Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	
AGENCY COMMENTS:			
Grey Sauble Conservation Authority	February 7, 2019	<ol> <li>Identified some concerns with the proposal, including natural heritage matters and recommend a tree retention plan be completed.</li> <li>The tree retention area is to include the identified wetland and should be added to the open space block.</li> <li>Recommends re-configuration of the lots in this area.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>EIS has been completed to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.</li> <li>Draft Plan Condition #4, #14, #15, #22, #25, #51(f), #56 and #57 address Grey Sauble Conservation Authority interests.</li> </ol>
Canada Post	October 3, 2018	1. To consult with Canada Post re: location and placement of mailboxes, permanent mailbox locations do not conflict with any other utility; concrete pads installed at each mailbox location as well as any walkway, curb depressions, and wheelchair access; prepare & compact any gravel at each mailbox location a min.30 days prior to any permanent occupancy; communicate the excavation date for first foundation & expected date of first occupancy; to be included in each purchase & sale a statement advising each new home owner their designated mailbox, the exact location with lot #'s of each mailbox location and advise homeowners of any easements; must notify each new home owner the exact location of their mailbox prior to sign-off; regarding condos notification be given to provide signature for License to Occupy and provide winter snow clearance; enhanced community mailbox sites with roofs will require add'tl documentation as per C.Post; no more than one delivery point to each unique address assigned by the Municipality; contact C.Post to confirm postal codes.	1. Draft Plan Conditions #40, #44, #45, #48(h & i.6), #58 address Canada Post interests.
Historic Saugeen Metis	October 15, 2018	1. No objection or opposition.	1. Noted.

Comments	Date	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	
Received By:	Received:		
		Interested to receive any information regarding Stage 3     Archaeological Assessments.	<ol> <li>Stage 4 Mitigation of Development Impacts of the Camperdown II Site report prepared by AMICK Consultants Ltd. has been deemed compliant by the Ministry.</li> <li>Draft Plan Conditions #51(i) and #52 address other archeological interests.</li> </ol>
Union Gas	June 18, 2019	Developer to provide the necessary agreements and easements for the provision of gas services.	1. Draft Plan Conditions #16, #40, #41, #42, #48 (i.4) and #54 address Union Gas interests.
Niagara Escarpment Commission	January 26, 2021	<ol> <li>The following draft plan conditions are recommended for NEC review and approval:         <ul> <li>Appropriate zoning for Block 4</li> <li>Final grading and drainage plan</li> <li>Erosion and Sediment Control plan</li> <li>Vegetation Protection Plan</li> <li>Landscape/Restoration Plan</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Draft Plan Condition #4, #22 and #59 address     NEC interests.
Hydro One	July 12, 2019	1. No comments or concerns at this time.	1. Draft Plan Conditions #16, #40, #41, #42, #48 (i.4) and #54 address Hydro One interests.
PUBLIC			
COMMENTS:			
John and Susan Stacey	October 23, 2018	Concerns: online mapping appears to overlap their property at top of ridge & unclear where their property starts/stops with regard to the mapping; how far from the bottom or up the ridge will the lots extend?; the ridge is quite steep and the trees need to remain to prevent erosion; 34 single det. lots seems too large for the size of the subdivision sites at top of ridge; where will the access of the new private condo	<ol> <li>Noted that online map is not 100% accurate. The proposed plan is based on a formal survey and therefore the plan boundaries are accurate.</li> <li>No lots are proposed to extend up the Nippissing Ridge.</li> <li>No development is proposed on the Nippissing Ridge.</li> </ol>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	
		road come from, i.e. Camperdown or Old Lakeshore Road?	<ol> <li>The proposed density conforms with the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan. Lots exceed the minimum size required by the Zoning By-law.</li> <li>A condominium road is no longer proposed. Municipal road access will be provided from Old Lakeshore Road.</li> </ol>
Bruce Robertson	April 22, 2019	<ol> <li>Concerned the proposal does not respect the Official Plan policies regarding the lands lying in a neighbourhood with a specific and unique land use and ignores the low density of the neighbourhood &amp; subdivisions are better located closer to Town.</li> <li>Concerned that the Town's infrastructure cannot absorb it.</li> <li>Concerned also about the natural green space being eliminated and the negative impact on existing property values which will erode the Town's tax base.</li> <li>Questioned the amount of site disturbance on the property, including the trees.</li> <li>Posed questions and concerns about tree removal and site disturbance on the site.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Proposal is consistent with the policies of the Official Plan and Old Lakeshore Road Neighbourhood Plan. Density is in keeping with maximum densities outlined by the Official Plan, and the proposed lots are larger in size, exceeding minimum set out by the Zoning By-law. It is noted that the lands are a designated Settlement Area and are planned for development.</li> <li>Infrastructure capacity is reviewed through the development review process. Wastewater and Water capacity shall be confirmed prior to final approval, in accordance with the proposed Draft Plan Conditions.</li> <li>Proposed development is to be located within the RRA designation. A 40% open space component containing the Nippissing Ridge is to be maintained in accordance with the policies of the Official Plan.</li> <li>Tree retention plans and monitoring plans are to be implemented through the construction, as per the proposed Conditions of Draft Plan Approval.</li> </ol>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:
Andrew Baughn	April 23, 2019	<ol> <li>Objects to the proposed plan of subdivision.</li> <li>As a certified Arborist, was concerned about tree removal, habitat and wildlife disturbance on the property.</li> <li>Identified Butternut Trees that appeared to be missed in the previous Environmental Impact Assessment. Had concern with EIS findings.</li> <li>Concerned about the traffic, condition of Old Lakeshore Road for handling increased users, safety of the road, ditches etc.</li> <li>Concerned about lights from the proposed condo road lining up directly with their home and causing disturbance and impacting their quality of life.</li> <li>Noted.</li> <li>EIS has been completed to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.</li> <li>EIS has been deemed acceptable to the GSCA. All recommendations to be implemented through the Subdivision Agreement.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units.</li> <li>All lighting, including street lights, are to be dark sky compliant, per Town standards.</li> <li>Followed up to the earlier correspondence by email with concerns that some of the butternut trees have been destroyed during site works this winter/spring.</li> </ol>
Caroline Bacher	September 17, 2019	<ol> <li>Objects the development.</li> <li>Concerned about bird habitat and animals and disruption to quiet nature.</li> <li>Concerned about impact of development on nature.</li> <li>Noted.</li> <li>EIS has been completed to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.</li> <li>EIS has been completed to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.</li> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Noted.</li> </ol>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:
Craig Goodman	July 14, 2019	<ol> <li>Provided detailed comments with options for development of the lands to minimize negative impact to character of the area, impacts to natural heritage features, such as woodlands and wildlife.</li> <li>Noted rural character of area. Included discussion of options for townhouses or mixed housing types with retained woodland areas.</li> </ol>
Faisal Ahamed and Allison Ahamed	April 22, 2019	<ol> <li>Their home is directly across from the Romspen lands.</li> <li>Concerned the development is not compatible with the area, would change the character of the street and impact their property.</li> <li>Concerned about traffic generated by the proposed development and new homes as they chose this area because of the existing low density.</li> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Development complies with policies of the Official Plan and now includes single detached dwelling units.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units.</li> </ol>
Mark Stein	July 4, 2019	<ol> <li>Asked about how density was calculated.</li> <li>Feels that the 34 units is an anomaly in the area and would be more in keeping with Collingwood or Thornbury.</li> <li>Concerns about the lot shapes and sizes of lots 16 and 17 which abut the property owners lands.</li> <li>Ask about how wildlife in the area would be protected.</li> <li>See Official Plan section of Staff Report PDS.22.056.</li> <li>Proposed density meets the maximum density permitted by the Official Plan.</li> <li>Lots 16 and 17 on the current draft plan remain larger than minimum required by the Zoning Bylaw. Muti-use trail and drainage swale, as well as Hazard lands, remain at the rear of the lots.</li> <li>EIS recommendations to be implemented through the Development Agreement.</li> </ol>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:
Lucille and Urban Joseph	July 8, 2019	<ol> <li>Concerned about traffic that would be generated by the additional houses.</li> <li>Would like to see a traffic study which looks at whether a light is needed at Camperdown Road/Hwy 26 intersection.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units.</li> </ol>
Henry Haiduk Camperdown Ridge Homeowners Association	July 8, 2019	<ol> <li>Concerns relate to the proposed "OPEN SPACE" of 2.80 hectares.</li> <li>Concerns about forest being removed impacting drainage and erosion.</li> <li>Would like this forest to remain intact and undisturbed.</li> <li>Would like to limit the removal of trees to the 195m contour line. This would insure protection of the slope and mitigate any erosion.</li> <li>Concern report does not show storm water management for the slope to the south, only for the land within the development.</li> <li>2. Ca3ha Open Space component represents 40% of the subject lands, as per requirement of the Official Plan.</li> <li>Tree removal to be completed in accordance with EIS and future tree protection/retention plan. Detailed engineering prior to final approval to address drainage/stormwater management.</li> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Trees to be retained in Hazard zone and removals to be completed in accordance with future removal/retention plan as part of Draft Plan Conditions.</li> </ol>
Darice Lush	August 13, 2020	<ol> <li>Does not support townhouse development.</li> <li>Concerned about environmental impact.</li> <li>EIS recommendations to be implemented through the Development Agreement.</li> </ol>
Mike Wellman	August 14, 2020	<ol> <li>Proposed plan inconsistent with current rural neighbourhood.</li> <li>Highway 26 access is limited. Adding proposed units would have a negative impact on traffic.</li> <li>Community consultation seems to have been limited.</li> <li>Proposed lots are of size and dimension to remain compatible with existing lots of record in the area</li> <li>Completed traffic impact study confirms that no intersection improvements are required. No comments received from in MTO in opposition to, or in favour of, the proposal.</li> </ol>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	
		<ol> <li>Concerns about negative impacts on the environment.</li> <li>Rural development in the area – proposed development does not align with neighbourhood.</li> <li>Proposed hiking trail directly through our property.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Public consultation completed in accordance with the Planning Act and Town practices</li> <li>EIS recommendations to be implemented through the Development Agreement</li> <li>See comment 1 above. Area is identified as an urban settlement area (i.e. not rural), which is the focus for growth and development per the Provincial Policy Statement.</li> <li>Hiking trail not located on private lots.</li> </ol>
Faial and Allison Ahamed	August 14, 2020	<ol> <li>Old Lakeshore Road should be left as is.</li> <li>New access road should be created on Camperdown Road.</li> <li>No street lighting.</li> <li>No sidewalks, or expansion of the road.</li> <li>Maintain as many trees as possible.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Noted. No improvements to Old Lakeshore Road are proposed at this time.</li> <li>Subject lands do not have frontage onto Camperdown Road.</li> <li>All roads to be designed in accordance with municipal engineering standards.</li> <li>No improvements or widenings are proposed for Old Lakeshore Road at this time.</li> <li>EIS recommendations to be implemented through the Development Agreement</li> </ol>
Becky Channer	January 12, 2022	<ol> <li>Concerns about impact on natural heritage features, including habitat and loss of green spaces.</li> <li>Concern about traffic impacts on Highway 26.</li> <li>Concerned with amount and speed of development throughout the Town.</li> <li>Concerned about urban sprawl, traffic, loss of quiet country living, loss of recreational green space.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>EIS recommendations to be implemented through the Development Agreement.</li> <li>Completed traffic impact assessment confirms that Old Lakeshore Road is capable of accommodating the additional thirty-three units and that no intersection improvements are required on Highway 26. No comments received from in MTO in opposition to, or in favour of, the proposal.</li> </ol>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	
,			3. Area is identified as an urban settlement area (i.e. not rural), which is the focus for growth and development per the Provincial Policy Statement.