

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
<b>Agency Comments</b>			
<b>Grey Sauble Conservation Authority</b>	July 29, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed severances have not demonstrated consistency with PPS policies. GSCA staff are of the opinion that the applications should be deferred. We anticipate that the regulatory floodplain will be the primary constraint of development on the site. Should a site-specific flood plain study be provided which does support severances, the above noted natural heritage constraints should be considered. We note the following:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A site-specific floodplain study should be prepared to refine the floodplain mapping on site. To support severances, this study must demonstrate sufficient area for development outside of the existing regulatory floodplain without the requirement for infilling of the floodplain.</li> <li>2. The EIS should clarify the methodology for determining the encroachment in wetland setback.</li> <li>3. Lot four should be removed from the development proposal as it represents a significant encroachment into the wetland setback.</li> <li>4. Detailed plans should be provided which outline the erosion and sediment control, enhancement planting and fencing recommendations of the EIS.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application has been revised to address comments.</li> <li>The proposed number of lots has been reduced to three.</li> <li>Note GSCA updated comments from March 2022.</li> </ul>
<b>Grey Sauble Conservation Authority</b>	March 2, 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GSCA generally has no objection to the subject application, and we still recommend the following two conditions for the severance with some of the noted changes above:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requested conditions have been included in the Consent Decision.</li> </ul>

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The downstream improvement to the culvert be completed in it's entirety and be certified by the project engineers as a condition of the severance. A permit for this work will be required from GSCA.</li> <li>2. Completion of the groundwater monitoring program and demonstration of the results that demonstrate that all development is located above the water table</li> </ul>	
<b>Huron-Wendat Nation</b>	May 10, 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Huron-Wendat nation wishes to be consulted and is interested in participating in all archaeological fieldwork for this project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No archaeological work is anticipated as no site alteration is proposed.</li> </ul>
<b>Grey County</b>	July 7, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An EIS was complete as part of the justification for the proposed development. Several mitigation recommendations have been provided in the EIS including the recommendation of maintaining a 30 metre setback from the wetlands. County Planning staff recommend that all recommendations provided in EIS be implemented through this or future site plan process.</li> <li>Appendix B also identifies the existence of 'significant woodlands' and 'other wetlands' on the subject property. Recommendations provided in the EIS also address these natural heritage features.</li> <li>County Transportation Services has reviewed the subject application and provided the following comments. Separation of entrances does not meet County criteria of 100 m, that will require an exemption request to the Director of Transportation to obtain. The County Setback policy appears from the drawing to be in order.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft Zoning By-law Amendment will include a condition requiring the mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) completed by Birks Natural Heritage Consultants, Inc., dated March 14, 2022, be implemented, as required, to the satisfaction of the Town and other relevant agencies as required.</li> <li>A road widening of 5.18 metres will be dedicated to the County as part of the development.</li> </ul>

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		<p>Transportation Services requests a road widening and Entrance permit is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided that the Conservation Authority is satisfied with the EIS and Transportation Service requirements of a Road Widening and entrance permit are met, County Planning staff have no concerns.</li> </ul>	
<b>Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON)</b>	June 29, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Saugeen Ojibway Nation does not support any further development of the Silver Creek Wetland complex without considerable mitigations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several mitigation measures are proposed to ensure impacts are minimized, as set out in the EIS submitted. Administering these mitigation measures will be a condition of the Zoning By-law Amendment.</li> </ul>
<b>Town of Collingwood</b>	May 18, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Town currently has a pause on development within the municipality of the Town of Collingwood and the approval of developments is only happening through exemptions to the Interim Control By-law, and granted to developments that have been evaluated through the municipalities newly adopted Servicing Capacity Allocation Policy. The Town has limited capacity to allocate until the completion of a water treatment plant expansion, which is planned to be complete end of 2025/early 2026. Based on the restrictions currently in place related to development within the Town of Collingwood, we are not in a position to provide water to Town of the Blue Mountain properties at this time. The Town would be willing to support connections to our water system following the water treatment plant expansion, scheduled for 2026. Alternatively, if Town of the Blue Mountains was in agreement, the lots could be connected to the Collingwood system and supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A condition will be added to the Zoning By-law Amendment requiring the lands be connected to municipal water services and that any required agreements to secure the municipal water connections with the Town of The Blue Mountains and Town of Collingwood are in place.</li> </ul>

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		from the water allocation provided to TBM through our supply contract (i.e. Collingwood would minus the allocated SDUs from the 1,250m3/d allocated to TBM).	
<b>Public Comments</b>			
<b>Duncan Bristow (Blue Mountain Watershed Trust)</b>	June 13, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does this development maintain the minimum required buffer to the nearby Provincially Significant Wetland?</li> <li>There is typically flooding in this area (Town Line Creek), and we're concerned about maintaining the function of the watershed and ecosystem. Two of the proposed properties are directly impacting a wetland designated area (see attached map). Has there been or will there be an assessment with respect to the impact of this development on the hydrologic function of this wetland area?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed by Birks Natural Heritage Consultants, with mitigation measures recommended to avoid and mitigate any potential negative ecological impacts associated with development. The Town has proposed the Holding provision for the Zoning By-law Amendment require the mitigation measures of the EIS be met. Based on the EIS, potential ecological impacts are minimal and mitigable, provided the listed mitigation measures are applied accordingly.</li> </ul>
<b>Pamela Spence (Pre-Public Meeting)</b>	June 10, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Public meeting is Premature As of June 1, 2022 there were no agency comments on file with the Town. GSCA or NVCA need to do a review of the EIS and provide comments or recommendations which are not on file. Secondly, the MTO must give driveway permits for this proposal and their position is not known. Furthermore, there is talk of a roundabout at Grey Rd 21 and Hwy 26 therefore traffic/turning conflicts need to be assessed and there is not traffic study on file.</li> <li>2) EIS The EIS is poorly done. Due to its proximity to Silver Creek wetland which is provincially significant, the environmental assessment should be done for 120m from the boundary of the wetland. There is no</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GSCA have reviewed and provided comments on the EIS. Based on their re-review and confirmation of mitigation measures, they have no objections to the application.</li> <li>An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed by Birks Natural Heritage Consultants, with mitigation measures recommended to avoid and mitigate any potential negative ecological impacts associated with development. The Town has proposed the Holding provision for the Zoning By-law Amendment require the mitigation measures of the EIS be met. Based on the EIS, potential ecological impacts are minimal and</li> </ul>

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		<p>hydrological study in the EIS, and the study area is not correct. Figure 2 in the EIS is inadequate. The information is unclear there is no explanation of yellow line, watershed boundary or forest count/area The Significant Woodland is recognized by EIS in the body of the report but no mapping has been done for the 3.5 ha identified The source for boundaries shown on Figure 3 is not substantiated. Key Natural Heritage Features are not shown on Fig 3 so overlap is indeterminate The 30m setback from watercourses and wetlands, which is required in the Official Plan Section C2, could be maintained if lots were not so deep. Lot 4 is almost entirely in setback area. The average setback number is not relevant and probably does not even include the intrusion into Lot #4. Setback enhancement area ownership is not clear and the zoning for that enhancement area needs to be clarified. Mitigation measures offered pertain only to construction time period; long term measures need to be outlined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3) Tatham Report • Speaks to full services yet EIS speaks of septic services so EIS misinformed • Lots of historical flooding in this proximity not identified/addressed in this report • MTO permit required but no dialogue prior to or since March 15 2022</li> <li>• 4) Planning Justification Report • Does not conform to PPS as it is within the 120m PSW limits without better EIS and proper understanding of hydrological/drainage consequences of house location • Misquotes the EIS •</li> </ul>	<p>mitigable, provided the listed mitigation measures are applied accordingly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed lots meet the standards of the R1 Zone.</li> </ul>

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		<p>Can not be compliant with County Official Plan til GSCA signs off and entrance permit granted • Sec. 4.4 is miscalculated – area being rezoned is only the 4 lots which is 1/3 of Hectare and therefore 3.3 units are permitted not 10 • Does not conform to Town OP as it does not conform to 30m setback, the EIS does not definitively address natural heritage features or protection • Seemingly too close to proposed turning circle to be built at Hwy 26 and Grey Rd 21.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5) TBM Zoning By-law • Lots are massively larger than standards for R-1; lot size reduction could accommodate setback measures and still be generous and meet R-1 standards • Zone designation needed for proposed enhancement area with clarity of ownership and easement to Town • Is enhancement area in lieu of parkland dedication/payment or is trail? • The footprint shown on the Consent Sketch 2 is over 4000 sq ft – another monster home • Such uniformity is boring; could be staggered and permit better visibility entering onto busy County Rd.</li> </ul>	
<b>Pamela Spence (Post-Public Meeting)</b>	July 22, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public meeting is Premature - There were no comments available ahead of or at the meeting from GSCA, MTO or other agencies which are directly impacted by this proposal. Furthermore, the response came back that there is no water or sewer to the sight now or in the foreseeable future. This application is premature and must be turned down.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response above.</li> </ul>

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EIS - The comments from Ms. Loft to my question was that the diagram she referenced was in the EIS. I have perused it several times and do not find her illustration used in her presentation. I do note that the most southerly lot is almost entirely in the setback allowance, there is no math illustrating how the "average" calculation was made and there is no hydrological report. Water monitoring informs a hydrological study but does not constitute the requirement and no further study was promised. The EIS is poorly done. Significant Woodland areas and Key Natural heritage features are not sufficiently shown. Silver Creek wetland is inadequately research. Because this area is in the Silver Creek wetland which is provincially significant proposal should be turned down.</li> <li>Planning and Zoning Problems - Lots are massively larger than standards for R-1; lot size reduction could accommodate setback measures and still be generous and meet R-1 standards. The footprint shown on the Consent Sketch 2 is over 4000 sq ft – we do not need more monster homes – furthermore, the uniformity is boring. The lots could be staggered which would permit better visibility entering onto busy County Rd 21. The 30m setback from watercourses and wetlands, which is required in the Official Plan Section C2 is not maintained because the lots are so deep. Lot 4 is almost entirely in setback area. The average setback number is not relevant and probably does not even include the intrusion into Lot</li> </ul>	

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		<p>#4. Ownership of the setback enhancement area is not clear and the zoning for that enhancement area is not defined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finally, the matter of illegal fill on the site to alter the hydrology of the site, affect the provincially significant wetland is very concerning. If illegal the owner should have to remove it and be fined. At a minimum it should be stopped until such matters as compliance and reparation to fill by-laws are met, water and sewer are available and comments from other agencies are received.</li> </ul>	
<b>Martin Kilby</b>	May 31, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not object to the proposed plan to change the zoning to create the smaller building lots along Grey 21.</li> <li>I am however, concerned that the entire balance of the 50 acre property would be changed to R1 thus eliminating the Hazard portion that abuts many of the property owners along Timmons street. These hazard portions are a haven for deer and ducks and turtles. It is typically very swampy for most of the year. Will the effect of removing the Hazard zoning and replacing it with R-1 along the whole of the property create a window of opportunity to future development of these lands from the other abutting land owner to south? Is it not possible to maintain the H zoning in those portions if it is not the owner's intention to ever develop? A future owner could also just create an access road off of Timmons St. With R-1 zoning on that acreage, the possibilities become financially feasible. In my opinion,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only a 0.3 hectare portion of the 20.28 hectare property currently zoned Development 'D' along Grey Road 21 is proposed to be rezoned to Residential One 'R1' and severed into three single detached residential lots.</li> <li>No changes are proposed to the Hazard 'H' Zone or the Wetland 'WL' Zone.</li> </ul>



## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		such a drastic change would be unwelcome to neighbouring owners who purchased along Timmons St with the understanding that there was significant wetland areas that would prevent any future development. I would support maintaining the H zoned areas and protect our wetlands and grant the owner the R-1 to develop as proposed with this Zoning amendment	
<b>Lucy Richmond</b>	May 26, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of 372 Grey Road 21 sits over a Provincially Significant Wetland and development there is discouraged by the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS): Setbacks from watercourses, significant woodlands and Provincially Significant Wetlands must also be protected, as legislated.</li> <li>• The Town's Transportation Master Plan has not been completed and the effects of widening Grey Road 21 in the near future have not been considered.</li> <li>• 372 Grey Road 21 and the surrounding lands flood seasonally and intermittently. There is no Town Drainage Master Plan to mitigate these events on this property or on the as-built neighbourhood.</li> <li>• The Town does not practice "Watershed-based Planning", yet, as described in legislation that has been drafted by the Province on the matter. Each of the three (3) sub-watersheds mentioned and the as-built areas adjacent to this property will be affected by any disruption in the dynamic watershed functions of the area, as a whole.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed by Birks Natural Heritage Consultants, with mitigation measures recommended to avoid and mitigate any potential negative ecological impacts associated with development. The Town has proposed the Holding provision for the Zoning By-law Amendment require the mitigation measures of the EIS be met. Based on the EIS, potential ecological impacts are minimal and mitigable, provided the listed mitigation measures are applied accordingly.</li> <li>• A condition will be added to the Zoning By-law Amendment requiring the lands be connected to municipal water services and that any required agreements to secure the municipal water connections with the Town of The Blue Mountains and Town of Collingwood are in place.</li> </ul>

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is poorly aligned with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the Town's Official Plan. A Master plan for both segments of 372 Grey Road 2, and one more Public Meeting about the Master Plan, is required in order to understand and manage development in the area, wisely.</li> <li>If the Town is to act on its Declaration of a Climate Crisis, this is the time to amplify the Town's OP mandates regarding "Watershed-based Planning". There will never be a better opportunity than the one before Council NOW to PROTECT the dynamic watershed functions in the narrow band of land between the Niagara Escarpment and Georgian Bay, two important Biospheres recognized globally and designated by the United Nations. The Province, Grey County and the Citizens of the Town are all waiting to see how we manage today's drainage and flooding challenges and, together with developers, pave a creative path into a more reliably sustainable future.</li> <li>This application is incomplete and pre-mature. As such, it qualifies as a matter for a second full public review and consideration before coming before County or Town Council for approval. The application is to be denied at this time.</li> <li>PS For those who worry that the County Official Plan has been approved and we must comply, please know that Amendment #11 to Grey County's Official Plan has not yet been approved, to the best of my knowledge, and</li> </ul>	

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		<p>further amendments have been requested. The Town's OP 2016 prevails until changes to it are approved. Changes are only to be made if they will better serve the Town, its citizens, and the lands they live on. When conflicts arise, we, as citizens of the Second-Tier Municipality have recourse, in Provincial Legislation, if the Town's Council has not approved activities that are against the best interests of the Town, its citizens and the lands they live on.</p>	
<b>Lucy Richmond</b>	June 26, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial interests would not be served if the request were to be approved at this time because adequate infrastructure is not in place to support the proposal, nor is it planned. See: Attachment A1. Provincial laws direct new development to settlement areas where infrastructure is in place or planned.</li> <li>The best interests of the Town, its Citizens and the Lands where they live work and play would not be best served, in the short or long term, if the request for re-zoning were to be approved at this time. See: Attachment A2. Only if the Zoning remains Development "D" Zone, can the Town, conserve and protect this holding, from seasonal and intermittent flooding and the continued loss of dynamic, natural, watershed functions, over time. The Town's Fill By-Law addresses this matter.</li> <li>There is too great an infrastructure gap (as reported at the June 13 Public Meeting) in this area of the Town, both regarding water/wastewater infrastructure, including the ability of the Municipality to provide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response above.</li> </ul>

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		<p>adequate wastewater services (including sewage and drainage systems), and regarding local transportation systems that are meant to integrate town, county, and provincial roads, trailways and cycle paths. In the interim, until the missing infrastructure has been put in place, or is planned and "shovel-ready", and as more complete information is being gathered, the granting of permissions, under the Town's "Fill" By-Law, for site alterations must be formally PROHIBITED. This prohibition would include the accepting and/or removing of "fill" of any kind (earth, gravel, sand, tree-trunks, canopy, and ecosystems. Only if the Zoning remains Development "D" Zone, can such a permission be denied. Please give these two matters your consideration before deciding about the request for Zoning By-Law Amendment for 372 Grey Road 19 that was proposed at the June 13, Open House. Those who have commented, so far, in the public forum, as a matter of record, are not satisfied that adequate consideration has been given to all the factors that affect these and neighboring lands, nor are they satisfied, yet, that the proposal would be in the best interests of the province, the Town, residents and the highly functional, working, Watershed Ecosystems within which they live.</p> <p>Watershed Ecosystems can easily be enhanced and expanded by those who know how to do that task by employing the principles and techniques of sound,</p>	

## PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3165 372 Grey Road 21

Public Meeting Date: June 13, 2022

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Town Response
		watershed-based planning. The watershed-based planning act, for Ontario can help with that.	
<b>Madi Hayles</b>	May 12, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not support this application for ZONING AMENDMENT. No development. This area is part of the Silver Creek Wetlands.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed by Birks Natural Heritage Consultants, with mitigation measures recommended to avoid and mitigate any potential negative ecological impacts associated with development. The Town has proposed the Holding provision for the Zoning By-law Amendment require the mitigation measures of the EIS be met. Based on the EIS, potential ecological impacts are minimal and mitigable, provided the listed mitigation measures are applied accordingly.</li> </ul>