

**From:** [Becky Hillyer](#)  
**To:** [Planning General](#)  
**Subject:** County Comments - P3354 ARU ZBA  
**Date:** March 8, 2024 1:49:35 PM

---

Hi TBM Staff,

We received a note from our IT department that the comments for the ARU ZBA we sent yesterday may have not been sent due to a server interruption. Please see those comments again below, and apologies if you are receiving these comments twice.

Warm Regards,

Becky Hillyer

-----

Hello TBM,

Please note that Grey County Planning staff have reviewed Zoning application P3354, which proposes to update the Town of The Blue Mountains Zoning By-Law related to Additional Residential Units.

County staff applaud the Town for updating their Zoning regulations to align with the current direction of the Planning Act and the County's Official Plan, in order to facilitate new housing-creation options.

County staff have no concerns with the changes proposed at this time. Beyond what has been proposed at this time, County staff would note that the Planning Act limits municipalities to requiring a maximum of one parking space for any proposed ARU (in addition to the parking requirements of the main dwelling).

Staff have no further comments.

Please note, a paper copy will not be provided unless requested.

Let us know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Becky Hillyer

**Becky Hillyer**  
*Intermediate Planner*  
Grey County  
595 9th Avenue East  
Owen Sound, ON N4K 3E3

Phone: 548 877 0715  
[Becky.Hillyer@grey.ca](mailto:Becky.Hillyer@grey.ca)  
<https://www.grey.ca>  
<https://www.visitgrey.ca>  
<https://greyroots.com>





**Nottawasaga Valley**  
Conservation Authority

---

March 11, 2024

SENT BY EMAIL

Town of the Blue Mountains  
32 Mill St,  
Thornbury, ON  
N0H 2P0

Attn: Corrina Giles  
Town Clerk  
townclerk@thebluemountains.ca

**RE: Comments for Town-wide ZBA – Additional Residential Units  
March 2024  
NVCA ID #18956**

Dear Staff,

Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority [NVCA] staff appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the town-wide Zoning By-law Amendment to provide more flexibility with additional residential units. We have provided our comments in regard to our mandate, as this will hopefully provide clarity and strengthen natural hazard policies.

We are hopeful that these comments will be implemented to ensure the maximum protection for persons and property against natural hazards and increased climate change resiliency.

**Ontario Regulation 172/06:**

1. In the proposed amendment there is no mention of natural hazards. Additional dwelling units/intensification is not permitted within natural hazards. It is recommended that a policy be included that mentions "additional dwelling units shall not be permitted in natural hazards."
2. Even if an ADU/ARU/Garden Suite is proposed within an existing structure that is within a natural hazard, a permit would not be obtainable from the NVCA for the change of use.
3. We recommend a subsequent section be added to address the above. Further details can be discussed on exact wording to ensure clarity is provided to residents and conforms with the Conservation Authorities Act.
4. The definition of a Bunkie should only include sleeping facilities. Once sanitary facilities appear it is easy to create cooking/sleeping facilities post-development that extend beyond the intent of a Bunkie.

**Conclusion:**

NVCA staff appreciates the opportunity to comment at this stage. These comments should be considered valid at the time of issuance. The NVCA is happy to submit further

information or explanation if required. The NVCA may at any point change our comments should new information become available which raises concerns pertaining to the NVCA core mandate.

Please feel free to contact the undersigned at extension 233 or [tboswell@nvca.on.ca](mailto:tboswell@nvca.on.ca) should you require any further information or clarification on any matters contained herein.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Tyler Boswell.

Tyler Boswell  
Planner

## Carter Triana

---

**From:** Corrina Giles  
**Sent:** March 12, 2024 8:42 AM  
**To:** Riverside Press, Linda  
**Cc:** council; SMT; Karen Long; Carter Triana  
**Subject:** RE: Zoning By-law 2018-65

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Good morning,

I acknowledge receipt of your attached comments in response to the March 12 Notice of Public Meeting and confirm I have forwarded the same to Council for their information and consideration. As your comments were received after the deadline, your comments may not be included in the summary of comments read at the Public Meeting, but will be attached to a followup staff report regarding this matter,

Kind regards,



**Corrina Giles, CMO**

Town Clerk

Town of The Blue Mountains, 32 Mill Street, P.O. Box 310, Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0

Tel: 519-599-3131 ext. 232 | Fax: 519-599-7723

Email: [cgiles@thebluemountains.ca](mailto:cgiles@thebluemountains.ca) | Website: [www.thebluemountains.ca](http://www.thebluemountains.ca)

---

**From:** Riverside Press, Linda <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 12, 2024 12:44 AM

**To:** Corrina Giles <[cgiles@thebluemountains.ca](mailto:cgiles@thebluemountains.ca)>

**Subject:** Zoning By-law 2018-65

***The proposal is seeking an amendment to Zoning By-law 2018-65 to update the “accessory apartment” provisions of Section 4.1 and associated definitions. For the purposes of this application, “accessory apartments” will be referred to as additional residential units (ARUs).***

***An ARU may also be known as an “additional dwelling unit”, “accessory dwelling unit”, “ADU”, “accessory apartment”, or “secondary dwelling unit”. An ARU may be considered as a garden suite where an approved temporary land-use by-law is in effect, but shall not mean or include a bunkie, a recreational trailer or vehicle, or a short-term accommodation.***

**Comments:**

This Bylaw initially referred to how apartments could be included to a primary dwelling and should still use the same terminology - accessory apartment

Additional Residential Units can come in many different shapes, styles and sizes. By using this term to define an apartment becomes confusing.



## Carter Triana

---

**From:** Andrew Pascuzzo [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** March 12, 2024 9:14 AM  
**To:** Corrina Giles  
**Cc:** Carter Triana  
**Subject:** ARU provisions  
**Attachments:** B-6-P3354 Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting (ARU ZBA).pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Good Morning Corrina

I have reviewed the proposed ARU bylaw amendments.

### 4.1.3 ARUs in Detached Buildings

ARUs located in a detached accessory building shall be subject to the provisions of Section 4.1.2 and the following:

- a) The minimum *rear yard* shall be 1.2 metres. All other *setbacks* shall be in accordance with those applicable to the *primary dwelling unit*.
- b) The maximum *height* shall be 5 metres, except where the unit is located above a detached *private garage*, in which case the maximum *height* shall be 8 metres.
- c) The maximum *lot coverage* shall be permitted to exceed that applicable to *accessory buildings and structures* by 5%.
- d) For lots in the RU, A, or SA zones, ARUs shall be located within 50m of the *main building*.
- e) ARUs shall comply with *Minimum Distance Separation* requirements.

Section 4.1.3 c) proposes to limit the increase in maximum lot coverage to 5%.

If someone proposes 2 ARU's then they would only be able to use 2.5% additional coverage for each of the ARU's

I would recommend changing proposed section 4.1.3 c) by adding , "per ARU", after 5%. So 5% for one ARU and 10% for 2 ARU's.

c) The maximum lot coverage shall be permitted to exceed that applicable to accessory buildings and structures by 5%, **per ARU.**

It's also worth noting that there should also be acknowledgement that the R1 maximum lot coverage provisions need to also be increased accordingly....i.e. by 5 and 10% as well.

Andrew Pascuzzo MCIP RPP

Pascuzzo Planning Inc.

[www.pascuzzoinc.ca](http://www.pascuzzoinc.ca) [REDACTED]



The information above is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

## Carter Triana

---

**From:** Carla Crawford <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** March 18, 2024 3:02 PM  
**To:** Town Clerk  
**Subject:** Public Comment for the ARU project.

Good afternoon,

I would like to submit the following as a public comment for the ARU project:

We live in Clarksburg and are considering ideas for building a home for my parents to come live next to us. We're exploring the idea of either building them a garden suite (detached ARU) on our property or severing the rear of our property to create a new one for them next door to us on our corner lot. After reading the proposed provisions, it seems like an ARU is only permitted on properties that are 0.4 hectares or larger. I may have missed something, but I don't see anything in the documents about partially serviced lots under 0.4 hectares, which is the case with our property. Ours is about 0.16 hectare, and we are partially serviced with municipal water and private septic. I spoke with some people in the Town Planning and Building departments, and from those calls it sounded like we can build a detached ARU on our property as long as it conforms for setbacks, height, lot coverage, etc, and that we can install a second septic system for the ARU as long as it too complies with the regulations for septic systems. However, now I wonder if the proposed ARU regulations suggest that we can't build one at all on our property because it's under 0.4ha and is only partially serviced. Is this correct? Will partially serviced lots under 0.4ha not be allowed to have ARUs at all?

Thanks very much,  
Carla Crawford, resident of Clarksburg