

Public Comments Matrix

Attachment 1
CS.25.025

Options for 130 King St. W

Public Information Centre – Thursday, May 8, 2025

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE – Comments Received		
<i>Recreational Enhancement Suggestions:</i>	May 8, 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Staff & Council need a vision for overall sports complex at Tomahawk • Set Town Priorities • Add some swings & teeter totters • Leave as is • Add a fountain and/or splash pad • Get on with it before the \$365k is effectively worthless • Sports courts for multi-use • Clean up the land for sod & pathways • Connection to Georgian trail and/or trail to town. Increase access to public • Leave the two tennis courts, put several park benches • TBM needs a swimming pool • Parking & lighting • Swimming pool • Splash pad/park area/swimming pool/playground • Re: Tomahawk youth golf program where youth could play for free + now they pay 17.50 per round and we are discussing this tennis complex • Open space, trail links, max two courts • Playscape for children • More indoor and outdoor pickleball courts • Green space, park, no more buildings • Allow existing courts to remain, develop passive parkland on balance of property • Sell the property to develop low-income housing and put the income toward park and rec facilities • Restore the two courts that are there and make the rest parkland • Please leave us a green park to enjoy forever • Restore the existing courts • Park land yes, no paved over green spaces

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
General Property Use Suggestions		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Space/Parkland. Two courts MAX for residents • Parkland with paths • Multi-use sport court • Parkland, no more than two courts (tennis) benches • Parkland only. Accessible pathways and walkways. No lighting, no tennis bubble • A park with affordable housing • Snowshoeing and river walk • Sell the property, reduce taxes • Green space, parkland for everyone's use • Park • Leave it alone • Good for walking and snowshoeing • Parkland, a space that can be used by the whole neighbourhood, not just tennis players. There are no parks for the development in that area. • Open parkland and safe access to creek for kids • Accessible parkland for all ages of residents • Parklands and green space. • Indoor/outdoor tennis courts & pickleball • Bench and picnic tables • Passive use parkland. Maybe trails, some educational signage – nature or history. Keep the tennis courts, a couple of benches
General enhancements – most important		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Naturalized Plantings / Shade Trees: 36 • Sheltered Areas: 13 • Lighting: 0 • Drinking Water Fountain: 4 • Interpretive Signage: 2 • Walking Path: 26 • Public Art / Sculptures: 7 • Recognition of Truth and Reconciliation: 7
Carolyn Wedgbury	May 15, 2025	I was very surprised at the response from “the park supporters” at last week’s community meeting. Shame on them! As an interested resident of the area, I would ask if BOTH a park and some configuration of tennis courts could be considered.

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
Diana Wetmore	May 15, 2025	I would like the space to be greenspace or a park like setting while maintaining the natural habitat and surroundings. A space that can be enjoyed by the community in harmony with nature. Eg. Walking trails, benches, bird watching, picnic benches. Not multiple tennis courts. Tennis courts could be built over by Tomahawk golf course. Tennis courts disrupt nature, increase traffic, noise, congestion and its not necessary to build at 130 King ST. W. There are other more suitable locations.
Stephanie Henderson	May 15, 2025	It would be wonderful to see recreational facilities expanded at Tomahawk. Maximize usage of pickleball by putting a bubble over the courts, add tennis? Pool? Splash pad? Driving Range? Keep 130 King St. greenspace and shelter, flowers, gardens, sitting area, art. It was discouraging to see the Town Hall discussing tennis as an option to a space that is really not viable for more covered tennis. As an avid tennis player in the area this would be a terrible spot. Tomahawk should be the location to have parking and large space to develop more recreational facilities. Survey the people and make it legit. Act on what the majority want. Is there another way? Tonight's Town Hall seemed useless. Zero direct focus and zero productive.

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
COMMENTS RECEIVED BY EMAIL		
Michael Seguin & Catherine Sholtz	April 16, 2025	<p>At the April 7 meeting of Committee of the Whole, Council passed a motion recommending continued collaboration with the Georgian Bay Racquets Initiative. Meanwhile, the same group has launched what they're calling a "Response Guide" to help people fill out the Town's public survey on 130 King Street West, and I think that raises some serious red flags.</p> <p>This looks like an organized campaign to steer the results. The Georgian Bay Racquets Initiative has sent out emails and attachments encouraging people to complete the survey in a way that boosts support for indoor tennis. They include sample answers, screenshots of the survey, and language aimed at getting indoor tennis to "poll as high as possible." They're also encouraging participation from <i>anyone</i>, regardless of where they live—whether that's Thornbury, Owen Sound, Wasaga Beach or anywhere in Ontario.</p> <p>This is supposed to be a public consultation about a Town-owned property, but how meaningful is that consultation if one group is actively guiding responses with the goal of tipping the scale?</p> <p>Many of us were under the impression that indoor tennis would be removed from the survey entirely, based on past public input as well as the staff and the consultant's guarantee. And yet here it is, asking respondents to state their choice and type of tennis courts (Question #16) and being pushed hard by one group with a very specific goal. It's confusing, and it leaves the impression that the process hasn't been transparent for residents or for Council.</p> <p>I think this deserves a serious look. If the Town is going to base future decisions on the results of this survey, then we need to be confident that the results actually reflect what residents want, not just what one lobby group managed to mobilize.</p>
Dr. David Lewis	April 17, 2025	<p>Correspondence for May 8 Public Information Centre Regarding 130 King Street West.</p> <p>I am a resident of the Town of Blue Mountains and have been for more that five years.</p> <p>I have a Doctorate in Marketing and have decades of experience in consumer research. I am therefore highly qualified to comment on the validity of the survey instrument that was distributed and the value of the resulting information that is collected.</p> <p>I provided a lengthy letter to the Town on January 12, 2025. That letter provided suggestions to the Town on how the survey regarding potential uses for the land at 130 King Street West could be enhanced to ensure that the survey provides valid and reliable information. From reading and responding to the survey, I see that my recommendations were not considered.</p> <p>Some of the flaws are comical. For example, is a Toboggan Hill a realistic option for land that has a change of elevation of just one metre (from 190 metres above mean sea level at the south to 189 metres at the north)?</p>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p>Other flaws are critical. No effort was made to ensure that the responses came from tax-paying residents of the Town. In fact, it is now widely known that an outside interest group actively encouraged non-residents to respond. Furthermore, this group provided directions to their members on how to complete the survey to ensure that responses promoting their preferred use of the land would dominate the survey results.</p> <p>The principal for whose opinions should be solicited in public engagement should be no different than those that will apply in the municipal elections for the Town next year, "You reside in, own, or are a tenant of land in the Town of The Blue Mountains, or are the spouse of such a person." (Reference: https://www.thebluemountains.ca/town-hall/council-committees/elections#voting).</p> <p>This survey is critically flawed and should be discarded.</p>
Shane Skillen	April 27, 2025	<p>The Blue Mountains has become more than just our home—it's where my children have grown, where we've built lasting memories on the trails, at community events, and especially on the outdoor tennis courts. These experiences have fostered not only our family's well-being but also our deep connection to this remarkable community and the amazing people living here.</p> <p>When the Town's 2021 Leisure Activities Plan included the vision for an indoor tennis facility, my family were thrilled at the prospect of finally having year-round play. I know many residents share our anticipation for this facility, recognizing the significant health benefits that tennis provides—benefits that research suggests can add meaningful years to one's life.</p> <p>It was this passion for our community and enthusiasm for the project that recently led me to take an action that I now recognize was inappropriate. When I learned about the Town's recent 130 King St W survey regarding tennis facilities, I created and personally funded Instagram advertisements to promote participation. With my background in market research, I genuinely believed I was helping to increase community engagement in an important decision-making process.</p> <p>I now understand that by acting independently to promote an official Town survey, I may have inadvertently compromised the neutrality of the process. This was never my intention, and I sincerely apologize for this error in judgment. I should have consulted with Town staff before taking any action, and I regret not doing so. To be clear, my actions were wholly independent of the Town or any third party organisation or initiative.</p> <p>I've immediately discontinued all promotional activities and removed the advertisements. Moving forward, I commit to respecting the Town's established procedures for public engagement and will only contribute in ways that align with proper channels.</p>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p>My family and I remain deeply invested in the future of The Blue Mountains. I hope that despite my misstep, you can recognize that it came from a place of genuine care for our community. I'm truly sorry for any concerns my actions have caused, and I look forward to supporting our town's initiatives appropriately in the future.</p>
Robert Graham	May 2, 2025	<p>Even though I live in Thornbury, I only learned of the proposed 4-6 court indoor tennis facility presented by The Georgian Bay Racquets Initiative (as per their description below) last month. As a full time resident, I wanted to write and share my thoughts on the subject.</p> <p>The idea of additional recreational facilities in Thornbury is an attractive concept, but given the current environment, any “nice to have” project clearly warrants serious review.</p> <p>Is there a need? While the GBRI make the case for tennis to satisfy the needs of residents and non-residents alike (presumably within a service area of less than 70km), the priority should be first and foremost the needs of the local inhabitants. What is the actual demand for more tennis courts in Thornbury? While I don't have actual numbers, in my frequent passing of the tennis courts at Mill St and Bay St East they don't appear to be heavily attended. The GBRI acknowledges that one indoor facility (Monterra Tennis) has now closed. Perhaps because of costs and lack of support? A usage study seems like a reasonable first step to any proposal being considered.</p> <p>While 130 King St West has been identified as the GBRI's first choice, it would require a sizeable expenditure to service the lot. It is not serviced, trees would have to be cut down and the area graded to accommodate what is being proposed.</p> <p>The Town appears willing to spend \$365,000 to develop the facility. But what about ongoing costs? Even the Doran Park, Midland example the GBRI refers to in its Nov 28/24 proposal, acknowledges ongoing expenditures for the town. The proposal suggests there will be significant enrolment, beneficial public/ private cost sharing, and sizeable public revenue. I'd like to see some realistic pro formas be presented, as opposed to enthusiastic optimism.</p> <p>If the Town is determined to move forward with the idea, despite the financial burden that can be expected for its taxpayers, then other locations would be more cost effective choices.</p> <p>The park area by Mill and Bay St East,</p>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p>as well as the Tomahawk Recreation Complex/Tomahawk Fields, both have existing court surfaces, they have more open space available for expansion and there is existing parking. They would require less money to modify. Services are already there and future additional parking would be more readily available. As respects Mill/Bay St the maintenance area at Cedar Grove Park potentially could be used.</p> <p>But from a longer term regional servicing standpoint and to mitigate traffic congestion, why not look to the area east of the Astec building towards Grey St North. The area is closer to Collingwood and Craighleith and it would not force traffic to use the bridge through the centre of town.</p> <p>Noise and lights (for courts and parking) in the evening will be a significant imposition for nearby residents, regardless of location. Tomahawk would certainly be the least disruptive to residents in this regard. It can also be accessed without using Hwy 26 which is only going to get busier, as new housing is completed at Lora Bay.</p> <p>Trees would have to be cut down at the King St. location. Any reduction in the green belt along the nearby Georgian Trail reduces habitat for wildlife and birds, and reduces some of the cache that makes the area attractive for residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>Thornbury is growing and must do so thoughtfully. Finding ways to fund needed infrastructure is and will continue to be a challenge. So, decisions as to where our limited dollars are directed should be done responsibly. A tennis facility, primarily for non-residents, really is questionable.</p> <p>But surveys aside (which are not limited to local residents) perhaps a public referendum should be held as to where the residents of their town want their tax dollars going, as respects non-essential services. It could be very enlightening.</p>
Elizabeth Marshall	May 3, 2025	<p>It has been brought to a number of resident's attention that the Town of the Blue Mountains (TBMs) may be investigating an avenue to expense funding for an "indoor tennis facility." This seems to be a goal beyond what is actually a needed service throughout this community. With the TBMs already having, as reported, 3 public tennis courts (Bayview Park, Boyer Park, and Nipissing Ridge Park), it would seem the tax-payers of this municipality have expended sufficient funds for the very few members of the "tennis community."</p> <p>As the rules are laid out in the Municipal Act apply to staff, Director Gibbons may not be aware of his obligations to the residents of the entire municipality. Therefore, in the best interest of all residents, as expressed in the Municipal Act, the purpose of the TBMs is found in section 2 of the Act. It expresses that the province has created this municipality <i>"to be responsible and accountable governments with</i></p>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p><i>respect to matters within their jurisdiction and each municipality is given powers and duties under this Act and many other Acts for the purpose of providing good government with respect to those matters."</i></p> <p><i>The "Role of Council" is to "represent the public, meaning the residents, and to consider the well-being and interests of the municipality; to develop and evaluate the policies and programs of the municipality; to determine which services the municipality provides; to ensure that administrative policies, practices and procedures and controllership policies, practices and procedures are in place to implement the decisions of council; to ensure the accountability and transparency of the operations of the municipality, including the activities of the senior management of the municipality; to maintain the financial integrity of the municipality; and to carry out the duties of council under this or any other Act."</i></p> <p>As it is a duty of the Municipal Council and the Staff to maintain the financial integrity of the municipality, and as it is the duty of Council to represent the residents, being the tax-payers of this municipality, it was thought that to ensure you fully understand your fiscal responsibilities, section 9 of the Municipal Councillor's Guide should be brought forward. This section includes everything from "budgeting," to "revenue sources" that can be used by the TBMs. This also expands on the responsibility of Council and Staff to be fiscally prudent and not frivolous when using tax-payer's money. Please see the attached for section 9 of the Guide.</p> <p>As TBMs is a lower-tier municipality it is also being brought forward what is or is not within the jurisdiction of this municipality to actually create by-laws for.</p> <p><i>"Broad authority, single-tier municipalities</i> <i>10 (1) A single-tier municipality may provide any service or thing that the municipality considers necessary or desirable for the public. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 8.</i></p> <p><i>By-laws</i> <i>(2) A single-tier municipality may pass by-laws respecting the following matters:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Governance structure of the municipality and its local boards.</i> <i>2. Accountability and transparency of the municipality and its operations and of its local boards and their operations.</i> <i>3. Financial management of the municipality and its local boards.</i> <i>4. Public assets of the municipality acquired for the purpose of exercising its authority under this or any other Act.</i> <i>5. Economic, social and environmental well-being of the municipality, including respecting climate change.</i> <i>6. Health, safety and well-being of persons.</i>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p>7. <i>Services and things that the municipality is authorized to provide under subsection (1).</i></p> <p>8. <i>Protection of persons and property, including consumer protection.</i></p> <p>9. <i>Animals.</i></p> <p>10. <i>Structures, including fences and signs.</i></p> <p>11. <i>Business licensing. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 8; 2017, c. 10, Sched. 1, s. 1.</i></p> <p>Services or things provided by others</p> <p><i>(4) The power of a municipality to pass a by-law respecting the matter set out in paragraph 7 of subsection (2) does not include the power to pass a by-law respecting services or things provided by a person other than the municipality or a municipal service board of the municipality. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 8.</i></p> <p>Exception</p> <p><i>(5) Nothing in subsection (4) prevents a municipality from passing a by-law with respect to services or things provided by any person to the extent necessary,</i></p> <p><i>(a) to ensure the physical operation of a system of the municipality or of a municipal service board of the municipality is not impaired; or</i></p> <p><i>(b) to ensure the municipality, a municipal service board of the municipality or a system of the municipality or municipal service board meet any provincial standards or regulations that apply to them. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 8.”</i></p> <p>As section 11 lays out the varying jurisdictions of upper and lower tier municipalities, one must also have knowledge of what is included in that section, as well. It would behoove Council to pay particular attention to section 11 (8) below.</p> <p>“Broad authority, lower-tier and upper-tier municipalities</p> <p>11 <i>(1) A lower-tier municipality and an upper-tier municipality may provide any service or thing that the municipality considers necessary or desirable for the public, subject to the rules set out in subsection (4). 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 8.</i></p> <p>By-laws</p> <p><i>(2) A lower-tier municipality and an upper-tier municipality may pass by-laws, subject to the rules set out in subsection (4), respecting the following matters:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Governance structure of the municipality and its local boards.</i> <i>2. Accountability and transparency of the municipality and its operations and of its local boards and their operations.</i> <i>3. Financial management of the municipality and its local boards.</i> <i>4. Public assets of the municipality acquired for the purpose of exercising its authority under this or any other Act.</i>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p>5. Economic, social and environmental well-being of the municipality, including respecting climate change.</p> <p>6. Health, safety and well-being of persons.</p> <p>7. Services and things that the municipality is authorized to provide under subsection (1).</p> <p>8. Protection of persons and property, including consumer protection. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 8; 2017, c. 10, Sched. 1, s. 2.</p> <p>Services or things provided by others</p> <p>(8) The power of a municipality to pass a by-law under subsection (3) under the following spheres of jurisdiction does not, except as otherwise provided, include the power to pass a by-law respecting services or things provided by any person, other than the municipality or a municipal service board of the municipality, of the type authorized by that sphere:</p> <p>1. Public utilities.</p> <p>2. Waste management.</p> <p>3. Highways, including parking and traffic on highways.</p> <p>4. Transportation systems, other than highways.</p> <p>5. Culture, parks, recreation and heritage.</p> <p>6. Parking, except on highways. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 8.”</p> <p>The Councillor’s Guide expresses:</p> <p>“As well, in a two-tier system, a municipality: is generally prohibited from regulating non-municipal systems under six spheres of jurisdiction – public utilities; waste management; highways; transportation systems; culture, parks, recreation and heritage; and parking (subsection 11(8) (https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/01m25#BK15))</p> <p>When dealing with recreational facilities, the Guide tells Councils they must pay heed to “risk management,” to ensure the municipality is not being brought into even greater danger of harm or financial responsibility when people, even those who are not members of the municipality, use municipal facilities.</p> <p>“Risk management</p> <p><i>More and more, municipalities are adopting risk management strategies to address public liability. Generally, risk management strategies seek to minimize the effects and costs of public liability suits against a municipality. This involves identifying potential hazards and taking the appropriate measures to reduce or eliminate them in your community.</i></p>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p><i>You may find that the biggest areas for potential liability are public works, or parks and recreational services. Risk management initiatives will usually relate to these service areas."</i></p> <p>As laid out in section 9 and other sections of the Guide, the TBMs must also paid attention to provincial plans. Section 9 also includes information pertaining to 2024 and 2025 budgets. This is where the Council and staff must be informed of the provincial policy statement, the new provincial planning statement and the on-going information in section 9 to fully understand planning for the provincial priority and the restrictions of municipal budgets.</p> <p><i>"The regulation applies to a broad range of municipal infrastructure assets. Key requirements are phased-in as municipalities are expected to meet different requirements at different times over a period of seven years from 2019 to 2025.</i></p> <p><i>The regulation came into force on January 1, 2018, and is phased as follows:</i></p> <p>Phase 1 (by July 1, 2019): <i>Municipalities were expected to prepare a strategic asset management policy. Municipalities may wish to consider related matters such as promoting best practices and linking asset management planning with budgeting, operations, maintenance and other municipal planning activities.</i></p> <p>Phase 2 (by July 1, 2022): <i>Municipalities were expected to have an asset management plan in place for core infrastructure assets. These core assets include water, wastewater, stormwater assets as well as roads, bridges and culverts. The plan must include current levels of service for each asset category and costs to maintain these levels.</i></p> <p>Phase 3 (by July 1, 2024): <i>Municipalities are expected to include additional information in their asset management plan including information about proposed levels of service for each asset category, how the proposed levels of service differ from the previously identified levels of service for those categories and the annual costs of undertaking lifecycle activities in respect of those categories.</i></p> <p>Phase 4 (by July 1, 2025): <i>Municipalities are expected to have a plan in place that builds on Phase 3. Plans must shift from current levels of service to focus on proposed levels of service and related lifecycle management and financial strategy for all assets.</i></p> <p><i>Commencing the year after the expected completion of Phase 4, municipalities are expected to conduct an annual review of their asset management progress on or before July 1 each year. The municipality's asset management plans are also required to be updated at least every five years. Municipalities must post their current strategic asset management policy and asset management plan on a website available to the public, and to provide a copy of the policy and plan to any person who requests it. The Province will continue to require municipalities to submit completed asset management plans in connection with municipal infrastructure funding programs."</i></p>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p>It has also been brought to the resident’s attention that the organization lobbying for this new facility may not have been dealing in good faith. Attached is document dated April 11, 2025, which could be considered an attempt to skew the results of a survey. This should be seen as an attempt to manipulate the decision of Council as this is not a true survey which could be relied on as actual information. It would seem the “Georgian Bay Racquets Initiative” (GBRI) will use whatever means possible to obtain their goal, at the expense of the TBMs residents. From the purported survey:</p> <p><i>“Before proceeding, the Town has decided to undertake its own public survey to gauge whether an indoor tennis facility, amongst other options, should feature on this property. The Initiative has worked incredibly hard up to this point to ensure indoor tennis is considered as an option in this survey. We appreciate that you might feel frustrated to fill in yet another survey asking for enhanced tennis facilities – but we cannot understate how important this particular one is. A few minutes of your time to complete the survey and specifically state your support for indoor tennis will help the Initiative tremendously. The Initiative believes that with a strong community response supporting indoor tennis, there is enough momentum with the Town now that the project can be delivered.”</i></p> <p>As shown below (a few examples) and the attached, this is not a credible survey as it seems the GBRI group/association has provided the answers to the survey in their own promo of said survey. Of course, anyone filling out the survey has their own options to either use, or not use those answers. This survey shows a propensity of this group to use psychological manipulation to obtain their goals. By answering, even if it is a suggested answer, is placing the suggested answer and to some that can be the only answer.</p> <p>When entities attempt to manipulate people, particularly Municipal Councils and staff, they leave themselves open to a larger lack of credibility detracting from their objective. Using a ‘survey’ that supplies suggested answers is not only immoral but completely unethical. If those promoting this venture are so secure in the desire and/or the need for this facility there should be no need to manipulate the answers on a survey, again considering like so many surveys said survey isn’t restricted to the TBMs residents, only. There are, of course, far more serious issues with using manipulation when attempting to sway staff and council’s decisions.</p> <p>In conclusion the staff and council should be taking a step back from this venture as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – there are already 3 tennis courts available in the TBMs; – that, based on the survey, GBRI group/association may not be dealing in good faith – that, based on the amount of residents, who have determined that this is merely a waste of much needed tax-payer’s money;

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – where is it posted on Grey County’s web-site that Monterra has a year round tennis facility; – that Monterra is promoted by the Ontario Tennis Association; – that Council and Staff have a duty of care and office to be fiscally responsible with the budgetary needs to the municipality and to be responsible to the tax-payers <p>It shows that this facility is not needed and is fiscally irresponsible and the informed residents ask that Council and Staff cease and desist moving forward and/or wasting any more time (being tax-payer’s money) on this issue, informing the GBRI that the TBMs will not be moving forward with this initiative.</p> <p>Regards, on behalf of the majority of residents.</p>
Richard Lamperstorfer	May 8, 2025	<p>As a 5 hectare vacant land owner within the Thornbury West urban boundary, and as the person who previously proposed an indoor international tennis court in early 2019 (bricks and mortar), I suggest to the Town and to council that the 130 King Street West proposed racquet facility completely disregards the intended use, zoning, and declared housing crisis.</p> <p>I object.</p> <p>The approximately just over 1 hectare, 2.9 acre town owned site should be for HOUSING, period.</p> <p>I received by TBM email May 7, 2025 the following regarding this evening May 8 public info centre meeting-- copy & paste as follows,</p> <p>Recreational Development of 130 King Street West - Public Information Centre 'The Town of The Blue Mountains is pleased to invite you to attend the in-person Public Information Centre for the Recreational Development of 130 King Street West. The event will begin with a presentation by the Town's Director of Community Services to review the details about the property, and to review what has led up to this event. The presentation will be followed by an interactive Open House where attendees will be able to share their thoughts regarding the recreational development of the property, and get answers to any outstanding questions.</p> <p>The Town of the Blue Mountains is exploring potential recreational uses for the 130 King Street West property in Thornbury. The property is 2.9 acres and is currently home to two outdoor tennis courts. The current Official Plan designation of this property is Primary Settlement Area and the zoning is Community Living Area. Possible recreational uses could include parkland, recreational facilities or a</p>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p>combination thereof. Prior to any development, an appropriate Official Plan Amendment and or Zoning Bylaw Amendment request will need to be passed for the use of the land.'</p> <p>*So*, 1. the Official Plan 2016 designation is 'Primary Settlement Area'. 2. the zoning is 'Community Living Area'. 3. the TBM mapping OP 2016 is 'D' (got development).</p> <p>*And*, the 1.17 hectare Thornbury West Primary Settlement Area zoned 'D' which was reserved for workforce housing (according to a previous mayor and council public comment made recently) is now (during a council declared housing crisis) going to be a declared tennis crisis? declared a white collar white shoe crisis?</p> <p>*Dear me* So it seems to all we don't have an attainable housing bubble here, we have a Thornbury Tennis Bubble shortage?</p> <p>TBM, Building a Mystery, in acres not hectares as per private developer planning RULES. Drawings "not accepted" in Imperial measure. Just talked about like that?</p> <p>S A D</p>
Mary Farncomb	May 8, 2025	<p>I am not able to attend today's 5 PM meeting regarding recreation facilities but I would like to register my keen interest and enthusiasm for year round indoor and outdoor tennis courts somewhere here in the Thornbury / Collingwood geographic area and I know many others in the same mindset.</p> <p>Thank you for listening to my comments .</p>
Gill Cameron	May 8, 2025	<p>Hi</p> <p>I am writing again to show my support of building indoor winter tennis courts in the TBM. I have played at Monterra tennis courts for the last 5 winters and as nice as it is to have courts to play on in the winter, Monterra is a conference centre, first and foremost, not a tennis facility. After Covid the conferences have increased leaving the tennis players at a loss in the winter months.</p> <p>We have proven that the demand for tennis is very strong in the TBM and Collingwood., Owen Sound, Meaford, Wasaga Beach and Creemore. There are plenty of outdoor summer courts for our tennis community but for 7 months of the year we have no support.</p> <p>Now is the time.</p> <p>Thank you for trying to help us achieve our goal.</p>
Jim Oliver	May 12, 2025	<p>Hello,</p>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p>I appreciate this opportunity to provide some specific, written comments regarding possible future recreational development for this Town asset property, and in advance of any decision by Council on future direction.</p> <p>The 130 King W property is somewhat unique in its location (relatively off the beaten track) and past usage (somewhat exclusive use by a tennis group). It is also special given its size and percentage of vegetative cover.</p> <p>I can summarize my vision for the future best use of this property for recreational use by any resident(s) (and visitors presumably) of the TBM:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- the 2 existing tennis courts on the property should be retained, upgraded to make them playable for both tennis and pickleball, and allowed to be used by anyone with a paid reservation system and certain day(s), times for free public use (similar to the pickleball courts at Tomahawk). No additional courts should be added, nor should any lighting for evening use. 2- limited vehicle parking spaces should be provided (maximum 5-10 cars) off street and as close to Peel St as possible. 3- the remainder of the property should be designated and developed for passive parkland use, with a small covered picnic pavilion, small washroom building, scattered picnic tables and a perimeter walking path 4- designated pedestrian access to/from the property needs to be provided adjacent to Peel St, and ideally from Peel St. N. adjacent to the water treatment plant via a pedestrian/bicycling bridge across the small stream (Little Beaver). Designated pedestrian/bicycling access from the Georgian Trail (and High Bluff Lane) could also be provided at the appropriate time. <p>This limited amount of property development/redevelopment should satisfy all interest groups to an extent, while protecting the natural features of the property as much as possible, and at relatively low cost. It is important for the Town to retain greenspace whenever and wherever it can for the benefit of its residents and as part of its climate change response strategy.</p> <p>I would ask that this letter be included in the agenda package for the upcoming public meeting on this matter.</p>
Janice Medland	May 13, 2025	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the above property via survey, public forum and e-mail.

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments Received
		<p>After attending the forum and listening to many residents in the area, it is evident that there is a strong desire for more courts, in particular tennis, and most people support this. However, there is an equally firm stance that such facilities should not be placed in residential areas and green spaces such as 130 King Street.</p> <p>The position of this household at 107 Plum Ridge Circle is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintain 130 King Street as a natural green space with foot-paths and limited car access. Property such as this which is close to the water and without housing is scarce. Using such property for any type of additional courts or any recreational structure (whether it be tennis or other) would be a shame. As well, increased vehicle traffic on Peel and King Streets that would occur due to added facilities is not a fair proposition to residents who have moved here to enjoy nature and be close to the water. As a compromise, the two existing tennis courts could be refurbished for ALL residents to use AND any courts developed moving forward should accommodate not just tennis but pickleball and possibly basketball. Community courts for a single purpose is an unnecessary extravagance. 2. Recreational structures such as tennis and pickleball will continue to be in high demand given our growing and highly active population. Such structures are important and should be situated in areas that don't compete with residences or valuable green space around Georgian Bay. Tomahawk continues to be referred to as the ideal location but if not, other property south of hwy 26 and in existing industrial areas makes sense.