

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
<b>Comments Received for Initial Public Meeting (July 12, 2021)</b>					
1.	Ryan Courville, on behalf of Bell Canada	June 10, 2021	[REDACTED]	1. Regarding Official Plan (OP) section B.3.3.4.1 (P) New Development – suggest inclusion of wording to the effect of “where feasible” or “where practical” with regard to mitigation of visual impact of infrastructure	1. Comment received. It is noted that this section intends to screen certain infrastructure (such as hydro boxes, waste storage areas, etc) from public view. Town Staff review final locations of these items to ensure sufficient compatibility. No policy change required.
2.	Samantha Anderson, Skelton Brumwell & Associates Inc., on behalf of The Miller Group	June 18, 2021	[REDACTED]	1. Requests notification of project updates	1. Completed
3.	Glenn Wellings, Wellings Planning Consultants Inc., on behalf of MacPherson Builders	June 24, 2021	[REDACTED]	1. Home Farm Development approvals were based on conformity to the existing Town OP – these approvals should be appropriately recognized through policies in the future OP 2. Requests notification of project updates	1. No proposed changes to Home Farm Development 2. Completed.
4.	Sally Leppard, on behalf of Climate Action Now Network (CANN)	July 7, 2021	[REDACTED]	1. Requests that Request for Proposal include the following Discussion Papers: a. Best Practice Analysis of plans that have successfully incorporated a climate lens b. Compact Built Form and Design c. Retention and promotion of agricultural resources d. Protection of natural heritage systems e. Urban tree canopy protection and targets f. Water resource protection 2. Request that Sustainability Plan policies are incorporated into the OP	1. Letter received at time of developing project framework. Comments were incorporated into the final terms of reference endorsed by Council in December 2021.
5.	Catherine Lafond	July 9, 2021	[REDACTED]	1. Consider amendment to Schedule A of A-4 of TBM OP from Rural to Escarpment Recreation Residential Area to	1. No changes proposed to settlement area or lands not currently designated for development.

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				facilitate growth. The County and TBM Ops should reflect the same designation when referring to the same area – in this case 12 <sup>th</sup> Sideroad to Dorothy Drive and 7 <sup>th</sup> Line to the bottom of Blue Mountain Resort.	Growth Allocations background paper has confirmed that no additional lands are needed in order to accommodate growth for the next 25 years.
6.	Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association	July 12, 2021	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request incorporation of the following studies and plans into the Official Plan (OP) Review:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Grey County growth projections for TBM</li> <li>b. density and height limits in similar small towns</li> <li>c. Experience of other similar municipalities with the Community Planning Permit System</li> <li>d. Prepare studies and incorporate plans into the OP that address environmental stewardship</li> <li>e. Complete infrastructure-related plans addressing transportation, recreation and drainage</li> <li>f. Experience of other similar municipalities with architectural guidelines</li> <li>g. Experience of other similar municipalities with green building standards</li> <li>h. Comprehensive, fully integrated housing strategy</li> <li>i. Language changes to the OP that articulate what is required to comply with OP policies and recommend metrics that are clear and measurable</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Letter received at time of developing project framework. Comments were incorporated into the final terms of reference endorsed by Council in December 2021.</li> </ol>
7.	Alexandra Graham	July 12, 2021	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests a Short Term Accommodation (STA) Policy that ensures STAs are safe, occupants respect neighbours and bylaws, and a level playing field is created for rural residents</li> <li>2. Requests notification of project updates</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No proposed policy changes to short term accommodation uses in Phase 1 or anticipated in Phase 2.</li> <li>2. Completed</li> </ol>
<b>Comments Received After Initial Public Meeting (July 12, 2021)</b>					
8.	Ernie McCay	September 27, 2021	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recommendation to limit visual impact for the municipal building being considered at Grey Road 19 by increasing the setback from the road, ensuring a healthy tree break facing Grey Road 19, and using unobtrusive signage.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To be considered outside scope of Official Plan Review project</li> </ol>

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
9.	Miriam Vasni, Plan Wells Associates	October 4, 2021	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request consideration to add a retirement home/long-term care facility, with an affordable accessory rental residential component for staff housing, as site-specific institutional uses on the subject lands Lot 13 to 15 Alice, E/S Lot 13 &amp; 14 Louisa W/S, Pt. Lots 46 to 39 Louisa E/S.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See August 8 Letter</li> </ol>
10.	Michael Martin, on behalf of The Blue Mountains Historical Society	October 5, 2021	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Society supports the current OP (page 15, items 1 and 5, page 16, items 6 and 12, page 21, items 7, 9, and 10, and page 24, item 3) as it relates to the cultural values of the Town. Notes the importance of incorporating provisions to enhance significant historical features in the OP update.</li> <li>2. Ensure OP contemplates new construction methods for enhancing and preserving "Green" values.</li> <li>3. Require an overall urban forest policy to protect and enlarge our tree canopy.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comments received</li> <li>2. Green development standards being considered as part of the Grey County work. To be considered at a future date.</li> <li>3. Environment, Parks and Open Space to consider tree canopy.</li> </ol>
11.	Lorraine Sutton on behalf of CANN	November 26, 2021	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Climate Crisis must be in the forefront of the additions and amendments to the update of the TBM Official Plan and should be part of the Vision and guiding principles;</li> <li>2. December 2022 is not an acceptable time frame given it is unlikely that the Sustainability Plan will be completed and passed by Council prior to November 2022 election;</li> <li>3. The principals that need to be part of the Official Plan Update:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Climate change and its impacts;</li> <li>b. Utilize the consent of the Triple Bottom Line;</li> <li>c. Participate in the FCM PCP program;</li> <li>d. Promote lifestyles and choices that require less consumption, energy and demand for non-renewable resources;</li> <li>e. Why climate action is important and why it should be incorporated;</li> <li>f. Reference areas of agreement or disagreement with Grey County's Climate Action Plan;</li> <li>g. Commit to enforcement of the updated Official Plan;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See proposed changes to Vision, Guiding Principles, Goals and Objectives</li> <li>2. Environment and Climate Change policies to be reviewed as part of Phase 2 of project. Timing of Sustainability Plan influenced timing of this policy review</li> <li>3. Listed items have been / will be considered as part of Official Plan Review. Other tools may be explored outside of Official Plan Review process</li> </ol>

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				h. Moratorium on exemptions to existing policies and by-laws; i. Introduce an incentive plan for builders and home owners to go net zero	
12.	Linda Wykes	November 30, 2021	[REDACTED]	1. Suggests that tiny homes be permitted	1. Policies encourage a wide range of housing types. Tiny homes are not prohibited, however Tiny homes are regulated under the Zoning By-law.
<b>Comments Received For Second Public Meeting (August 8, 2022)</b>					
13.	Kay Schaltz on behalf of CANN	March 1, 2022	[REDACTED]	1. Suggested edits to Draft Introduction and Vision section of Official Plan	1. Comments received and edits incorporated.
14.	Anthony Marano	March 6, 2022	[REDACTED]	1. Concerns about pedestrian and bicycle connectivity near the village where Sidewalks and Street lights do not exist.	1. Updates to active transportation and trails network to be considered under Phase 2 and after the completion of the Transportation Master Plan.
15.	Carl Michener, President, Blue Mountain Watershed Trust Foundation	May 2, 2022	[REDACTED]	Section C8 Watershed Planning of the 2016 Official Plan requesting: 1. Increase the town's focus on watershed-based planning; 2. Expeditiously conclude the studies of the Town's Natural Heritage features, including studies of the Town's current surface and municipal drainage patterns; 3. Make watershed based planning a routine practice in the Town	1. Comment received. Section C8 and items raised (1 through 3) to be reviewed as part of Phase 2.
16.	Jeff Barrett on behalf of change.org petition	May 17, 2022	[REDACTED]	1. Requests that the Castle Glen Secondary Plan be reviewed, and with support of 1,383 petition signatures that the Castle Glen lands be developed much less dense than what is currently contemplated by the Official Plan, and insist that a substantial portion of lands are preserved for public enjoyment as natural spaces. <i>Staff Note: as of 08/23/22 petition includes 1509 signatures.</i>	4. Comment received. Changes to Castle Glen are not considered in the Phase 1 or Phase 2 project workplan

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
17.	Grant Russell	May 25, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The official plan directs the establishment of new recreational facilities, however existing facilities such as the Lora Bay Pier is prime public shore access and is an eyesore that needs to be improved.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received. Parks and Open Space to be reviewed in greater detail under Phase 2.</li> </ol>
18.	Dan Skelton on behalf of Blue Mountain Resorts	May 25, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At present the Official Plan from the County of Grey or Town of The Blue Mountains do not specifically address housing various workforce groups. There is little policy guidance to acknowledge the need for employee housing, what employee housing is, or how it can be provided.</li> <li>2. General policy direction, goals and objectives are provided that recognize employee housing as an additional housing type and that employee housing will be permitted in land use designations that are in proximity to major employment uses and centers.</li> <li>3. A definition for employee housing is provided as well as additional implementation comments.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New section on Employee Housing proposed including definition. Minor edits considered from Public Meeting version</li> <li>2. See #1 above</li> <li>3. See #1 above</li> </ol>
19.	Rick and Julie Tipping	June 22, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Given projected growth forecasts, the Town will remain a small community and preserving the character and uniqueness of urban and rural areas is vital</li> <li>2. Given projected growth forecasts, there seems no justification for exceeding the County 20 units per hectare density target. Increasing density will impact character, reduce green space, tree canopy, street character and increase pollution and congestion</li> <li>3. There is no data to justify 6 storeys. There are no benefits or justification to exceed current height limits</li> <li>4. New Housing initiatives need to be considered particularly for attainable housing needs and to accommodate the major employment growth forecasted in the tourism/service industry. Other initiatives related to taxation should be considered</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Comment received. See Phase 1 policy changes on Character. Further work in Phase 2 to character and urban/rural areas will be completed.</li> <li>6. Official Plan changes are seeking to strike a balance between all factors raised as well as appropriately accommodating growth, providing efficient use of land/infrastructure, developing additional housing types at various price points, and others. See also staff report for further notes on Density changes</li> <li>7. See Staff Report for further justification on proposed Height changes.</li> <li>8. See Staff Report on housing</li> <li>9. Comment received. Changes to Castle Glen are not considered in the Phase 1 or Phase 2 project workplan</li> </ol>

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				5. Development is not sustainable. Profits are put in front of the environment and people. Castle glen is an example and is not being considered.	
20.	Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association	June 29, 2022	[REDACTED]	1. Ensure the policies developed are sound and have the support of the community; 2. Housing affordability requirements in Phase 1; 3. Allow full consideration of key items in Phase 2 (Environment/climate change, Transit and Transportation, First Nations Engagement, Parks and Open Space, Commercial/Employment Lands, Storm Water Protection, Community Design Guidelines, Servicing, Agricultural/Rural Lands, General Development policies prior to finalizing Phase 1; 4. BMRA is opposed to any OPA that would formalize any of the key policy items addressed in Phase 1 prior to the full consideration of key items in Phase 2; 5. The BMRA supports defining the intent and parameters of the deliverables in Phase 1, but they should only be implemented as part of the Official Plan Amendments to be made during Phase 2; and 6. The BMRA supports the Town commissioning a housing needs assessment to analyze family and employee growth and define needs targets to address what mix of housing is required. The BMRA also supports commissioning a study of opportunities in the Planning Act to address zoning or permitting options that provide land uses for attainable housing.	1. Comment received 2. See Staff Report on project timing and Council options. 3. See Staff Report on project timing and Council options. 4. See Staff Report on project timing and Council options. 5. See Staff Report on project timing and Council options. 6. Council has directed additional information on a Housing Strategy. This study to be completed alongside (but not part of) Official Plan Review. See also Housing section of Staff Report
21.	Laura Macdougall and Philip Watkins	July 5, 2022	[REDACTED]	1. Suggests Town clarify which objectives are required and which are recommended; 2. Develop a best demonstrated practice guideline to identify what optimal steps can be taken at each step of the planning process to ensure as many planning guidelines are adhered to;	1. Goals and Objectives inform the policies of the Plan. New development and change shall conform to the Official Plan. 2. A Development Review process is in place to review development applications.

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Town initiate a specific time limit for development projects and not allow large developments to be grandfathered;</li> <li>4. Protect migratory bids</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Development projects including subdivision, condominium and site plans contain lapse (expiry) dates. These dates may only be extended upon request and subsequent to a town review.</li> <li>4. Comment received.</li> </ol>
22.	The Blue Mountains Short Term Accommodation Owners Association	July 14, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the Employee Housing letter provided by Blue Mountains Resorts including the need to:</li> <li>2. Have the County and Town acknowledge the need for employee housing and provide land use policy to support;</li> <li>3. Amend Development Charges By-Law provisions to include purpose-built employee housing;</li> <li>4. Amend Zoning By-Law to include a definition for employee housing; and</li> <li>5. Employee housing shall be an additional defined and permitted use, distinct from residential dwelling units</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received</li> <li>2. Comment received</li> <li>3. Changes to Development Charges may be considered outside of the Official Plan Review</li> <li>4. A comprehensive update to the Zoning By-law will occur after the approval of Official Plan updates</li> <li>5. Completed</li> </ol>
23.	Pamela Spence	July 22, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protest the rapid scheduling of events, requests what the Planning Act requirements are, and does this the project timing meet them?;</li> <li>2. What are the legal references that give Council the authority and mandate to approve major OP changes within days of an election?</li> <li>3. What is the logic and reasoning for densities to be increased if current standards provide the numbers we want?</li> <li>4. Infrastructure must be improved to meet the demands generated by the proposed changes in the OP – why is this not addressed along with growth and density changes?</li> <li>5. What does the provincial definition of settlement area come from and is this the same as a settlement area in The Places to Grow policies? Is TBM a settlement area in Places to Grow? Does the County/Town have the</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Staff note that required Planning Act timing for notice and holding of public open house and public meeting have been met. Scheduling of events are in accordance with the project workplan endorsed by Council in December 2021 and established in the project Terms of Reference</li> <li>2. There do not appear to be any prohibition for an outgoing Council to make decisions on Official Plan Amendments including a 5 Year Review.</li> <li>3. See Density section of Staff Report. Current standards can accommodate growth for the next 25 years, policies encourage a greater variety of housing types, more compact development and efficient use of land.</li> <li>4. Servicing infrastructure review will be examined in greater detail as part of Phase 2. New projects</li> </ol>

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				<p>authority to define settlement areas and if so where is that authority given?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The Commercial strip or core of Craigleith Village should be designated beyond just the developers' property – how and when will this be incorporate into the OP?</li> <li>7. The community needs assurance that Building Height Guidelines will be in place before applications seeking maximums come forward. The policy should be inverted to say that the Building Height Study will be completed and locations permitted variations beyond 3 stories will be identified before a variation to the 3-storey height is approved;</li> <li>8. The OP must protect our beautiful views and vistas. How do you reconcile the tradeoff between policies to preserve views and vistas and the impact of high buildings above the tree lines and our natural elements, etc.?</li> <li>9. How do you justify 6 storey height maximums in Craigleith and only 5 storey in Blue Mountain Village? Does the Development Community understand and agree to heights impacting their proposals to that they will supply housing to address attainability, rental, alternative tenure options, etc. and not just increase their profitability?</li> <li>10. Will currently draft plan approved projects be able to change their proposals and take advantage of height and density changes? Will the community have to relitigate these all over again?</li> <li>11. Is Council Willing to consider these changes and corrections to Phase 1?</li> </ol>	<p>proposed at higher density are required to demonstrate available capacity to accommodate development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. See proposed changes to Community Structure Plan and further clarification on role of various settlement areas. Additional background information is available in the Vision, Guiding Principles, Goals and Objectives background paper.</li> <li>6. Comment received. Commercial/Employment Lands will be reviewed in greater detail as part of Phase 2 of the project.</li> <li>7. Building Height Study was not part of the Phase 1 workplan, and may be considered as an addition to Phase 2. Until such time as the Building Height Study is completed for the Downtown Area, individual studies will be required for each development taking into consideration adjacent lands.</li> <li>8. Comment received</li> <li>9. See Staff Report on Height and Housing</li> <li>10. Draft Plan Approved projects may adjust approvals at anytime prior to final plan approval and registration. Changes to Draft Plan Approved projects are reviewed in their entirety and not based on height/density numbers</li> <li>11. Comment received</li> </ol>
24.	Bruce Harbinson, President and Founder of the	July 23, 2022	b [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significantly concerned regarding the Lack of notice, general timing of the project, lack of public forums and fast tracking Phase 1 before completing necessary phase 2 work;</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project meets the enhanced public consultation plan considered in December 2021. Project timing discussed in further detail in the Staff Report.</li> </ol>



Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
	Escarpment Corridor Alliance			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient development approvals are in place to meet the growth targets to 2046. Density and height increases may result on existing applications, are infrastructure requirements in place for these changes?</li> <li>Has Climate change been given enough attention? Front-loading development will exacerbate our climate crisis and local impacts</li> <li>Castle Glen represents the single largest greenfield in the Town and the Official Plan Review is silent on these lands;</li> <li>Questions if Castle Glen is a settlement area, the County and Town mapping are confusing and have discrepancies</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development approval units are described in greater detail in the Growth Allocations background paper. Density and Height changes may be considered under new policies. Sufficient infrastructure to be in place at time of development. It must be demonstrated that infrastructure can accommodate new development.</li> <li>Climate Change addressed at Vision, Goals and Objectives level. Further policy detail to be provided in Phase 2.</li> <li>Changes to Castle Glen are not considered in the Phase 1 or Phase 2 project workplan</li> <li>Enhancements proposed to the Settlement Area descriptions and figure proposed in Community Structure section of Official Plan.</li> </ol>
25.	Tom Eisenhauer	July 27, 2022		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deeply concerned that Council did not listen to the feedback on the proposed Castle Glen Development.</li> <li>Need to consider Phase 2 before proceeding with Phase 1</li> <li>The rapid schedule of events to get the phase 1 approved is too aggressive. Request that Council delay the public proceedings and consideration of the OP Review until after the upcoming municipal election and after phase 2 has been completed.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes to Castle Glen are not considered in the Phase 1 or Phase 2 project workplan</li> <li>See Staff Report on project timing and Council options</li> <li>See Staff Report on project timing and Council options</li> </ol>
26.	Jim Oliver	July 28, 2022		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of the new guiding principles regarding Climate change;</li> <li>The climate change action items and strategic objectives are excellent</li> <li>Requests consideration of reducing lot coverage from 30% to 25% to reduce carbon footprint and provide additional greenspace</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment received</li> <li>Comment received</li> <li>Lot Coverage to be reviewed in greater detail as part of Zoning By-law review.</li> <li>Comment received</li> <li>See Staff Report for further comments on Building Heights</li> </ol>

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very supportive of the proposed increase in the density target of 25 units per hectare in thornbury and Clarksburg. Minor edits to the density targets for housing types are also suggested.</li> <li>Regarding building heights, 4 storeys should be considered the general maximum versus the current 3 storey maximum. The exceptions for increased height should be limited to 5 storeys versus the proposed 6 storeys subject to meeting criteria</li> </ol>	
27.	Eleanor Ward	July 28, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about the proposed density increase, particularly because the last official plan review already increased the maximum density permissions;</li> <li>Concerned that development has been focused in the Blue Mountain, Craigeith, Lora Bay area and not Thornbury Clarksburg where adequate services and infrastructure exists</li> <li>Concerned about Climate change and the need to preserve natural areas;</li> <li>Protect the escarpment by protecting the Niagara Escarpment Plan areas</li> <li>Please do not increase density in the resort residential areas, density should be directed to Thornbury and other nearby towns</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment received, see Density section of Staff Report</li> <li>Growth Allocations study does forecast majority of growth outside of Thornbury/Clarksburg. Further examination is required as to where growth should be directed.</li> <li>Received. Enhancements to Goals and Objectives proposed</li> <li>Lands designated escarpment have limited development potential. Parks and Open Space review in Phase 2 may look further into this</li> <li>See Density section of Official Plan. Density increases are proposed however they are at a scale less than Thornbury/Clarksburg</li> </ol>
28.	Norm Lingard, Senior Consultant on behalf of Bell Canada	August 1, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bell Canada is most interested in changes to the transportation network and/or policies and regulations relating to the direction of growth and public infrastructure investments, heritage character, urban design, broadband and SMART-related objectives and how Bell can assist the Town to be connected community.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment received</li> </ol>
29.	Terry Kellar	August 3, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revisions must reflect that the residents of the Town want and contain language so that no new STA's can be spot zoned in any area;</li> <li>Disapproves of the proposal for 6 storey height</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the Short Term Accommodation policies are proposed under Phase 1 or anticipated under Phase 2</li> <li>See Staff Report on Height</li> </ol>

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
30.	County of Grey	August 4, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally supports the growth management work, proposed density targets, settlement area clarifications, and inclusion of other work the County is undertaking on climate change and green development standards</li> <li>Recommends a large number minor policy revisions to proposed text and mapping in various sections.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment Received</li> <li>Minor policy changes accepted and inserted in final version</li> </ol>
31.	Robert Mitchell	August 4, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the complexity of the amendments;</li> <li>Requests that council slow the process down and convene a Committee of Residents to review the amendments;</li> <li>How will the application/interpretation of these criteria change from one Council to another?</li> <li>Thornbury and Clarksburg follow the same intensification patterns as the rest of TBM so as not to lose the small town feel;</li> <li>Density, height, range of housing types and affects on the character of the community;</li> <li>Define minimum and maximum more clearly;</li> <li>The Official Plan Amendments process is rushed</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment received</li> <li>See Staff Report on project timing and council options</li> <li>Application/interpretation remains consistent from one Council to another.</li> <li>Comment received</li> <li>See Staff Report on Density/Height/Housing and policy changes regarding Character</li> <li>Minimum and maximum are defined in the glossary and are measurable</li> <li>See Staff Report on project timing</li> </ol>
32.	Pat Yeager	August 4, 2022	[REDACTED] <i>(mail or fax only)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding the permitting of secondary dwellings, variety of building heights up to 5/6 storeys, infill an intensification, and bed and breakfasts that will dramatically change the character of the Craigeith community.</li> <li>Wish the existing low density single detached dwellings and open space to remain.</li> <li>Should prohibit Short Term Rentals</li> <li>Concerns with the potential that too much development is occurring between blue mountain area and the town of Collingwood</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Staff Report for further comments on building heights and density.</li> <li>Comment received</li> <li>No changes to the Short Term Accommodation policies are proposed under Phase 1 or anticipated under Phase 2</li> <li>Comment received.</li> </ol>
33.	Kay Schaltz on behalf of Climate Action Network Now (CANN)	August 4, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of needed additions have been drafted that relate to climate change, however additional work is still required in Section B – land Use designations of the Plan</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment received. Additional work is proposed to be completed as part of Phase 2 of the project.</li> <li>Comment received. It being noted that the County of Grey is making progress on developing</li> </ol>

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Town should commit to develop Green Building Standards within 1 year.</li> <li>Requests that the Climate Emergency Declaration made by Council in 2019 be inserted into the introductory section of the Plan</li> <li>A number of other policy edit suggestions and reference materials are provided to bolster the environment and climate change themes throughout various sections</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green Building Standards to help municipalities develop their own Standards.</li> <li>Completed</li> <li>Received with some minor edits being inserted</li> </ol>
34.	Paul Williams	August 5, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defer the decision to allow 6 storey buildings and develop new trails, parks and public waterfronts, consistent with being a unique hub for outdoor recreational activities</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Staff Report on Building Heights. Parks and Open Space to be reviewed in greater detail as part of Phase 2</li> </ol>
35.	Lorne Gladstone	August 5, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests patience – wait until the Official Plan Review process has been fully completed; and</li> <li>Respect for the population of the Town by waiting for the election so the next Council is not bound by out going Council</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Staff Report on project timing and Council options</li> <li>See Staff Report on project timing and Council options</li> </ol>
36.	Richard Lamperstorfer	August 5, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The official Plan process must not take a not in my backyard (NIMBY) approach</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Official Plan Review considers Public Interest and long term community goals.</li> </ol>
37.	Miriam Vasni, Plan Wells Associates on behalf of Part Lot 24 Concession 7	August 5, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request a site specific exemption in the official plan to recognize a historical permission for a new single detached dwelling in the escarpment designation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site specific request is outside the scope of Phase 1 and is not flagged as a housekeeping item. Phase 2 will consider escarpment lands and policies that prevent the establishment of dwellings within the designation.</li> </ol>
38.	Miriam Vasni, Plan Wells Associates on behalf of Lora Greens subdivision	August 5, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that consideration be given to the Hazard / Floodplain studies completed on the lands and that Hazard boundaries be adjusted.</li> <li>Note that the proposed subdivision has not yet been submitted, and wish that affordable/attainable housing is not considered for this project</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted in the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal Decision, the readjustment of the watercourse is required first. Second is the adjustment of the Hazard Limits through an administrative process. It appears premature to adjust the Hazard limits at this time.</li> <li>Staff cannot comment on the appropriateness of development requirements at this time. Applicable Official Plan policies in effect at time</li> </ol>

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
					of application review/decision will need to be considered.
39.	Miriam Vasni, Plan Wells Associates on behalf of property roll number 424200001700300 (Commercial Corridor Lands Thornbury)	August 5, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request that the Official Plan Update consider adding a retirement home/long-term care facility, with an affordable accessory rental residential component for staff housing, as site specific additional Institutional uses on the subject lands</li> <li>2. Request the removal of the Deer Wintering Areas constraint from the subject lands</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site specific requests outside the scope of the Official Plan review should be considered under an individual application process. If clarification is required as part of existing policy, these lands will be considered as part of the Commercial / Employment lands review under Phase 2.</li> <li>2. Deer Wintering Areas are included as part of the constraint mapping. The development of these lands may occur subject to meeting policy criteria and does not require the formal removal from the lands. Staff has not received any further study or acceptance of further study on Deer Wintering Areas.</li> </ol>
40.	Miriam Vasni, Plan Wells Associates on behalf of Blue Meadows Inc.	August 5, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request the removal of the Deer Wintering Areas constraint from the subject lands</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Deer Wintering Areas are included as part of the constraint mapping. The development of these lands may occur subject to meeting policy criteria and does not require the formal removal from the lands. Staff has not received any further study or acceptance of further study on Deer Wintering Areas.</li> </ol>
41.	Brian Nelson on behalf of Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association	August 5, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant concerns regarding timing of approving an Official Plan Amendment at the end of Phase 1. Supports deferring all Official Plan changes after Phase 2 is completed.</li> <li>2. The Sequencing of approvals by an outgoing council will create challenges for the next council and fulsome public review.</li> <li>3. Many Public comments and questions on the proposed Official Plan Amendment have not been addressed.</li> <li>4. No specific policies to mandate affordable and attainable housing. Clear and measurable policies are required.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment Received, See Staff Report on project timing and Council options</li> <li>2. See Staff Report on project timing and Council options</li> <li>3. See Staff Report and this comments summary matrix</li> <li>4. As also heard and discussed at the August 8 Public Meeting, Draft OPA has been modified to provide enhanced policy direction on affordable/attainable housing</li> </ol>

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Existing growth management studies confirm that the Town can already accommodate growth for the next 25 years within existing settlement areas</li> <li>6. Limiting sprawl by employing intensification strategies is clearly necessary. TBM is well positioned to meet intensification targets within the current height and density policy framework. Policies in the proposed OPA to allow 6-storey buildings and 100 units per hectare appear arbitrary, with no substantive justification.</li> <li>7. Character is clearly a priority for the Town, no work has been completed to address the proposed increase in height of 6 storeys in Thornbury.</li> <li>8. Concerns with some policy language not being direct enough, and may lead to interpretation issues. Some policy changes lack sufficient direction particularly regarding 6 storey buildings throughout the municipality</li> <li>9. The Building Height Study should be completed prior to considering increases in building heights in the Town.</li> <li>10. The implications of higher density/taller buildings has not given consideration to impacts on existing infrastructure and current concerns relating to traffic, servicing, and others.</li> <li>11. Increases in height/density should also be accompanied by specific, measurable and enforceable policies related to transportation, open spaces, environment and climate change which are not proposed to be examined until phase 2</li> <li>12. No information has been made available to indicate whether the proposed policies have been reviewed by legal experts to ensure that they will strengthen the Town’s ability to avoid costly hearings,</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Growth Allocations background paper identifies Development units in the ‘pipeline’ exceed growth forecasts. It being noted that the units counted in the ‘pipeline’ include projects at concept stage up to under-construction stage. Some ‘pipeline’ units may be subject to further changes, and others may not move forward to development stages.</li> <li>6. See Staff Report for discussion and justification on Height/Density policy changes</li> <li>7. See Staff Report for commentary on character and proposed policy direction under Phase 1</li> <li>8. Comment received. Staff believe sufficient direction and controls are provided.</li> <li>9. Building Height Study was not part of the Phase 1 workplan, and may be considered as an addition to Phase 2. Until such time as the Building Height Study is completed for the Downtown Area, individual studies will be required for each development taking into consideration adjacent lands.</li> <li>10. Servicing infrastructure review will be examined in greater detail as part of Phase 2. New projects proposed at higher density are required to demonstrate available capacity to accommodate development.</li> <li>11. Comment received. See Staff Report and Council options on approving/delaying Phase 1 modifications.</li> <li>12. The Official Plan provides guidelines for future growth and change. Policies are to be evaluated in their entirety. An Official Plan is not intended to be as prescriptive as a Zoning By-law.</li> </ol>

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
42.	Heather Macnaughton and David Dunphy	August 5, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about increased density in certain areas to 6 stories;</li> <li>Project Timeline seems rushed</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment received and discussed in further detail in the Staff Report.</li> <li>Comment received and discussed in further detail in the Staff Report.</li> </ol>
43.	Maria Reinhard	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Town needs to develop clear guidelines for commercial, residential and municipal light pollution, and ideally a lighting bylaw to address the dramatic increase of light pollution in the context of the emergence of ubiquitous LED lighting                      Consider the following in the Official Plan:                      -Develop a Dark Sky Action Plan                      -Examine local light use and develop Dark Sky Action Plan and implement policies within the Town Official Plan                      -Tailor the Action Plan to our community recognizing and identifying areas that require outdoor lighting                      -Consult with the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada                      -Collaborate with Sustainable Tourism operators in the development of the plan</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goals and Objectives section has been updated to bolster protection of night sky principles. Additional Plans and implementation tools could be explored outside of the Official Plan 5 Year Review.</li> </ol>
44.	John and Susan Young	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the recommendations of the BMRA</li> <li>Council should defer building height and density changes until further study is completed</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment received</li> <li>Comment received and discussed in further detail in the Staff Report.</li> </ol>
45.	Michaelene O'Mally	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the recommendations of the BMRA</li> <li>6 storey buildings may become precedent and new norm</li> <li>Additional criteria needed for taller buildings</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment received</li> <li>Comment received and discussed in further detail in the Staff Report.</li> <li>Policies require a Building Height Study to comprehensively look at Downtown Area, prior to that study, individual studies required for each development taking into consideration adjacent lands.</li> </ol>

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
46.	Kelly Tomenson-Haas	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Opposes increasing building heights to 6 storeys in Thornbury, does not believe higher density housing is needed</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received and discussed in further detail in the Staff Report.</li> </ol>
47.	Paul Blythe	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerns with the proposed six stories and if sufficient background work has been completed to support environmental benefits / attainable housing costs?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received and discussed in further detail in the Staff Report.</li> </ol>
48.	David Hinchcliffe	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Light pollution requires further attention, including better policy, by-laws, education and other tools to reduce impacts</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Goals and Objectives section has been updated to bolster protection of night sky principles. Education plans and further tools could be explored outside of the Official Plan 5 Year Review.</li> </ol>
49.	Rosalyn Morrison	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Congratulates Staff on OP process and community engagement</li> <li>2. OP focus should be on “strategic growth” based on community needs, enhancing the community and attracting next generation employment uses</li> <li>3. We need density and intensification to help with many things such as climate change and affordability</li> <li>4. Regarding the survey and public input an offer to create a matrix based on relevant indicators related to ‘Sustainable Development Goals (SDG11)’</li> <li>5. Guiding Principles could refer to ‘Complete Communities’ concept</li> <li>6. More emphasis needed on protecting agricultural lands</li> <li>7. Affordable housing strategy needed to develop understanding on medium/long term needs for apartment/rental units</li> <li>8. Consider developing an Innovative Hub for TBM</li> <li>9. Innovation required how to develop our 21<sup>st</sup> century integrated economy into TBM</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledged and comment received.</li> <li>2. Modifications proposed to Goals and Objectives section.</li> <li>3. Modifications proposed to Density/Height/Housing and high level environmental policies</li> <li>4. Further discussion in Phase 2 to look at outside examples is welcome</li> <li>5. Comment received. ‘complete communities’ term is included presently, and has been increased.</li> <li>6. Phase 2 will look at agricultural lands. Emphasis on long term protection is included.</li> <li>7. Council direction on Housing Strategy may better address this comment</li> <li>8. Comment received</li> <li>9. Goals and Objectives section updated based on findings of Economic Development Study. Further work can be considered in Phase 2 Employment lands study</li> </ol>



Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
50.	Pamela Spence	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed Track changes comments list regarding revisions to the Goals and Objectives section of the Official Plan. (See Letter for detailed comments)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter provides a number of recommended edits to the Goals and Objectives section of the Plan. Staff thank the author for the detailed comments and review. Further modifications to the Goals and Objectives section have resulted.</li> </ol>
51.	Betty Schiwkow	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly supports sound planning principles for the benefit of the community, the town's authority to regulate land use, and Town By-laws regulating land use. We need your help to save our community and neighbourhood</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged and comment received.</li> </ol>
52.	Robert Turner	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that current Council defer the Official Plan Amendments to the next Council due to project timing, availability of information, and election timelines.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project remains on schedule with the original project terms of reference endorsed by Council in December 2021 that identified the adoption of Phase 1 changes in the fall of 2022. All cumulative information was released as part of the July 2022 Public Open House and Public Meeting Notice. Prior to the notice information was released in stages culminating at the Public Notice</li> </ol>
53.	Al Burton, Thomson Rogers on behalf of Abbotts Subdivision	August 8, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft policies do not contain any measures which are inconsistent with the Tribunal Decision.</li> <li>The land use as approved by the Tribunal Decision is a permitted use and does not require the provision of any affordable housing</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment received.</li> <li>Comment received. Post public meeting modifications to housing policies and affordable housing do not appear to contain any measures inconsistent with the Tribunal decision.</li> </ol>
54.	June Porter	August 8, 2022	Verbal Presentation at Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thornbury character has strong appeal. Character needs to be defined using objective information. Related documents such as Community Design Guidelines and Engineering Standards need updating</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protection of existing built areas from substantial change has been built into the policy direction. Consideration of gentle intensification is proposed within built areas. More substantial changes in height/density pushed to greenfield areas and edges of built boundary.</li> <li>Updating of Community Design Guidelines are not part of Official Plan Review, however</li> </ol>

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
55.	Bruce Harbinson	August 8, 2022	Verbal Presentation at Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project timeline has been too fast for the amount of information and documentation released.</li> <li>2. Hold off deciding on Phase 1 until Phase 2 work is completed</li> <li>3. Sufficient development is available already in the 'pipeline' to serve town needs to 2046</li> <li>4. Castle Glen should be examined through the Official Plan Review. Protection of character and environment is priority.</li> </ol>	<p>inclusion as part of Phase 2 can be discussed with Council after Phase 1 is completed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Engineering standards being reviewed through separate process.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project remains on schedule with the original project terms of reference endorsed by Council in December 2021 that identified the adoption of Phase 1 changes in the fall of 2022. All cumulative information was released as part of the July 2022 Public Open House and Public Meeting Notice. Prior to the notice information was released in stages culminating at the Public Notice</li> <li>2. See Staff Report for recommendations on Phase 1 and Council options.</li> <li>3. Development 'pipeline' units are described in greater detail in the Growth Allocations background paper. It being noted that these projects are at concept stage up to under-construction stage. Some 'pipeline' units may be subject to further changes, and others may not move forward to development stages.</li> <li>4. The project terms of reference includes themes related to character and the environment which may also apply to the Castle Glen lands, however more substantial changes are not part of this project.</li> </ol>
56.	Betty Wallace	August 8, 2022	Verbal Presentation at Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree with most of the Phase 1 review.</li> <li>2. Policies should be included so that new Short Term Accommodation uses cannot be 'spot zoned' outside of the existing permitted area at Tyrolean Village</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledged and received.</li> <li>2. No proposed policy changes to short term accommodation uses in Phase 1 or anticipated in Phase 2.</li> </ol>

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
57.	Kay Shaltz	August 8, 2022	Verbal Presentation at Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Climate Emergency Declaration from 2019 should be inserted into the introductory section of the Official Plan.</li> <li>2. Also see letter comments.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Declaration of Climate Emergency has been added.</li> <li>2. Minor edits have been added</li> </ol>
58.	Brian Nelson on behalf of Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association	August 8, 2022	Verbal Presentation at Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project timing has moved too quickly</li> <li>2. No decisions on Phase 1 until Phase 2 is completed</li> <li>3. Need to understand the implications of what the policy changes will look like</li> <li>4. Community design guidelines are outdated and need to address the proposed increased height/density limits prior to considering OP policy changes.</li> <li>5. Also see letter comments</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project remains on schedule with the original project terms of reference endorsed by Council in December 2021 that identified the adoption of Phase 1 changes in the fall of 2022.</li> <li>2. Comment Received. See staff report for further discussion on Draft Amendments and Council adoption options.</li> <li>3. Policy changes provide parameters and guidelines for new development. The Zoning By-law will provide further guidance on permitted uses and land development standards. It is noted that the Plan policies intend to provide stronger direction on future development while also providing some flexibility for innovation and adaptive development.</li> <li>4. Comment Received. The need for updated Community Design Guidelines have been requested a number of times throughout public consultation and could be considered as an addition to Phase 2 pending Council direction. It is noted that the current community design guidelines paired with updated Official Plan policies will continue to provide good direction on community design.</li> <li>5. Letter comments provided on separate item</li> </ol>
59.	John Milne	August 8, 2022	Verbal Presentation at Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recognize the importance of the Official Plan review, legacy of Council and to ensure that the project is not rushed.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project remains on schedule with the original project terms of reference endorsed by Council in</li> </ol>

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
60.	Pamela Spence	August 8, 2022	Verbal Presentation at Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project timing has moved too quickly</li> <li>2. Many areas of the 2016 Official Plan have not been implemented</li> <li>3. Raised questions have not been responded to</li> <li>4. Document requires more thorough review for errors</li> <li>5. More work is needed prior to considering OPA's</li> <li>6. There is an immediate need for serviced employment lands</li> <li>7. Also see letter comments</li> </ol>	<p>December 2021 that identified the adoption of Phase 1 changes in the fall of 2022.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project remains on schedule with the original project terms of reference endorsed by Council in December 2021 that identified the adoption of Phase 1 changes in the fall of 2022.</li> <li>2. Comment received</li> <li>3. Project team has acknowledged that public consultation has been successful, however improvements to directly responding to comments that are received will be reviewed as part of Phase 2.</li> <li>4. Comment received.</li> <li>5. Phase 2 work will look to bolster some Phase 1 work, however Phase 1 work can be considered complete and sustainable. Phase 2 will provide further clarity that otherwise may need to be determined by further study by applicants.</li> <li>6. Commercial / Employment lands to be reviewed in greater detail under Phase 2. Growth Management work has identified that sufficient designated lands are available, however it is acknowledged that majority of these lands may not be adequately serviced by water/sewer/roads and other infrastructure</li> <li>7. Letter provides a number of recommended edits to the Goals and Objectives section of the Plan. Staff thank the author for the detailed comments and review. Further modifications to the Goals and Objectives section have resulted.</li> </ol>
61.	Lucy Richmond	August 8, 2022	Verbal Presentation at Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notes concerns with interpretation of Provincial and County planning documents</li> </ol>	<p>(see also written letter below)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project team consists of professionals at the Town, County and outside Consultants. Upper</li> </ol>

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				2. Notes that the County does not prescribe density/height numbers for the entire Town	tier interpretation has been discussed and to ensure conformity to County Plan and consistency with Provincial Plans/Policy. It is also noted that County Council has an obligation to ensure the local Official Plan will conform and be consistent with upper tier planning documents. 2. Comment received. County Plan prescribes minimum density requirements for Primary Settlement Area (20 units per hectare, proposed through OPA 11 to 25 units per hectare). These requirements apply to Thornbury/Clarskburg. Outside of these areas, the County provides policy guidance only and not prescribed numbers. The Town is then required to establish minimum density requirements for other areas.

**Comments Received After Second Public Meeting (August 8, 2022)**

62.	Robert and Joan Newman	August 9, 2022	[REDACTED]	1. Oppose this Council to finalize the Official Plan. The next Council should have the opportunity to review and modify. 2. Oppose Building Height policies 3. Supports the position of the BMRA	1. Comment received and discussed in Staff Report 2. Comment received and discussed in Staff Report 3. Comment received.
63.	Carolyn Ellis	August 9, 2022	[REDACTED]	1. Oppose this Council to finalize the Official Plan. The next Council should have the opportunity to review and modify. 2. Oppose Building Height policies 3. Supports the position of the BMRA	1. Comment received and discussed in Staff Report 2. Comment received and discussed in Staff Report 3. Comment received.
64.	Alexandria Pike	August 11, 2022	[REDACTED]	1. Regarding the secondary unit policies - why would this policy apply to recent subdivisions that were already granted significant density (particularly as compared to neighbouring historic neighbourhoods)?	1. Second and Third residential unit policies are prescribed under provincial requirements. These units are intended to be small scale in comparison to the primary dwelling.

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. What new developments would have to consider TWO secondary units in their design - those that had not yet been approved for rezoning?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. New policy section encourages that all new developments consider 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> unit design options. May include within the dwelling, accessory building, as well as considerations to parking, amenity space, and other elements.</li> </ol>
65.	Lucy Richmond	August 11, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports increased transparency that links the original Official Plan assessment and background papers to the technical amendments proposed.</li> <li>2. New development, re-development, and intensification projects need to be delayed due to conflicts with Provincial Policy and Plans.</li> <li>3. The Official Plan Review needs to be directed to follow and demonstrate conformity with OP Section E9.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Official Plan Phase 1 process has been developed with multiple milestones that deliver incremental information ultimately resulting in the Draft Official Plan Amendment document. It is important to note that the background papers contain an assessment of the Official Plan and upper tier planning documents. Also considered are the public comments received prior and post the background papers in informing the Draft Official Plan Amendments.</li> <li>2. Planning Staff fail to see conflicts with Provincial Policy and Plans unless otherwise noted in the background papers.</li> <li>3. The Official Plan project Terms of Reference were developed under the framework of OP Section E9. It is noted that portions of E9 are to be addressed in greater detail under phase 2</li> </ol>
66.	Anna Pannabaker	August 12, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the protection of night sky principles. Are there plans to educate the public on reducing light pollution? Will there be a Lighting By-law?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Goals and Objectives section has been updated to bolster protection of night sky principles. Education plans and further tools could be explored outside of the Official Plan 5 Year Review.</li> </ol>
67.	Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association	August 17, 2022	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant and important effort has been made on the project.</li> <li>2. Requests a public document that: summarizes comments received at the Public Meeting, work completed for Phase 1</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledged and Received.</li> <li>2. Completed.</li> <li>3. See Staff Report on Draft Official Plan Amendment and Council options</li> <li>4. Housing Strategy is not included as part of Official Plan project. It is noted that Housing work is</li> </ol>

Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Official Plan Review

File No. P3067

Item No:	Comments Received By:	Date:	Contact Details:	Summary of Comments:	Staff Response:
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. All work should be considered draft subject to further review and results of Phase 2 recommendations</li> <li>4. Requests that the Housing Strategy be accelerated to help inform effective policies</li> <li>5. Prepare the Building Height Study prior to policies that would allow for increased height beyond 3 storeys</li> <li>6. Complete the Phase 2 work before finalizing Phase 1 policy changes</li> <li>7. Use findings from above studies and Phase 2 results to ensure policies are clearly defined, supported by mapping, enforcement, and linked to affordable/attainable housing objectives that have no negative impact on community character, infrastructure and services</li> <li>8. Ensure that any policies to permit building heights greater than 3 storeys have in place resources to manage approvals including updated design guidelines and in-house expertise</li> </ol>	<p>underway at the County level and just being started at the Town level. Some Housing policies are proposed to incorporate the Housing Strategy work to be completed. Additional recommendations of Housing Strategy may be incorporated in Phase 2 or through its own Official Plan Amendment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Building Height Study is not included as part of the Official Plan project. Consideration of adding to Phase 2. Policies can stand on their own in Phase 1, and bolstered in the future upon completion of study.</li> <li>6. Received. See Staff Report recommendation and Council options.</li> <li>7. Phase 1 recommendations are sustainable and can be implemented at this time, and bolstered further through Phase 2 work. Council to consider the balance of implemented policies needed now and deferring policies to a future date</li> <li>8. Comment received.</li> </ol>