, regarding Mr. Small's reference to legal action, asking that Mr. Small keep to the facts. Mr. Small noted that the previous proposal leaving the road allowance unaffected would allow trees and soil to absorb and mitigate, as well as reducing the asphalt footprint, would go a long way to addressing these concerns, as well as embrace the philosophy of the seventh generation principle. Mr. Small noted the Black Tusk development is a good solution, allowing for development, and is also respectful protection of the area in question. Mr. Small then spoke regarding the proposed coach houses, and noted that he is opposed to the present proposal as it stands, regardless of the coach houses. Mr. Small noted that even without the coach houses and the way this development is set up, including the opening up of the road allowances, that the prior proposal with a private road, and ten individual homes is more than appropriate.

Councillor Sampson then spoke asking if the Planning Department could comment on the history of the assembly of land and the "Black Tusk" proposal in the followup report.

Deputy Mayor Potter spoke noting that much has been said regarding the drainage situation, and asked if staff could provide Council with information as to where we stand in terms of dealing with the drainage situation in this part of Thornbury. Deputy Mayor Potter noted that there are drainage issues across Town that we are trying to catch up with, but noted that Council needs to know where we stand right now.

Councillor Hope spoke noting that she supports Deputy Mayor Potter's comments, further noting that Council needs to know a lot more about the drainage.

Jay Taradash, resident 63 Bay Street West in Bayside Villas and is also on the Board of the Condo Corporation. Mr. Taradash noted that he fully agree with and supports the points made by Doug MacCon in his comments to Council.

Kim Harris Gardner, resident 78 Lakeshore Drive, grew up in Thornbury, Clarksburg, Christie Beach and Kimberley. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that she rented in the area when she lived in New York, from Tyrolean to Ravenna when they would come back for Christmas and summer. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that she purchased 78 Lakeshore Drive, next to the pier on the waterside, and was also lucky enough to be an owner at Bayside Villas for several years so she has a lot of background in this area and also in 2016, became involved with the Harbour West Concerned Residents Group ("Group"). Ms. Harris Gardner noted that their mission statement is that they fully support this area being developed, are not anti-development, and understand that even though the official plan calls for 5 – 6 units in terms of intensification in Thornbury and Clarksburg, that that official plan was written in 2016, and that is not the pressures that we are under now and they recognize that there will be an infill development on these lands. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that the Group wanted to obtain a better understanding on how they could participate with the Town as stakeholders to achieve an optimal outcome in further development in the area. Ms. Gardner noted that their primary concern has been misinterpreted through Planning, or perhaps through their communication, but noted that they are definitely interested in all the drainage problems, density issues, character issues, and understand that the development will not be exactly in accordance with the official plan. Ms. Gardner noted that what the Group has always wanted to do is preserve the trees, so when they started in 2016, they were trying to save the 2.5 hectares from clearcutting, and preserve as much as possible of the ancient cedars

on the road allowance that have been there since the beginning, and not hem in ten condos with a road in front and a road behind. Ms. Harris Gardner referenced 2016 Town of The Blue Mountains meeting minutes, and the Black Tusk proposal when Abbotts owned two of the lots, but has subsequently acquired the third lot, noting the landholding is larger now, and that the situation we are in now is the worst possible situation. Ms. Harris Gardner then reviewed the history of the development, noting that creating a double lot frontage is their concern, with the opening of the road allowance. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that it would be helpful if they could type Abbotts into the search engine of the Town website and all of the documents regarding this development would populate, further noting that this would be useful information in terms of being able to access the history and understand where their Group has been coming from. Ms. Harris Gardner referenced watermain breaks in the area, noting that this is part of the larger picture of the infrastructure the Group wishes to discuss. Ms. Harris Gardner referenced the current housing lot fabric, and the current unopened road allowances that are covered in trees. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that Lakeshore Drive is unusual as it has a lot of full-time residents, further noting that houses stay in families for generations. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that those that do move to this area tend to be from out of Town, with the hopes to retire in this location, further noting that in her opinion, the Abbotts properties will be \$1million dollar properties. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that the homes in the area are a lot of second and third generation homes, further noting that the development owners own two of the lots on Lakeshore Drive on the south side. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that in 2017 Council considered a staff report noting that the Abbotts were requesting to purchase the road allowances, and in response residents ask that Council not sell the road allowances noting that residents want to save the trees. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that The Blue Mountains Watershed Trust Foundation commented and walked the property with the Mayor, and declared it a significant greenspace and a cedar woodlot, and advised that an environmental impact study should be completed. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that in 2017 the developer's property is bulldozed, and that this is the reason she became involved in the tree committee working with Councillor Matrosov. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that the bulldozing was done legally, noting that they called Grey County, and were advised that because the lots were cleared over time, being within six months, that it was legal. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that all that is left is the 1.73 acres that is the road allowance, further noting there are 80 foot cedar trees on this road allowance. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that Abbotts then withdrew their request to purchase the road allowances. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that late in 2018 that the Town and developer reengaged with the Group, and were given to understand that the developer had come to the Town with three options, with just one being shown to the Group as the Planning Department was trying to avoid the use of swales. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that if the Planning Department really had focused on addressing the drainage issues that they should have focused on the cedars as they are the only thing left. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that Councillor Uram is working to get this older development through, further noting that there has been extensive consultation and meetings, and that they were not provided with another date to meet. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that the main concern of the Group is that they do not want the cedars cut down. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that they have submitted their emails in advance of meetings as requested, have limited their numbers, represented streets requested by Planning, deferred their deputation to Council, and since 2016 have spoke regarding the dump and the quarry. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that the Group would like an Environmental Impact Study done, further noting that they have consulted extensively. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that their Group has raised money to hire a planner to act for them, but to date, have not been successful. Ms. Harris Gardner questioned how many unopened road allowances are in Thornbury and Clarksburg, further noting that hemming the current residents in, is concerning. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that she believes this road allowance to be different than any other road allowance, because of the ancient cedar forest, and because hemming in the current residents is particularly egregious. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that if this development proceeds the residents will have 20 foot lights in their backyard, noting that the southside Lakeshore residents built their homes at a time that, if an abutting road allowance was next

The Blue Mountains

to your property, that you had the ability to purchase the road allowance abutting your property. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that this changed several years ago, noting that many of the residents were unhappy to learn this information through their involvement with the Group. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that, by opening the road allowances, that not only will you see the development on the right, but you will also see every house on Lakeshore Drive, on the southside, and the Bayside Villa condominiums. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that Lakeshore Drive is 2' under the 100 year storm waveswell levels, further noting that many of the houses on Lakeshore Road South are set back from the road and are built higher than Lakeshore Drive. Ms. Harris Gardner spoke regarding a former proposal by the developer, with the road allowance trees intact. Ms. Harris Gardner spoke regarding parkland, noting that she disagrees with cash-in-lieu. Ms. Harris Gardner asked for options from the developer that does not include cutting trees, and noted that the coach houses are concern and questioned if they are charged development charges for a coach house. Ms. Harris Gardner noted that Grey County does not have an issue with this development and noted that the County stands to benefit from this development, though the Town is not giving the infrastructure to support the development.

Doug Hackbart, resident 81 Lakeshore Drive, spoke noting he is a Structural and Building Sciences Engineer, and that he does a lot of work on water. Mr. Hackbart referenced the layout of the proposed lots and the existing lots, and noted that the proposed lots are extremely narrow lots, being just 29' wide, further noting that the proposal is to put a shared driveway between each of the units. Mr. Hackbart noted that assuming that each driveway would be 10-12' wide, there will be approximately 25' of driveway, and a roadway that goes between the units into each backyard, and then an area is required to turn around and enter the garage in the back, further noting that what results is an area that is 60% paved. Mr. Hackbart noted that the runoff from this is far and above what would normally be seen in an area this size because of so much paving, and all of it is going to run to the new ditch being constructed on the north side. Mr. Hackbart noted that another big issue is that everyone coming into their house, will drive along the property line to get to their parking area behind their house, which means that their headlights will shine into the back of all of the properties on Huron Street as they come home, and as they leave, their headlights will shine into the backs of the houses along Lakeshore as they leave their homes. Mr. Hackbart noted that each of the driveways will, conceivably, serve as many as four residences, further noting this is a lot of lights entering and exiting and impacting neighbouring windows, in addition to the streetlights. Mr. Hackbart noted that all of the drainage is to come to the drainage ditch, further noting that this area sits on a hard glacial til layer, approximately six to eight feet down, with a granular alluvial deposit sitting on top of it consisting of boulders, cobbles and stones down to gravel. Mr. Hackbart noted that the ditch will be inundated by a lot more water than what it currently receives, because the water gets there so much faster because of the hard landscaping directed water to it, which is in addition to the water coming from uphill, through the groundwater that is already occurring. Mr. Hackbart noted that the ditch is being moved into the backyards of the houses along Lakeshore Drive. Mr. Hackbart noted that the current bottom of the ditch at the corner of Bay Street and Victoria Street is approximately seven inches above his backyard, further noting that placing a ditch that much closer, in a granular soil that forms an aquifer, and not resulting in a flood to all of the houses on the south side of Lakeshore, is unrealistic. Mr. Hackbart noted that the roots of the trees are the barriers that slow the drainage. Mr. Hackbart noted that because this water is not permitted to go into the Bay any quicker than it is now, control structures must be put in place to hold the water in the ditch. Mr. Hackbart noted that holding deep water directly behind the properties, will cause the water to come across the surface of all the lots on Lakeshore South, further noting that it is not responsible development to flood the neighbours. Mr. Hackbart noted that this will be inevitable if this plan is allowed to proceed as it currently stands. Mr. Hackbart noted that in 2016, it was noted that it was impossible to do a development without double-siding the road, further noting that what is being proposed now has houses on just one side. Mr. Hackbart noted that the existing ditch is along the southern edge of the road allowance and,

if left in this location, the developer would only need to give up approximately 11.5 metres of his property toward a new road, further noting this is 33' on a 164' deep lot. Mr. Hackbart noted that this development does not make sense, does not follow the official plan, does not maintain the trees, is not in keeping with the character of the area, houses are being placed in front and behind, there is no alignment of property lines, increased flood risk and liability, with an increase in the possibility of short term rentals. Mr. Hackbart urged Council to deny this application.

Willa Marcus, resident Bayside Villas, noting that the unopened Victoria Street road allowance is right behind her. Ms. Marcus noted that she fully endorses the comments of Doug MacCon. Ms. Marcus spoke regarding the Bay Street West unopened road allowance, which is just north of Bayside Villas, noting that Bayside Villas wishes to purchase the unopened road allowance lands. Ms. Marcus spoke regarding the road allowances noting that the draft plan for the new development includes a municipally assumed "one-way lane", which extends eastward from Lansdowne on the unopened section of Bay Street to Victoria then south to Huron via the unopened Victoria Street. Ms. Marcus spoke regarding the Victoria Street unopened road allowance and noted that there is a part of this unopened road allowance that runs just north of Huron Street, between Bayside Villas on the east, and a Huron Street home on the west. Ms. Marcus noted that the Bay Street unopened road allowance does not abut the Abbots property, further noting that the Abbots property fronts Lansdowne, and if the developer was to build in from Bay Street West off Lansdowne, to Victoria, there would still be an opportunity to develop the property. Ms. Marcus noted that they are not against the development of the property, however, what is proposed is significantly more as the developer will benefit from the unopened road allowances being opened, some of which are not even abutting the lands. Ms. Marcus noted that the developer is taking a piece of land that they own, adding unopened road allowances and getting the Town to assume their developer's one way lane that's only purpose is to get in and out of their development, and as a result they have increased their benefit to the disadvantage of all the neighbours. Ms. Marcus noted that it may be a good idea for Council to approve this development application, but noted that she believes this to be wrong that one property owner should get sole advantage of sections of unopened road allowance that it does not even abut. Ms. Marcus noted that the Town should give the actual abutting property owners a chance to obtain or purchase the unopened road allowance before it allows a non-abutting land owner. Ms. Marcus then referred to the comments of Mr. Burkman made regarding the land being disposed of, further noting that this land is being disposed of, to a non-abutting property owner. Ms. Marcus noted that affordability and intensification are important, further noting that intensification is a crucial modern planning goal, and the term itself appears in the Planning Justification Report 18 times. Ms. Marcus noted that the Planning Justification Report proposes very aggressive intensification, further noting that intensification done right starts with building up on the main arteries, with varied forms of housing, such as duplexes, and triplexes. Ms. Marcus noted that the proposed application has 22 classic single-family homes compressed, then adding in 22 coach houses, to bring the density to 44 units, further noting that this is more like an apartment building density. Ms. Marcus noted that they all agree that an apartment building would not be appropriate on this site, but it would avoid asphaltting 11 separate driveways and would channel cars into a single parking area leaving more greenspace. Ms. Marcus then spoke regarding affordability, noting it is referenced 22 times in the Planning Justification Report, noting that affordability is a very important planning goal and for the Town, but there is no suggestion that the single family homes will be affordable. Ms. Marcus noted that affordability comes into this development with the possible addition of the coach houses, further noting that the coach houses are unlikely to be suitable for young families if the units are built. Ms. Marcus noted that this will be very aggressive intensification, further noting that the coach houses are much more likely to be used for short term accommodation or seasonal vacation rentals, and none of that is affordable housing. Ms. Marcus noted that abutting land owners should have "dibs" on the disposition of the land before non-abutting land owners get all the benefit. Ms. Marcus noted that she

is hopeful that Council will not approve this project, further noting that intensification and affordable housing is not being properly served with this project.

Helmet Hock and Catherine Howell, residents 80 Lakeshore Drive. Mr. Hock spoke noting that the number of comments received today speak to the concerns he is addressing. Mr. Hock noted that they have been in Thornbury for over 14 years, initially at 61 Lansdowne Drive, then in 2013, they moved to 80 Lakeshore Drive, further noting that he is very familiar with the neighbourhood and the area. Mr. Hock noted that the old cottage feel of the treelined street with the fall canopy is clearly enjoyed by residents and non-residents alike, and the Harbour West area is a uniquely attractive area in Thornbury that must be preserved. Mr. Hock noted that they are members of the Harbour West Concerned Residents Group, and are fully supportive of the development of the site, but noted that it needs to be developed properly. Mr. Hock noted that given the history of the property, the size of the property, the proximity to downtown Thornbury and the Harbour, that very careful consideration needs to be taken to determine what is an appropriate development. Mr. Hock noted that the proposed development to create 22 semi-detached residential dwellings, including the elimination of the mature trees of Victoria and Bay Street unopened road allowances is outrageous, further noting that the current R1 zoning is consistent with the existing built form and should be maintained to ensure that the development is a good fit and maintains the character of this very desirable, prime real estate neighbourhood. Mr. Hock noted that on the Town's website it is stated "our commitment to engagement, public engagement helps the Town do a better job to serve our residents and our community and it is key to open and transparent government". Mr. Hock noted that since 2016, the area ratepayers have had continuous dialogue and consultation with the Town, and are not getting anywhere, which is evident given the development proposal before the Town at this time. Mr. Hock noted that he has been the Past-President of two ratepayer associations in the GTA and has done a lot of work with the Planning Departments and the Councils, and noted that he is sorry to say that his experience is that they have been much more open and collaborative than he is finding the Town to be at this current time. Mr. Hock noted that he believes this proposal is a culmination of closed-door meetings between the developer and the Town, essentially ignoring all input and concerns and suggestions from the local residents, and is truly appalling. Mr. Hock noted that some work was done with the previous Council, further noting there is a new Council before us and noted that he hopes that this Council will do what they have committed to. Mr. Hock spoke regarding the Town's vision statement in the official plan "managing growth that will support and emphasize the Town's unique character, diversity, civic identity, recreational and tourism resources, rural lifestyle and heritage features and to do so in a way that has the greatest positive impact on the quality of life in The Blue Mountains". Mr. Hock noted that this is a fantastic vision, and the Harbour West Community Group totally supports working with the Town to achieve this end result. Mr. Hock noted that several proposals have been proposed by the developer, but for some reason, they are only hearing about the most egregious one at this point in time. Mr. Hock noted that this gives their Group the sense that the Town is unilaterally pushing its agenda to maximize intensification at all costs, ignoring all other aspects of the official plan and resident input. Mr. Hock questioned when the newly elected Council will implement their vision, further noting it is hoped that it will be before Thornbury is ruined by wreckless development projects. Mr. Hock noted that it is time to take stock of what is important, and what makes Thornbury great, and not ruin it under the guise of intensification. Mr. Hock noted that he does not understand why the Town of The Blue Mountains believes this application is worthy of a public meeting, further noting that it is an egregious development with 44 proposed development units, noting it smacks of total disregard for the cultural and character of the Harbour West Community. Mr. Hock noted that he and his wife request that in order to arrive at a better place, that the following be undertaken, the development of a master plan for the Harbour West area with specific focus on maintaining and enhancing the unique and rural feel of the area, with a wholistic view and plan for the Harbour West Community Area, noting that this is vital to the successful continuation of Thornbury. Mr. Hock requested fully transparent processes that

assess the appropriateness of future proposals for this site, including intensification and all other criteria related to the official plan. Mr. Hock requested that an ESA be completed on this site given its prior history, review of the site drainage, emphasizing and minimizing the damage to the neighbouring properties and maximizing the retention of the established cedar forest. Mr. Hock noted that the Town should conduct a detailed assessment of the risks and liabilities of “stuffing” two to four times the permitted density into an already ecologically compromised area. Mr. Hock requested that the Town reevaluate its planning directive that seems to be favoured by the Town that the road allowances should be first sold to the developer, rather than be offered to the abutting properties, further noting that the abutting property owners have established their properties, with the expectation that the unopened road allowances with the heavy trees and cedar forests were going to continue to exist for decades to come, as they have to date. Mr. Hock noted that by-laws need to be established that protect our trees and canopy to prevent the clearcutting of trees. Mr. Hock noted that they are in favour of respectful development which is in keeping with the character and cottage feel of the area, but believe that an open public consultation will result in a win-win solution for everyone, and encourages Council and the Town to adapt a new way of working on development proposals where there are a lot of resident concerns.

Councillor Hope spoke thanking for the contributors from the Harbour West Group, noting they are very articulate, and have provided a lot to think about.

Councillor Hope vacated the meeting at 4:00 pm

Tom Downer, resident, spoke noting that he has provided his written comments, further noting that his comments are in keeping with the comments made by others. Mr. Downer spoke regarding the Crozier consulting letter on traffic flows, noting that he recognizes the 11-15 two-way trips generated by North America formula based on all land uses, does not apply to Thornbury. Mr. Downer noted that the nature of this development is going to increase traffic flows in our surrounding streets, and this will continue to increase the choke-points that already exist when Town streets lock onto Highway 26, with Highway 26 controlled by just one stop light. Mr. Downer noted that time and patience will all continue to build given the size of this development. Mr. Downer noted, further to Mr. Hock’s comments, that the maps provided are focused on the development in the immediate streets, and asked Council to think about scale. Mr. Downer noted that 200’ to 300’ east of the development is Little River Beach Park with the pier and the Harbour, further noting that this development will be within walking distance of downtown Thornbury and Little River Beach Park. Mr. Downer noted that any development in this area should be scaled out, with a review of the harbour, its use, recreational planning, traffic flows, and any other infrastructure, ie. stop lights, that will have to be added into the whole big picture.

Dr. Timothy Peloso, 96 Huron Street West, Thornbury, spoke noting that their property abuts the Victoria Street North road allowance, and that he has great concerns of it being used for anything but the greenspace that it provides now as a buffer, especially if it was to be used for access for this type of proposal. Dr. Peloso noted that when they purchased their property 15 years ago, that greenspace was part of the reason they purchased at this location because of the beauty and the size of the trees. Dr. Peloso asked that Council be made aware that they support all of the many comments heard today, as well as the letters submitted, and noted that when he met at the Town offices two years ago as part of the Harbour Group with Loft Planning, that it was apparent that there were three options. Dr. Peloso specifically asked Ms. Loft to provide the other two options, but noted this was not provided. Dr. Peloso confirmed that they are not anti-development, but asked that development be done with a lot of dignity and grace, and represent what is in this area now. Dr. Peloso asked for similar “backyard to backyard” development, with no open road allowances. Dr. Peloso asked that the other development options be presented and that

Council seriously consider all of the logistical points that have been brought up by the previous speakers.

Mayor Soever thanked the speakers for their verbal and written comments and confirmed that no decision is being made today, that this was an information gathering session.

As no one further wished to speak, the Mayor declared the Public Meeting to be closed.

C. Adjournment

Moved by: Andrea Matrosovs Seconded by: Jim Uram

THAT this Special Meeting of Council does now adjourn at 4:03 p.m. to meet again at the call of the Chair,

Councillor Bordignon	Yay
Councillor Hope	Absent
Councillor Matrosovs	Yay
Deputy Mayor Potter	Yay
Councillor Sampson	Yay
Councillor Uram	Yay
Mayor Soever	Yay
The motion is Carried.	

Alar Soever, Mayor

Corrina Giles, Town Clerk