


The Blue Mountains Community Design Guidelines Comments – April

Commentor	#	Comment	Response	
Brian Nelson	Volume 1			
	1	Section 1.4: I strongly support a requirement for development proponents to submit “a Community Design Checklist and/or supporting materials or studies to confirm that the applicable Design Guidelines have been considered and incorporated into development proposals”. Documentation will enable members of the public, as well as Staff and Council, to understand if/how proposals conform to the Guidelines, and advocate for conformity where possible. At the public engagement session held on April 14, 2026, PDS staff and consultants outlined how the Design Guidelines can be used in development approval processes, including pre-consultations with proponents, which would appear to serve as opportunities to introduce a Design Checklist. Any efforts by staff and Council to ensure that the Guidelines are applied in practice will be very important.	Thank you for the comment. A draft checklist has been prepared as part of the final Community Design Guidelines to be implemented through development application review.	
	2	Section 2.1.1: A definition of “woodlot” may be required to clarify and ensure that the Guidelines apply broadly to any significant stand of trees.	The Town’s Official Plan defines “woodlands”. The section and language in the Guidelines has been revised to “woodlands” for consistency.	
	3	Section 2.1.3: Reference to the Town’s Municipal Tree Preservation By-law is very important. A major public effort to ensure adoption of a long overdue updated Tree Preservation By-law following the upcoming municipal elections is anticipated.	Noted. An additional reference to the Tree Preservation By-law has also been added to Section 1.4 as part of the list of documents to also be referenced.	
	4	Section 3.1: A stronger reference to the importance of storm water management is recommended, given the significance of this issue in our Town. This should include insuring adequate open space for absorption of stormwater in both public spaces and private lots, as well as protection of watercourses.	In addition to the stormwater management guidelines in Section 2.4, an additional guideline in Section 3.1 has been added to ensure development parcels provide sufficient public and private landscaped open space to support stormwater infiltration, retention and runoff management through parks, natural features, stormwater management facilities and on-site landscaped areas.	
	5	Section 3.2: Guidelines supporting the incorporation of energy efficiency measures into building design and construction should be added throughout this section (e.g., passive/active solar, these should address all major building types (i.e., single detached, semi-detached, townhouse, infill/replacement housing, ARUs, low-rise residential buildings).	A new Section (3.2.6) has been added with a new set of guidelines for resilient and energy efficient built form based on comments received.	
	6	Section 4.1: Stronger and more direct references to design features that support pedestrian-friendly spaces, active transportation, and public safety are recommended. These features are increasing recognized globally as critical to the success of downtown areas and should be prioritized over motor vehicle traffic flow and parking where necessary.	Additional language and guidelines focused on pedestrian-friendly spaces, active transportation and safety have been added throughout this section.	
	7	Section 5.1: Add guidelines to support/encourage energy efficiency measures and renewable energy systems in site and building design.	Supporting guidelines have been added to Section 5.1 and 5.2 for Built Form and Site Design.	
Brian Nelson	Volume 2			
	8	Section 1.2: Sustainable Design: I attended the Energy Mapping Workshop sponsored by the Town on February 11, 2026. Several themes were discussed that potentially relate to Town structure and design such as renewable energy, active transportation, public transportation, and intensification of development. An example would involve a network of energy hubs in strategic locations across Town. These would be energy generation hubs based on renewable sources. A key role of these hubs would be to serve as charging stations for a fully electrified fleet of transit vehicles. The energy hubs could also support active transportation connecting to our trail systems and providing services such as bike and e-bike rentals. They could also serve as focal points for higher density, multi-use developments and much needed housing alternatives in key locations. There is potential for large-scale renewable energy and district heating projects that could improve energy efficiency and reduce costs. As energy hubs evolve into more intense and diverse land use hubs the benefits circle back to transportation by reducing travel distances and vehicle trips. Ideas like this may not fit directly into Design Guidelines or other planning tools at this time. However, envisioning how a network of energy hubs can be integrated into our settlement areas could potentially lead to	Noted. No further changes required at this time	

		practical solutions to key planning challenges in our Town such as providing economically viable public transportation, managing traffic on Highway 26, and reducing our carbon footprint.	
	9	Section 1.2: Natural Character: This section should be strengthened by referencing how our natural assets are central to the identity of our Town, our quality of life, our tourism and recreational industries, our economy, and our capacity to ensure sustainable development.	Wording has been added to the end of Natural Character Principle #1.
	10	Section 2.2: Stronger support for commercial and institutional uses is recommended to address the longstanding need for services to support extensive residential development in this area.	Noted. The specific section and objectives for Craigleith Village is intended to signify this. Additional context has also been added to the new Official Plan reflecting this need.
Grey County Planning and Development Cassandra Dilman – Intermediate Planner	General Comments		
	11	Grey County’s population is growing and aging faster than the provincial average. As noted in the Official Plan, this presents an opportunity to adopt an Age-Friendly approach to planning, design, and decision-making. The built environment has significant influence towards creating and maintaining a healthy lifestyle, which includes identifying and responding to age- and dementia-friendly needs through supportive infrastructure and services for residents of all ages (4.3.1).	Noted.
	12	The OP also encourages parks to be designed or redesigned as accessible, Age-Friendly spaces that provide a balance of passive and active recreational options (7.12.5). Further, new subdivision development should incorporate Age-Friendly and transit-supportive elements, such as connected pedestrian and cycling networks, complete streets, active transportation features, and enhanced safety (8.5.4).	Noted. This is addressed through the neighbourhood design guidelines.
	13	The County’s Age Friendly Community Strategy builds upon these policies to consider an Age-Friendly approach to community building and development. For example, housing choices, such as smaller rental apartments, allow people to live independently for as long as possible and remain part of their communities as they age.	Noted.
	14	County staff acknowledge and appreciate that many of the proposed design guidelines already incorporate Age-Friendly considerations (e.g., Sections 2.3.3, 2.2.4.4, 3.2.5.16, and 4.1.6.5). Staff would encourage the continued integration of an Age-Friendly lens throughout the guidelines. Applying an Age-Friendly and dementia-inclusive approach to community design can support positive intergenerational outcomes at the neighbourhood, street, and individual unit scales, helping to create communities where people of all ages—children, youth, adults, and older residents—can live, work, and play.	Noted. Additional references to age-friendly have been added in Section 2.2 (Parks, Open Space and Waterfront Areas) and 4.1 (Downtown and Commercial Areas).
	15	Staff note that there may be opportunities to further strengthen the guidelines through more explicit language related to Age-Friendly and dementia-inclusive design. For example, Guideline 3.1.1.6 could be interpreted through a dementia-inclusive lens, as retaining heritage structures can provide familiar, recognizable, and prominent landmarks that support people’s mental mapping of neighbourhoods and enhance the street experience for individuals living with dementia.	Age-friendly language has been added throughout the document.
	Examples of design considerations from an Age-Friendly perspective may include the following:		
	16	• Incorporating weather protection elements such as awnings and overhangs, particularly in conjunction with seating at building entrances, to provide comfortable shelter for at least two people waiting together.	Noted. Addressed in Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.3, as well as a new added Section 3.2.6 Resilient and Energy Efficient Building Design.
	17	• Encouraging lay-by parking in close proximity to building entrances to support accessible pick-up, drop-off, and delivery functions for older adults and families.	An additional guidelines has been added to Section 3.2.5 (Low Rise Residential) Section 4.3.2 (Commercial/Mixed Use Site Design).
	18	• Designing play spaces that are welcoming and inclusive for a wide range of users, including children, older adults, caregivers, and people with disabilities.	An additional guidelines has been added to Section 2.2 (Park Design).
	19	• Considering the full spectrum of the sensory experience, including visual cues and sound. For example, certain ambient sounds (such as children playing, birdsong, or running water) may be beneficial for people living with dementia, while high traffic noise or large crowds can be overwhelming.	This relates more to detailed design of parks, open spaces, etc. than needed for the Guidelines.
	20	• Providing seating with a traditional, easily recognizable bench form to clearly signal places for rest.	Reference to “easily recognizable” has been added to the benches guideline in Section 4.1.4 (Street Furniture).
	21	• Locating waste storage areas within multi-unit residential buildings, where feasible, to improve accessibility and ease of use.	A guideline has been added to Section 3.2.5 (Low Rise Residential Buildings – Site Design).
County Climate change staff have reviewed the proposed guidelines and provided the following comments:			

	22	Grey County Climate Change Staff see significant alignment with climate change policies in Grey County's Official Plan (s. 7.13) and priority actions in Going Green in Grey, the County's climate change action plan, such as protecting and expanding forest, habitat, and biodiversity, accelerating zero-emission vehicle adoption and active transportation, and promoting compact, mixed-use development. Several guidelines align with the recently approved voluntary Green Development Program (i.e., Native Species, Tree Canopy, Park Access, EV Readiness, Complete Streets, Solar Readiness, Energy Efficiency and Electrification).	Noted. Thank you.
	23	a) County staff support energy-efficient building design of community spaces (s. 2.5.8) and support potential expansion to residential buildings.	Noted.
	24	b) Grey County's climate change adaptation planning process projects significant increase in extreme heat days (+30C). Therefore, County staff see strong rationale for heat island mitigation in parking areas (s.4.3.2.11) and see potential expansion to include similar measures for roofing materials, or incorporating other resilience measures, such as flood or wind proofing measures.	A new Section 3.2.6 (Resilient and Energy Efficient Building Design) has been added. A new guideline has been added to encourage the use of green roofs, white roofs or other high-reflectance and energy efficient roof treatments.
	25	c) County staff appreciate reference to building materials, and there may be an additional opportunity to encourage use of low-carbon building materials, in support of the Embodied Carbon Metric of the Green Development Program.	A new Section 3.2.6 (Resilient and Energy Efficient Building Design) has been added. A new guideline has been added to encourage the use of durable, low-maintenance and low-carbon building materials.
	26	d) Lastly, in support of both climate change and Age-Friendly strategies, the Town may consider additional guidelines to support transit readiness.	The Guidelines are intended to support walkability, gentle intensification and improved streetscape design and connectivity. An additional transit infrastructure guideline has been added to Section 4.1 (Downtown Streetscapes).
	27	In addition to the above staff appreciate and acknowledge the following alignment with the Green Development Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritizing sustainable design features, such as low-impact design (LID) measures, as it aligns with the Stormwater Metric. • Encouraging use of native, non-invasive plant species aligns with the Native Species Metric. • Ensuring parks have street frontage (s.2.2.6) aligns with Park Access Metric. • Orient buildings and lots to maximize solar access and opportunities for passive solar design (s. 3.1.2.5), as it aligns with our Solar Readiness Metric. • Use of Dark Sky Compliant lighting aligns with the Bird Friendliness/Dark Sky Metric. 	Noted. Thank you.
County Ecology staff have reviewed the proposal and provided the following comments:			
	32	Staff generally have no concerns with the proposed guidelines and have one question for clarity regarding Guideline 2.1.1 Woodlots: <i>3. Ensure that woodlots have at a minimum, 50% public frontage and visibility, through such means as single loaded streets or incorporation into a park or stormwater management area.</i> Staff are unsure of the intent behind this guideline section and note that it may not be a feasible goal. Please clarify the intent of this guideline. i.e., is this intended to target 50% of the woodland dripline, and for this dripline to be visible and also front a public road, park or stormwater management system?	The intent of the Guideline is to ensure visibility and safety by making the frontage of a woodland largely visible. It is not intended to be a technical standard and can be applied in a flexible manner.
	34	The County requests notice of any decision rendered with respect to this file.	Noted.
Great Gulf Trish Elliott – Development Manager, Land Development	35	My primary concern is that we need to better understand how the Guidelines will be interpreted and integrated into the development review process. Can you please provide more details on this? The reason I ask is that the document speaks to these being guidelines and not policies/regulations (so that they can be applied in a flexible manner), yet there are many statements in the document that use the word “ensure”, “will” or “shall”. This language is in conflict and needs to be addressed, otherwise we will have significantly more comments on areas where changes are needed to maintain the intended flexibility in the guidelines.	The concern is understood. The few references to “shall” and “will” have been replaced throughout the document. Language has been added to the beginning of the document – Section 1.4, to note that the guidelines will be interpreted and applied flexibly, with action words serving to indicate the Town's ultimate objectives rather than prescribe rigid requirements.

	<p>36 Some examples of this are: 1) The use of “ensure” in Volume 1, Section 2.1.1 (Woodlots), Item #3 means that developments are required to meet this threshold for public frontage/visibility, however the site specific context of a development (e.g. the organic edge of the natural heritage limit, the topography of the land, the size/shape of land beside the NHS, etc.) may not facilitate this.</p>	<p>Ensure has been revised to encourage.</p>
	<p>37 2) The use of “ensure” in Volume 1, Section 3.2.1 (Lot Configuration and Building Orientation), Item #2 does not allow for creativity in lot siting or site-specific conditions. Things such as a unique lot shape, creation of a focal point or architectural interest, etc. may mean that a parallel orientation for the home is not necessary. So long as the building is addressing the street and creating the desired interest/pedestrian friendly condition, this creativity should not be discouraged.</p>	<p>The reference is Section 3.1.2. The wording has been revised; however it is important to note that these are general guidelines and cannot be expected to address all unique situations.</p>
	<p>38 We also have a handful of guideline-specific comments: - Volume 1: Under the “Orientation, Massing and Articulation” portion of 3.2.1, Item #6 speaks to the design of corner lots and appears to be the same as Items #6 and #7 under Section 3.2.2 (Townhouse Dwellings). We recommend that the existing #6 be replaced with the language used for #6 & #7 in the Townhouse section, as these contain a bit more clarity in direction.</p>	<p>Section 3.2.1 has been revised.</p>
	<p>39 Volume 1: Under the “Driveway and Garages” portion of Section 3.2.1 (Single Detached and Semi-Detached Dwellings) and Section 3.2.2 (Townhouse Dwellings), Item #2 and #12 speak to the driveway width being limited by the width of the “interior of the garage”. We would like to suggest that the wording be changed to just “the width of the garage”, as it can be quite technical to determine the inside vs. outside of the garage, and even the images used on this page appear to show driveways that span the full garage instead of just the limit of the inside wall of the garage. The current wording could also create situations where there are awkward gaps in the pavement (that cannot facilitate grass), such as the narrow width of the wall that divides the interior garage of these 2 townhouse units (image taken from page 35 of Volume 1):</p> 	<p>Noted. The wording has been revised to remove interior.</p>
	<p>40 Volume 1: Under the “Driveways and Garages” portion of Section 3.2.1 (Single Detached and Semi-Detached Dwellings), Item #6 that speaks to driveways being from the ‘secondary street’ should include the additional clarification language in Section 3.2.2 Item #15 to define what this means.</p>	<p>Noted. The same wording from Section 3.2.2 has been added to Section 3.2.1.</p>
<p>Town Roads and Drainage</p>	<p>Stormwater Management (Page 19 – Section 2.4)</p> <p>41 Section 2.4 could be reviewed for consistency with the Town’s Stormwater Management By-law, particularly with respect to how stormwater management facilities are described in relation to use and access.</p>	<p>Noted. Changes have been made</p>

	42	The guidelines encourage stormwater management facilities to function as passive open space amenities. The Town's by-law restricts direct access and contact within the facility for safety reasons. References to "recreational" should be removed to remain consistent with the By-law, which restricts public interaction with stormwater management facilities.	Noted. "Recreational" has been removed. FYI, a lot of the "green amenity" and pedestrian connection language was carried forward from the town's original Community Design Guidelines.
	43	• Pt. 3: it will be helpful to clarify that the 1.8 metre mow strip is intended to be located on private property and not on Town owned lands.	This was not the intent. The Guideline has been removed for clarity.
	44	Pt 6: The word "decorative" should be removed. Fencing, where required, should be functional and consistent with safety requirements and Town standards.	"Decorative" has been removed.
	Driveways and Garages (Page 33)		
	45	Pt 3: this bullet point should be removed.	The Guideline has been removed.
	Street Trees and Plantings (Page 50)		
	46	• Pt 4: please remove the reference to 8 to 10 metre spacing. Street tree planting should generally be considered at a rate of one tree per lot, with wider spacing (approximately 30 metres) along collector roads, subject to coordination with utilities and site conditions.	The text has been revised to encourage one tree per lot.
Tree Trust TBM Betty Muise	47	Tree Trust supports the comprehensive integration of measures to ensure tree protection and tree planting in the Community Design Guidelines. This includes measures in public spaces such as parks, open spaces, trails and waterfront areas (Section 2), as well as neighbourhoods (Section 3), commercial and employment areas (Sections 4 and 5).	Noted.
	48	We support the reference to the Town's Municipal Tree Preservation By-law. The current By-law, from 2010, is severely outdated and in need of renewal to incorporate current best practices and respond to public demands for improved tree canopy protection/enhancement regulations.	Noted.
Pamela Spence	Volume 1		
	49	Page 7 – Definitions should come from the Town's new and almost improved Official Plan (OP).	The definitions referenced for character, compatible and enhance reflect what is included in the Official Plan. Sense of place is not referenced in the Official Plan but has been added to provide additional context for the Community Design Guidelines.
	50	Page 9 – "appropriate" is vague; buffer has been defined in OP as 30m; designate woodlots as Open Space (OS).	The Official Plan and other technical documents set the standard that is to be relied on. These documents are to be referred to collectively.
	51	Page 10 – Guideline #1 should be to maintain 30m setback as buffer from top of each bank to conform to OP. Guideline #4 should remove preferably (too weak; guideline after all is weak not law)	The Official Plan and other technical documents set the standard that is to be relied on. These documents are to be referred to collectively.
	52	Trees and Hedge Rows TBM Municipal Tree By-law only pertains to trees on public lands and does not apply to private developments.	Wording has been revised to remove reference to "all development" for clarity.
	53	Reference should be made to Town's Engineering Standards and generally accepted principals (which ever are the stronger). Specifically Standard Sec. 4.14.3 (pg 115/142) says "developer must preserve all trees within the limits of the development in accordance with the inventory assessment preservation plan/report." AND Sec. 4.14.5 "Additional trees may be required to buffer private and public areas as determined by the Town."	There is language points to this document that it should be reviewed alongside the Guidelines.
	54	Definition of a "mature tree" and measure method should be included as well as define a measure or formula to setback for the mature tree	The Guidelines include reference to the Town's tree standards, which should be reviewed in conjunction with this document to ensure consistency in interpretation. In addition, the Grey County Tree

		Inventory and Preservation Plan Technical Guidelines provide direction regarding the identification and protection of trees through the development process. These documents provide the framework for considering tree protection and preservation matters as part of development review.
55	Page 14 – Guideline #1 should be to maintain 30m setback from high water or wave uprush mark of waterfront. Native plantings should be defined or lists included as appendix.	The Official Plan and other technical documents set the standard that is to be relied on. County of grey ecologist will review individual applications on a site by site basis and include recommendations on native tree species.
56	Page 17 – Establishment of corridor along Nipissing Ridge; Town has declined to take charge of that at Parkbridge and has delayed pressing developer to do the work on its behalf. Joining of trails onto Georgian Trail should not be at 90 degree angle but by 45o entry ramp.	Noted. Nippising Ridge is outside of project scope. Georgian trail connections to be reviewed as part of parks and trail master plan
57	Page 19- definition of SWM ponds should be provided and design best practices. Some have rip rap edges which should have design guidelines to soften and integrate. Guidelines should be included re regular maintenance (per NVCA SWM pond planting guide within 10 year ponds fill in 50%) including reference to Sediment and Erosion Control Plan (Sect 3.4.11.4) and Landscape Plans for SWM Ponds (Sect. 4.5.6.5) and specify in CDG that 1 tree planted at least every 50m.	SWM Ponds to be designed in accordance with engineering best practices together with landscape plans to ensure naturalization of these facilities consistent with Community Design Guidelines.
58	Page 26 – Craigleith Depot picture is not current picture therefore replace with 2026 version.	Noted. The image has been replaced.
59	Craigleith Community Centre as an old school house – is it designated and properly maintained? How can you ask others to abide when Town does not? D5 in Town’s OP has 8 policies that should be incorporated in CDG!	Craigleith Community Centre is designated and maintained by the Town.
60	Lighting reference should be taken from the OP that requires downlighting only.	The Community Design Guidelines build upon and are aligned with the Official Plan. The lighting guidelines promote responsible lighting practices that direct illumination to intended areas while minimizing glare and off-site impacts.
61	Views and Vistas are an essential chapter and design policy in the OP and should be outlined as a separate and strong direction in CDG.	Views and vistas are referenced throughout the Guidelines.
62	Page 28 – Projects exist in TBM where the built form of roads and infrastructure (which includes parking and stormwater management ponds) have justified removal of trees in preservation plan and compromised other standards or policies and of course guidelines. It should be clarified in Section 3 that neighbourhood and built form designs should be done without compromising the policies and guidelines even though some areas permit. Through thoughtful design and rework, the guidelines can be followed.	Noted.
63	Page 29 - #7 and #8 seem to conflict with each other.	The exact wording has been revised to provide clarity.
64	Page 31 – Residential Built Form does not list rental apartment blocks prominently enough. This is most required housing form so would ask it to be first in descriptor section.	Rental refers to a tenure not a built form. The same guidelines would apply for built form.
65	Page 32 – references only 2.5 stories but OP has a height limit which should also be specified as BOTH apply in any application! Add metric heigh measures where ALL storey measures are provided.	Metres have been added for clarity
66	Where driveway guidelines are provided, minimum lengths should also be provided.	This is a zoning matter.
67	Page 36 #19 states “below grade units are discouraged”. This is the prominent type of ADU the Town is promoting and approving – this conflicts with Town policies.	Noted. The discouraging language has been removed.
68	Reference the Town’s Zoning By-law for rear/side/front yard setbacks	Reference to the specific standards of the Zoning By-law has been added to the introduction of Section 3.2

69	Page 43 references Section 6.2 but no such section!?????	The reference has been revised to Section 4.2
70	Not sure 5 storeys are permitted on Hwy 26 in Thornbury. All storey references should have maximum height in metres along with storeys.	The height has been revised to 4 storeys. Metres have been added for clarity.
71	Page 57 does not give guidelines for Craigleith Village but should. This area is yet to be designed so critical to provide guidelines for this “evolving” area to guide staff and designers. Craigleith Village be included in multiple sub section of Section 4.	Both the Community Design Guidelines as well as the design guidelines in the Official Plan apply to Craigleith village. A lot of the guidance is best practice and would apply in this scenario.
Volume 2		
72	Volume 2 should be Volume 1. This document sets out the origination of and principles behind the CDG Volume 2 and should be read ahead of the guidelines. Furthermore, the Community Design Principles should be in the forethought of all design efforts and application of the Guidelines. This reinforces the need that this document be Vol 1.	Volume 1 is intended to be the primary reference for the review and preparation of development applications, and Volume 2 provides supporting context to inform how the Guidelines are applied.
73	Secondly, I read in some places that the word “urban” was used in various contexts describing the Town. I would suggest that the community has been careful and dare I say vigilant to not imply TBM is an urban community nor does it have urban areas. Please remove the word “urban” in this volume.	References to urban have been removed, other than the Urban Employment Area as this is the name of the Town’s designation.
74	Generally I think the principles are valuable and clear except for a few suggestions outlined below. Page 7 – Natural Character Design Principles should more prominently speak to preservation of views and vistas (rather than “as well as”) as this is a strong principle in the Town’s OP (D5.5). Ideally Views and Vistas would be a standout principle. – Cultural Heritage The image is correctly the current state of the Depot and is different from the Depot picture in other volume which is outdated.	The intent of this principle surrounds “visual quality”. “As well as” has been replaced with “including” for clarity. Thank you. The previous image has been replaced.
75	Page 8 – Tourism and Recreation Remove the word “resort” ahead of community in the first Design Principle. Only part of Craigleith is a resort area and Craigleith is only part of the whole Town. The recreation and tourism aspect is sufficiently strong that inserting “resort” to Town’s total descriptor is not applicable.	This change has been made.
76	Page 21 – Craigleith “Settlement” should NOT be included in Residential Recreational designation.	Noted. And the designation has been updated
77	Page 23 – Under “broad range of housing types” priority or emphasis should be on rental stock!	Noted. Types “and tenures” has been added.
78	Page 26 – Technically Lora Bay is a Residential/Recreational and Recreational Commercial designation and settlement is not used in its context. Please remove “settlement”. (notable that on page 27 re Camperdown settlement is correctly NOT included in the descriptor!)	Noted. And the designation has been updated
79	Furthermore, I urge the Town to incorporate some LID measures and energy efficient building design suggestions in the CDG as I understand the Town's engineering dept. has been unable to decide on which could be incorporated as Town "standards". BY suggesting some in the guidelines it would be promoted that the Town is looking to see progressive designs and drainage solutions that positively influence our community.	Noted. Additional reference to resilient and energy efficient building design, as well as LIDs has been added in the document.