

Town of the Blue Mountains - Servicing Allocation Policy Comment-Response Matrix					
Date	Submitted By	Comment/Question	Response	Action	Status
May 14, 2024 (Public Meeting) - Council	Councillor McKinlay	Will there be a fee associated with reviews of these applications?	AS: Town is currently undertaking a Planning and Development Services Fee Review. This Policy can be considered as part of the Fee Review. We do expect that this Policy will require staff time and it will have to be factored into the overall Fee Structure.	Town to confirm if Servicing Allocation Policy Application Review will be contemplated through the Planning and Development Services Fee Review.	Fee Review remains on-going. Support for implementation to be considered in 2025 Budget.
	Councillor Hope	Overall, supports and is appreciative of this policy coming forward and notes that it is a strong and positive alternative to an Interim Control By-law (ICBL). What were the previous options before this Policy was conceived?	AS: ICBL was looked at. Collingwood experience influenced this policy. This policy should remain regardless if water is plentiful or scarce. An option to the proposed policy is continuing with the 'first come, first served'. This policy is an important tool and the current policy isn't suitable for our current needs.	No action required	
		Consider adding more bite or specific evaluation criteria around trees. For example, no clear-cutting and adhering to the forthcoming tree by-law. Mention tree preservation plan. Could these items be added to the "green" category of the Evaluation Matrix?	AS: we have some criteria pertaining to sustainability and the natural environment. Further discussion and refinement can occur once the documents are publically released. Regarding tree removal, development agreements contemplate tree preservation planning. We can refine the evaluation criteria to make reference and consideration of tree preservation more clear.	WSP to refine evaluation criteria to explicitly consider tree preservation.	Section 2.4 revised to include tree canopy enhancement and on-site tree preservation.
	Councillor Porter	Regarding greenspace and parks, are points awarded for cash-in-lieu or only if greenspace is provided?	AS: points are specific to the inclusion of greenspace.	No action required	
		How does the scoring work for affordable housing?	JD: The evaluation criteria table awards 1 point per 5% of affordable/attainable housing units up to a maximum of 5 points.	No action required	
	Councillor Maxwell	How will enhanced infrastructure, economic benefits and affordable housing be defined and by who?	AS: Staff are considering a committee-based approach to evaluating applications and would be putting the onus on applicants to determine how they are meeting the criteria. The Policy has enough specificity to provide staff guidance on evaluation but too much that would result in boxing in evaluation or interpretation. There is a balance that needs to be maintained.	No action required	
		How are greenfield and brownfield sites contemplated in the policy?	AS: Brownfield sites would be made a priority for redevelopment and the evaluation framework encourages redevelopment of these sites.	No action required	
	Deputy Mayor Bordignon	Commends the committee-based approach to evaluation of applications.		No action required	
In light of evolving Provincial policy, is there flexibility in the proposed policy to accommodate changes?		AS: This policy relies on the Municipal Act and is not embedded within the Official Plan. The policy also has an 18-month review period built-in and staff will be monitoring Provincial policy changes. This policy has been purposely separate from the Official Plan and Planning Act.	No action required		
May 14, 2024 (Public Meeting) - Public	Pamela Spence	Overall, supports the proposed policy. Notes North Grenfell and how they have also relied on the Municipal Act to move the policy forward. Make rental housing and geared-to-income housing a priority and refer to the Housing Needs Assessment. Notes that the evaluation criteria and policy should be made public and posted on the website for public review and comment. Requests that the pass level be greater than 50%.	Thank you for your comments on the proposed Servicing Allocation Policy and Evaluation Criteria.	WSP to include Housing Needs Assessment in Section 11 References and Related Policies.	Housing Needs Assessment has been included in Section 11 References and Related Policies of the Policy.
				WSP to use terminology from the Housing Needs Assessment and PPS where appropriate to align the Policy.	Tied definition of 'affordable housing' in the Policy to the Housing Needs Assessment and PPS.
				WSP to confirm that explicit reference is made to affordable housing.	Evaluation criteria refers directly to definition of 'affordable housing' as per the Policy.
	David Scoon, Escarpment Corridor Alliance.	Overall, supportive of the proposed policy and framework but would like to see specific reference to climate change/mitigation and cultural heritage and recreational amenities in the criteria.	Thank you for your comments on the proposed Servicing Allocation Policy and Evaluation Criteria.	WSP to include 'recreational amenities' in Criteria 5.5.	Recreational amenities have been included in Criteria 5.5
		Climate Change and Mitigation, while not explicitly, is built into Criteria 2. The flexible nature of the Policy allows staff/committee to review the proposed climate change/mitigation features and determine their weight and significance.	No action required		