

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3355 Development 'D' Zone ZBA

Public Meeting Date: May 14, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
Agency Comments			
Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	April 26, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
Grey County	April 30, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
Grey Sauble Conservation Authority	May 13, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments or concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
Public Comments			
Andrew Pascuzzo	April 23, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with the removal of single detached dwellings as a permitted use. Why would the Town want to zone a property into a zone that allows essentially nothing to be constructed on it? The Town should use forward thinking and good planning to pre-zone the properties to a residential zone. At the very least, one single detached dwelling, accessory buildings/apartments, and recreational uses, etc. should be permitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of the D zone is to retain land for future development. Restricting the use of the land until a planning application is submitted to the Town allows for additional review to ensure that proposed development does not compromise the potential for future development on the lot. Pre-zoning may be considered through the upcoming review of the Zoning By-law but will require additional review to pre-zone on a site-specific basis. Current permissions for single detached dwellings have resulted in the developability of lots zoned D being compromised.
Henry and Debra Gilas	May 1, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We own a small property zoned Development and Hazard east of Peel Street and west of the Little Beaver Creek that contains the ruins of a single-family dwelling. We attempted to develop the property, but the project was beyond our means. We then reverted to our original plan to build a home there when we retire in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amendment would not render any property worthless forever. Instead, a Zoning By-law Amendment would be required to ensure that the location a proposed single detached dwelling does not compromise the future development potential (if any) of the lot. Existing uses, buildings and structures that

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3355 Development 'D' Zone ZBA

Public Meeting Date: May 14, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>the distant future. This amendment would render our property worthless forever. We also wonder if what is proposed is even legal.</p>	<p>were established legally would be permitted to continue as legal non-conforming and could be expanded, subject to the proposed provisions.</p>
<p>Denis Martinek</p>	<p>May 6, 2024 May 21, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tyrolean Village Resorts owns various lands that will be impacted by the proposal, and we have concerns regarding the removal of certain permissions that apply to our lands. Until we have had an opportunity to fully evaluate the potential impacts, we object to the proposal. • Permissions carried over from the former Collingwood Township Zoning By-law 83-40 on a Tyrolean property include agricultural permissions, a proposed commercial lodge on commercially designated land that is fully serviced, and a greenhouse permission. The proposal also affects 138 Kandahar Lane, where a Planning Act application is currently before the Ontario Land Tribunal. The removal of these permissions will have significant impact on the value of vacant land and will cause serious financial implications for owners that have secured financial commitments based on the land's highest and best use. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • As 138 Kandahar Lane is currently the subject of an appeal under the Planning Act, provisions have been included to exempt this property from the proposed amendment. The provisions of the former Township of Collingwood Zoning By-law 83-40 would continue to apply to this property.
<p>Chris and Kitty Studiman</p>	<p>May 7, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We acquired a vacant lot which was previously zoned RERa under the former Township of Collingwood Zoning By-law 83-40. The proposed provision to prohibit the construction of new single detached dwellings on vacant lots affects our plan to build a retirement home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A property can be rezoned to an appropriate zone provided the proposal maintains conformity with relevant Official Plan policies. A D-zoned property could therefore be rezoned to a residential zone now or after/if the proposed amendment is approved. This has occurred in many such cases in the Town.

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3355 Development 'D' Zone ZBA

Public Meeting Date: May 14, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>on the property. We object and wish for it to be retracted from the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being a RERa zoned lot under Township of Collingwood 83-40, is there a provision to rezone our D lot to an R1-1 zone? Should we be submitting an application to do this? 	
Dale Harbottle	May 13, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am in favor of the new proposal. My property that I live at was an existing bunk house and now my home, but apparently illegal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
Richard Lamperstorfer	May 14, 2024 May 16, 2024 May 20, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having a 3-storey house approved by LPAT a few years ago, to prevent my 13-acre lot from one house I would object to without a secondary plan. I accept that building on detached house on an existing 'D' acreage in West Thornbury may/should no longer be supported. The Town presentation contained examples of poor planning, neglect, and ignorance of the highest and best land use. This land is lost forever to density, highest and best use, families, and walkability. These lands have excessive frontage feet, increasing the cost of future services and assuring future sprawl. Should TBM pre-zone or start a Secondary Plan? Yes. I am against allowing one house as of right on my vacant lot in the Thornbury West 'D' zone without a Town-initiated Secondary Plan or Pre-zoning. Council should not take MZO/CIHA shortcuts on their recently purchased land while punishing "closer to the core" properties with, in effect, just another lame planning "freeze". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Pre-zoning lands currently zoned D may be considered as part of the upcoming Zoning By-law review.

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3355 Development 'D' Zone ZBA

Public Meeting Date: May 14, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
David Scoon	May 14, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is premature for comments from the Niagara Biosphere Alliance, but we are generally not in favor of future development taking place outside of settlement areas. Castle Glen has a secondary plan and is zoned D, so how will this effect those lands? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The secondary plan for Castle Glen is policy under the Town's Official Plan, but the lands have not yet been rezoned to facilitate development and, as such, remain in the D zone. As a Zoning By-law Amendment will already be required to rezone the lands, the proposed amendment would essentially have no effect on those lands.
Pamela Spence	May 14, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agree that this is confusing, but it sounds like the purpose is to control infill developments. Larger lots should be considered for infill housing, with distinct standards. Site-specific areas should be identified for increased density, heigh, and affordable housing on smaller lots. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These comments could be addressed through pre-zoning lands, which is something the Town will likely review through the upcoming Zoning By-law review. This would provide advanced planning permissions for development on certain lands based on specific criteria and standards.
Paul Reale	May 14, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Future Secondary Plan area of Thornbury West, the entire area is zoned D and I have been told it would take 10-15 years for a secondary plan to be prepared. When you are in a Future Secondary Plan area with no secondary plan, you have very limited permitted uses. For land in Thornbury West, property owners would not be able to build after this proposal. You cannot approach the Town to rezone. From my understanding of the Official Plan, the Town needs to initiate a secondary plan. I think we need distinction on what a secondary plan vs. a community or neighbourhood plan is. I question how this proposal favours the resident and how future planning growth that includes existing residents. What options would you have to sell if you 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permitted uses in the Future Secondary Plan designation of the Official Plan include single detached dwellings. As such, a Zoning By-law Amendment application could be submitted and, if approved, would allow for the construction of a single detached dwelling. This is in line with the intent of the Future Secondary Plan designation as is seeks to allow for the continued, interim use of lands provided uses, buildings, or structures are constructed and located in a manner which would not adversely affect the long-term development of the lands. Through a Zoning By-law Amendment application, the Town would have the ability to ensure conformity with this intent.

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Project File: P3355 Development 'D' Zone ZBA

Public Meeting Date: May 14, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		want to avoid upcoming development and construction? You will not get the proper price for your property until a secondary plan is created. It seems if a property owner wants to get out of this, they would have to ask for a CIHA or MZO.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This proposal does not favor developers or residents, rather, it favors the efficient use of land for the future growth of the Town.• A CIHA or MZO would not be required to rezone a property to permit a single detached dwelling on a D-zoned lot.