A. Recommendations

THAT Council receive Staff Report PDS.20.27, entitled “Harrington 234 Brophy’s Lane – Application for Zoning By-law Amendment”;

AND THAT Council enact a Zoning By-law Amendment so as to revise the zone boundaries between the Residential ‘R1-1’ lands and Hazard ‘H’ lands consistent with the recommendations provided by the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and to modify the 177.9 GSCA Elevation (100 year floodline) consistent with the submitted survey.

B. Overview

This report provides a recommendation and summary of an application for Zoning By-law Amendment that proposes to increase the development area by correcting the boundaries between the Residential and Hazard zones on Lot 102, 103 and Part Lot 177, Plan 529 (234 Brophy’s Lane)

C. Executive Summary

Application File: P2762

Application Received Date: June 24, 2019

Application Deemed Complete Date: July 19, 2019

Official Plan Designation: Residential Recreational Area ‘RRA’

Zoning Bylaw Designation: Hazard ‘H’
The purpose of this Zoning By-law Amendment is to correct the Hazard ‘H’ Zone boundaries on the subject lands in accordance with a 2007 County of Grey Official Plan Amendment (OPA 68), a 2009 Environmental Impact Study (EIS), a 2020 flooding/erosion engineering review, and review comments from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and topographical survey information. The conclusions of the aforementioned identify the surveyed limits of the Hazard lands and include revised mapping that decrease the Hazard lands and increase the developable portion of the subject lands.

D. **Background**

Planning Services has received an application for Zoning By-law Amendment to correct the boundaries between the Residential ‘R1-1’ Zone and the Hazard ‘H’ Zone in accordance with a previously approved County of Grey Official Plan Amendment (OPA 68) and as supported by a 2009 Environmental Impact Study (EIS).
The subject lands are located at 234 Brophy’s Lane and are legally described as Lot 102, 103 and Part Lot 177, Plan 529. The lands are approximately 0.45 hectares in size with 16.8 metres of frontage on Brophy’s Lane. An unopened road allowance exists along the southerly property line with approximately 68 metres of frontage. The lands include an existing single detached dwelling and a detached accessory garage. The remainder of the property not used for residential purposes includes forested and wetland features.

Surrounding land uses predominantly include single detached dwellings on large lots. The proposed Aquavil development is located to the west, Georgian Bay to the north, future residential development to the east, and wetland and hazard areas to the south.

The County of Grey Official Plan was amended in May 2007 redesignating a portion of the subject lands from Wetland to Escarpment Recreation Area. These wetland boundaries were reviewed and accepted by the Ministry of Natural Resources at that time. In 2009 an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was prepared in support of the construction of a then new detached garage on the lands. The study identified the limits of the wetland across the entire subject lands, and identified Hazard mitigation requirements for the construction of the garage. The 2009 EIS was reviewed by the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority who concurred with the study and a GSCA permit was issued alongside a Town Building Permit.

This application for Zoning By-law Amendment will correct the Hazard boundaries to align with the limits of the wetland boundary. The Public Meeting process identified a number of concerns and those specific to the 2009 EIS including: if the conclusions of that study are still reflective of the present environmental hazards; and, that the study does not address flood and erosion hazards associated with the wetland feature and Georgian Bay flood elevation.

From those comments the applicant retained Professional Engineer to review the natural hazard areas concluding that the Hazard Zone should be confined to the surveyed wetland boundary. Further review by the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority concluded that the wetland feature requires additional protections and they recommended a new Hazard Zone that includes the wetland feature and adjacent lands (see attached Schedule A-1 mapping).

E. Analysis

Provincial Policy Statement 2020

The Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS) provides direction on appropriate development, effective land use and long term economic prosperity while protecting resources of provincial interest, public health and safety, and the quality of the natural and built environment. Section 1 of the PPS seeks to efficiently use land for development purposes specifically in designated settlement areas such as the Residential/Recreational Area designation of the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan. Section 2 of the PPS is in place for the protection of natural heritage features including Wetlands. Development is generally prohibited within the wetland feature, and development may only occur adjacent to a wetland feature where it has been demonstrated that that there will be no negative impacts on the feature. Section 3 of the PPS
provides direction on public health and safety and directs development away from natural hazards that may pose risk to human health or property damage.

Based on the requirements of the PPS Planning Staff are of the opinion that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (as revised) is consistent with the 2020 PPS. Providing additional developable area within a settlement area increases the efficiency for lands available for development, while the appropriate studies and reviews have been completed demonstrating that there are no concerns with modifying the proposed Hazard lands in accordance with the conclusions of those studies/reviews.

Niagara Escarpment Plan

The Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) provides land use policies to guide development while ensuring the preservation and enhancement of the Niagara Escarpment. The subject lands are designated “Escarpment Recreation Area” which recognizes those areas of existing and potential recreational and residential development. Permitted uses include single detached dwellings, recreational uses as well as those uses listed under the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan. New development must not generate substantial negative impact on environmental features, and must be designed and located in a manner so as to preserve the natural, visual and cultural characteristics of the area. Site design and layout must also be in harmony with and maintain the existing character of the escarpment landscape. (Niagara Escarpment Plan, Section 1.8 and 2.2). The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to modify the Hazard zone boundaries and increase the area zoned residential does not appear to generate any conflicts with the Niagara Escarpment Plan. Comments have been received from the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) indicating that they do not permit development on sites prone to natural hazards and support a Zoning By-law Amendment that appropriately reflects the natural hazard area as a Hazard Zone. The NEC has no objections to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment provided that the Hazard zone is appropriately reviewed and accepted by the Conservation Authority.

Based on the requirements of the Niagara Escarpment Plan and in consideration of the comments provided by the Niagara Escarpment Commission, Planning Staff are of the opinion that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment as revised will not conflict with the NEP.

County of Grey Official Plan

The County of Grey Official Plan is intended to guide development within the whole of the County of Grey and provides broad policy framework for local Municipal Official Plans, Secondary Plans and by-laws. The subject lands include two designations. First is “Recreational Resort Area” (see Green Areas below) recognizing that the area is to be developed with a mix of Residential and Recreational uses with more detailed land use policies being directed to the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan (per Grey County Plan, Section 2.6.7 and 2.5.2). The second designation is “Wetland” recognizing a provincially significant wetland (see Blue Areas below). The Wetland policies generally seek a minimum 30 metre setback from Wetlands. In some cases the 30 metres can be reduced based on site-specific circumstances, or through the
completion and acceptance of an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) (per Grey County Plan, Section 7.3).

Figure 2: Schedule ‘A’ (excerpt) to the County of Grey Official Plan:

The County of Grey Official Plan was amended in 2007 to more accurately reflect the limits of the Wetland feature in consultation with further Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. The results of that process led to the approval of County Official Plan Amendment (OPA 68). This OPA 68 should have been included, but was never accurately translated, into the new Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan when it was approved in 2016.

It is noted that the County of Grey Official Plan does not generally designate lands ‘Hazard’ within Settlement Areas and those areas within the Niagara Escarpment Plan. Policies of the County Plan recognize that Hazard lands may however exist and must be reviewed in greater detail with the Conservation Authority (per Grey County Plan, Section 7.2).

The County of Grey Planning and Development Department provided comments indicating that they have no concerns to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment provided that positive comments are received from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (which is the case for this submission).

Based on the comments received above and the requirements of the County of Grey Official Plan, Planning Staff are of the opinion that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment as revised will comply with the County of Grey Official Plan.

Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan

The Official Plan provides land use policy direction for the long term growth and development of the municipality. As described above, the Niagara Escarpment Plan and Grey County Plan defer much of the site specific policy direction to the Blue Mountains Official Plan.
The subject lands are designated Residential/Recreational Area ‘RRA’ (see Beige Areas below) and Hazard ‘H’ (see Green Areas below).

Figure 3: Schedule ‘A’ (excerpt) to the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan:

Permitted uses in the RRA designation include a range of residential housing types, recreational uses, and similar uses. Lands designated Hazard are recognized as having inherent environmental hazards such as flood susceptibility or any other physical condition that may pose risk for the occupant or property. Permitted uses in the Hazard designation are strictly limited with buildings and structures generally being prohibited.

It is noted that the Hazard mapping contained in the Official Plan was prepared for the entire municipality at a basic level, and that there may be mapping inaccuracies that can only be found and resolved through a more detailed on-site analysis. The Official Plan permits minor modifications to the Hazard designation (without amendment to the Official Plan) where it is demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) in consultation with the Conservation Authority that the Hazard feature does not exist.

Based on the Environmental Impact Study and Floodplain Analysis prepared for the property, and based on the supportive comments received from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, Planning Staff are of the opinion that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment as revised will conform with the policies of the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan.

The Blue Mountains Zoning By-law 2018-65

The Blue Mountains Zoning By-law zones the subject lands Residential ‘R1-1’ and Hazard ‘H’ following the same development designation boundaries as the Official Plan. The Holding ‘-h1’ Symbol also applies to the lands recognizing certain development limits based on the presence of Wetlands in the area.
Figure 4: Schedule ‘A’ (excerpt) to The Blue Mountains Zoning By-law 2018-65:

Lands zoned Residential ‘R1-1’ permit single detached dwellings, as well as accessory uses, buildings and structures.

Lands zoned Hazard ‘H’ permit limited uses and generally prohibit buildings and structures unless used for flood control, certain non-habitable recreational uses (ie picnic structures), and others.

It is noted that the Zoning By-law also includes a Wetland ‘WL’ zone that specifically recognizes the limits of wetland features in the municipality. It would appear as part of the 2016 Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan update that the surveyed Wetland as approved through County Official Plan Amendment (OPA 68) was not carried forward thus resulting in the feature not being recognized in the 2018 Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Planning Staff recommend that the Wetland feature as surveyed should be rezoned from Hazard ‘H’ to Wetland ‘WL’. This is recommended to be done now as opposed to a future housekeeping amendment process to optimize this areas long-term natural heritage protection.

The studies completed on behalf of the applicant suggests that the Hazard boundaries should be limited to the surveyed edge of the wetland feature. The final review comments from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority has identified a larger Hazard zone. The applicant had originally sought the revised Hazard limits based on their own studies, but has subsequently accepted the Conservation Authority recommendations. Below is a side by side comparison of the two Hazard limits provided:
As per the above illustrations the Conservation Authority recommended Hazard Lands are slightly more conservative.

Based on the structure of The Blue Mountains Zoning By-law, Planning Staff recommend that the Wetland ‘WL’ zone be utilized to recognize the surveyed boundary of the wetland feature, and that the adjacent lands considered as Hazard by the Conservation Authority be zoned Hazard ‘H’. The remainder of the property will be zoned Residential ‘R1-1’ and with the Holding ‘h1’ symbol in accordance with the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment attached to this report.
As part of the application submission topographical survey information has been provided that includes surveyed elevation points accurately identifying the 177.9 GSCA Elevation (100 year floodline). Planning Staff recommend as part of the Zoning By-law Amendment that the 177.9 line be modified in accordance with the survey data.

Based on the foregoing, Planning Staff are of the opinion that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment as revised maintains the intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and is appropriate for the lands provided that the aforementioned comments are incorporated into the final By-law.

Public Meeting Comments

The Statutory Public Meeting was held at Town Hall Council Chambers on August 26, 2019. Mr. Andrew Pascuzzo, Pascuzzo Planning Inc., on behalf of the Owner provided an overview of the proposed project, history of the lands, and planning review. Council and area residents provided written and verbal comments which have been summarized in Attachment #2 to this report, and provided in full in Attachment #3 to this report. Planning Staff are satisfied that all comments received have been adequately addressed.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is the opinion of Planning Staff that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, does not conflict with the Niagara Escarpment plan, conforms to the intent and direction of the County of Grey Official Plan and Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan and represents good planning. Therefore, Planning Staff supports this application subject to the comments contained in this report.

F. The Blue Mountains Strategic Plan

Goal #3: Support Healthy Lifestyles
Objective #3 Manage Growth

G. Environmental Impacts

The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment is consistent with and supports the findings of environmental reports and surveys.

H. Financial Impact

There are no adverse financial impacts anticipated as a result of this application.

I. In consultation with

Trevor Houghton, Manager of Community Planning
Nathan Westendorp, Director of Planning and Development Services
J. Public Engagement

The development implemented by the proposed By-law was subject to previous public consultation and engagement through the August 26, 2019 Public Meeting as required by the Planning Act. Comments regarding this report should be submitted to Shawn Postma, Senior Policy Planner at planning@thebluemountains.ca.

K. Attached

1. Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
2. Comments Summary Matrix
3. Public Meeting Comments Received

Respectfully submitted,

Shawn Postma, MCIP RPP
Senior Policy Planner

Nathan Westendorp, MCIP RPP
Director of Planning and Development Services

For more information, please contact:
Shawn Postma
planning@thebluemountains.ca
519-599-3131 extension 248
The Corporation of the Town of The Blue Mountains

By-Law Number 2020 –

Being a By-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 2018-65 which may be cited as "The Blue Mountains Zoning By-law";

Whereas the Council of The Corporation of the Town of The Blue Mountains deems it necessary in the public interest to pass a by-law to amend By-law No. 2018-65;

And Whereas pursuant to the provisions of Section 34 and 36 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, the By-law may be amended by Council of the Municipality;

Now Therefore Council of The Corporation of the Town of The Blue Mountains hereby enacts as follows:

1. That Schedule ‘A’ to the Zoning By-law of the Town of The Blue Mountains, being By-law 2018-65 as amended, is hereby further amended by rezoning the lands lying and being in the Town of The Blue Mountains comprised of Part Lot 102 to 103 and Part Lot 177 Plan 529 from the Residential ‘R1-1-h1’ zone and Hazard ‘H’ zone to the Residential ‘R1-1-h1’ and Hazard ‘H’ zone as shown on the attached Schedule ‘A-1’.

2. That Schedule ‘A’ to the Zoning By-law of the Town of The Blue Mountains, being By-law 2018-65 as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting and replacing the 177.9 GSCA Elevation for the lands identified in Section 1 of this By-law as shown on the attached Schedule ‘A-1’.

3. That Schedule ‘A-1’ is declared to form part of this By-law.

And Further that this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the enactment thereof.

Enacted and passed this ____ day of __, 2020

___________________________
Alar Soever, Mayor

___________________________
Corrina Giles, Clerk

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of By-law No. 2020-____ as enacted by the Council of The Corporation of the Town of The Blue Mountains on the __ day of ______, 2020.

Dated at the Town of The Blue Mountains, this ____ day of _____, 2020.

___________________________
Corrina Giles, Clerk
Town of The Blue Mountains
Schedule 'A-1'

By-Law No.__________

Legend

- Subject Lands of this Amendment
- 177.90m Contour
- H to R1-1
- H to WL

Date: 2020/07/17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Comments Received</th>
<th>Staff Response / Project Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Grey Sauble Conservation Authority | August 23, 2019 | 1. Natural hazards on the property include the flood and erosion hazards associated with the wetland feature. A majority of the southern portion of the property is zoned hazard due to potential flooding potential beyond the established provincially significant wetland boundary. The GSCA has included a map attached to this letter with a recommended Hazard Zone area.  
2. The EIS submitted with the application was prepared in support of a storage building proposal in 2009. The EIS focused on the wetland boundary and associated buffer for the building. If new buildings or structures are proposed in the future, requirements of the Town Holding ‘-h1’ zone would need to be satisfied. A GSCA permit, updated EIS and an engineered water management plan would be required.  
3. The property is entirely regulated by Ontario Regulation 151/06 and a GSCA permit is required prior to development. |
|      |        | January 24, 2020 | 4. The GSCA has reviewed Tatham’s recent report and some preliminary LIDAR information we have in house. See February 14, 2020 map. Our experience in this area notes that flooding can and does occur beyond the provincial wetland boundary in some instances due to extreme rainfall events and spring melt. The GSCA supports an adjustment to the original Hazard zone boundaries in accordance with the mapping provided on February 14, 2020. |
| 2    | Niagara Escarpment Commission |  | 1. Draft Zoning By-law Amendment includes updated Hazard Mapping confirmed by Conservation Authority.  
2. Zoning By-law includes an ‘-h1’ Holding symbol on the subject lands. The ‘-h1’ symbol includes strict development limits to reconstruction and certain additions/expansions. All other development must first review potential impacts on the adjacent wetland feature prior to obtaining a building permit. |

**Notes:**
- Item 1: The attached hazard mapping has been received and circulated to the applicant for review and further comment. The applicant proceeded with additional studies to review potential flooding. See Tatham Engineering Report.
- Item 2: Zoning By-law includes an ‘-h1’ Holding symbol on the subject lands. The ‘-h1’ symbol includes strict development limits to reconstruction and certain additions/expansions. All other development must first review potential impacts on the adjacent wetland feature prior to obtaining a building permit.
## Harrington Zoning By-law Amendment Comments Matrix

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>County of Grey</strong></td>
<td><strong>County Staff</strong> note the presence of Natural Hazard and Natural Heritage features (Wetland and Woodlands). Provided that positive and detailed comments are received from the Conservation Authority regarding the wetlands, woodlands and scoped EIS, County Staff have no further concerns.</td>
<td><strong>1.</strong> See GSCA comments/response above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **4** | **Blue Mountain Watershed Trust** | **1.** Concerns over the proposed wetland buffer distance of 6 metres for the existing building and 0 metres for the requested draft By-law. Typical setback should be 15 to 30 metres.  
2. Wetland boundary was surveyed 10+ years ago and should be re-surveyed.  
3. Prior to development an assessment is required to determine conformity with the PPS and OP. | **1.** Further study since the Public Meeting has occurred to review appropriate Hazard distance from wetland feature.  
2. Wetland boundaries as defined are appropriate and have been accepted by appropriate external agencies.  
3. Holding ‘-h1’ symbol is in place with site specific lot development requirements adjacent to the wetland feature. |
| **5** | **Area Resident** | **1.** Concerns regarding the impact on the wetland feature  
2. Concerns on what future development is anticipated on the rezoned lands | **1.** The wetland feature and surrounding hazard lands have been reviewed in detail and accepted by the Conservation Authority in their February 14, 2020 mapping. The draft Zoning By-law Amendment is consistent with the Conservation Authority recommendations.  
2. The applicant does not have any development intentions at this time. It is acknowledged that the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment would increase the developable portion of the property, however, the property remains subject to the list of permitted uses and lot development standards of the Zoning By-law. |
| **6** | **Area Resident** | **1.** Long time area resident who understood that a number of lots in the area are not ‘buildable’ due to the wetland feature.  
2. Not in favour of bringing in fill to the area to increase the developable area  
3. Area provides many forms of wildlife that should be protected  
4. Lands should remain in their natural state. | **1.** Acknowledged. It is noted that some lots in the area do require further study to ensure no negative impacts of development on the wetland feature. The Zoning By-law and Conservation Authority Permit system ensure those studies are completed prior to building permits being available for new construction  
2. Acknowledged.  
3. Acknowledged. |

Review potential impacts on the adjacent wetland feature prior to obtaining a building permit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harrington Zoning By-law Amendment Comments Matrix</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Long time area residents who understood that a number of lots in the area are not ‘buildable’ due to the wetland feature.</td>
<td>1. Acknowledged. It is noted that some lots in the area do require further study to ensure no negative impacts of development on the wetland feature. The Zoning By-law and Conservation Authority Permit system ensure those studies are completed prior to building permits being available for new construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Area development projects include the “Havens” 19 lot subdivision and the Aquavil project that include wetlands and those features must be protected and not filled in.</td>
<td>2. Area development projects are also subject to environmental reviews and Conservation Authority acceptance. Boundaries of wetland features are defined, surveyed, and buffers put in place. Development restrictions are also placed for those areas inside, adjacent to and outside the wetland feature in accordance with accepted environmental studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Area Resident</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Concerns regarding harm to the aquatic ecosystem, loss of habitat, unnecessary risk to protected species, and large hydrological impacts to adjacent properties.</td>
<td>1. The wetland feature and surrounding hazard lands have been reviewed in the 2009 EIS. Hazard limits have been accepted by the Conservation Authority in their February 14, 2020 mapping. Further study may be required depending on the form of development proposed as per the Zoning By-law Holding ‘-h1’ requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Concerns that this amendment is being considered during the 2-year moratorium to not allow Zoning By-law Amendments.</td>
<td>2. Upon enactment of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2018-65, Council considered using the two-year moratorium provisions under the Planning Act and passed a resolution permitting all Zoning By-law Amendments within the two-years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Flooding to adjacent properties and destruction of Town infrastructure.</td>
<td>3. Since the public meeting a Floodplain Study was completed by Tatham Engineering confirming the limits of the flooding hazard. The Hazard lines have been adjusted based on the Conservation Authority review of that study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is the 2009 EIS still appropriate 10+ years after it was prepared?</td>
<td>4. The 2009 EIS identified the surveyed limits of the wetland feature. These limits were accepted by the MNR and GSCA at the time and implemented in the County of Grey Official Plan and as described in the Staff Report are to be carried forward into the Town Official Plan and Zoning By-law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Area Resident | 1. Concerns regarding development activity in the past filling in wetland features.  
2. Concerns over the precedence of allowing developers to move boundary lines and/or fill in wetlands. | 1. Area development projects are required to meet the environmental policies that were put in place at time of approvals. These reviews are then subject to MNRF and/or Conservation Authority acceptance. Boundaries of wetland features are defined, surveyed, and buffers put in place.  
2. Based on expert recommendations and peer review acceptance, development permissions/restrictions are implemented to protect sensitive features while allowing certain development to occur adjacent to and outside wetland features. |
August 23, 2019

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

Dear Ms. Giles:

RE: Application for Zoning Amendment P2762
Applicant: Dave Harrington
234 Brophy’s Lane
Town of the Blue Mountains
File: P19301

The Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA) has reviewed this application in accordance with our mandate and policies for natural hazards, for natural heritage issues as per our Memorandum of Agreement with the Town of The Blue Mountains and relative to our policies for the implementation of Ontario Regulation 151/06. We offer the following comments.

Site Description
The property is located on Brophy’s Lane in the Town of Blue Mountains and includes a dwelling and two main accessory structures. The south western part of the property includes a wetland area and treed area and includes wetland species such as sedges, willow, dogwood and ash among others. The area in general is characterized by a glacial dune complex with a series of dunes and swales/wetlands. A storage building was built on the property in compliance with the zoning at the time and permits from the Town and our office.

Provincial Policy Statement (2014)
3.1 Natural Hazards
3.1.1 Development shall generally be directed to areas outside of:

Watershed Municipalities
Arran-Elderslie, Chatsworth, Georgian Bluffs, Grey Highlands
Meaford, Owen Sound, South Bruce Peninsula, Blue Mountains
a) **hazardous lands** adjacent to the shorelines of the **Great Lakes - St. Lawrence River System** and **large inland lakes** which are impacted by **flooding hazards, erosion hazards** and/or **dynamic beach hazards**;
b) **hazardous lands** adjacent to river, stream and **small inland lake systems** which are impacted by **flooding hazards** and/or **erosion hazards**; and
c) **hazardous sites**.

Natural Hazards on the property include the flood and erosion hazards associated with the wetland on the property as outlined on the enclosed map. The wetland boundary on the property was apparently verified by the Ministry of Natural Resources during an appeal of the Town’s official plan. Official plan Amendment 68 recognized the property as escarpment recreation and wetland. At that time the GSCA recommended that the majority of the southern portion of the property remain within the hazard designation due to potential flooding beyond the established provincially significant wetland boundary. The hazard area as outlined includes additional areas beyond the wetland boundary that may be subject to flooding due to being low lying. We request that this recommended hazard zone be included in the proposed by-law. The recommended hazard zone also includes areas below the 100 year Georgian Bay flood elevation of 177.9 metres Geodetic Survey of Canada.

### 2.1 Natural Heritage

The following natural heritage and water policies of the provincial policy statement need to be considered in the review.

2.1.1 Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term.
2.1.2 The diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area, and the long-term **ecological function** and biodiversity of **natural heritage systems**, should be maintained, restored or, where possible, improved, recognizing linkages between and among **natural heritage features and areas**, **surface water features** and **ground water features**.
2.1.3 **Natural heritage systems** shall be identified in Ecoregions 6E & 7E, recognizing that **natural heritage systems** will vary in size and form in **settlement areas, rural areas**, and **prime agricultural areas**.
2.1.4 **Development and site alteration** shall not be permitted in:
a) **significant wetlands** in Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E, and
b) **significant coastal wetlands**.
2.1.5 **Development and site alteration** shall not be permitted in:
a) **significant wetlands** in the Canadian Shield north of Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E;
b) **significant woodlands** in Ecoregions 6E and 7E (excluding islands in Lake Huron and the St. Marys River);
c) **significant valleylands** in Ecoregions 6E and 7E (excluding islands in Lake Huron and the St. Marys River);
d) **significant wildlife habitat**;
e) **significant areas of natural and scientific interest**; and
f) **coastal wetlands** in Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E that are not subject to policy 2.1.4(b)
1 Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E are shown on Figure 1.
unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.

2.1.6 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in fish habitat except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.

2.1.7 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in habitat of endangered species and threatened species, except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.

2.1.8 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in policies 2.1.4, 2.1.5, and 2.1.6 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions.

2.1.9 Nothing in policy 2.1 is intended to limit the ability of agricultural uses to continue.

2.2 Water

2.2.1 Planning authorities shall protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water by:
a) using the watershed as the ecologically meaningful scale for integrated and long-term planning, which can be a foundation for considering cumulative impacts of development;
b) minimizing potential negative impacts, including cross-jurisdictional and cross-watershed impacts;
c) identifying water resource systems consisting of ground water features, hydrologic functions, natural heritage features and areas, and surface water features including shoreline areas, which are necessary for the ecological and hydrological integrity of the watershed;
d) maintaining linkages and related functions among ground water features, hydrologic functions, natural heritage features and areas, and surface water features including shoreline areas;
e) implementing necessary restrictions on development and site alteration to:
   1. protect all municipal drinking water supplies and designated vulnerable areas; and
   2. protect, improve or restore vulnerable surface and ground water, sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features, and their hydrologic functions;
f) planning for efficient and sustainable use of water resources, through practices for water conservation and sustaining water quality;
g) ensuring consideration of environmental lake capacity, where applicable; and
h) ensuring stormwater management practices minimize stormwater volumes and contaminant loads, and maintain or increase the extent of vegetative and pervious surfaces.

2.2.2 Development and site alteration shall be restricted in or near sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features such that these features and their related hydrologic functions will be protected, improved or restored.

Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to protect, improve or restore sensitive surface water features, sensitive ground water features, and their hydrologic functions.
An environmental impact study (EIS) was completed as part of the proposal to build the existing storage building on the site in 2009. This EIS considered the noted policies and focused on the wetland boundary delineation and associated buffer for the building. At the time, the EIS and associated engineered lot grading and drainage plan was accepted to allow the specific storage building to be constructed. The application indicates that there are no new buildings or structures proposed for the property. Therefore, it does not appear that the existing use would change. If new buildings or structures are proposed in the future, requirements in the holding provisions of the Town's Comprehensive Zoning By-law would need to be satisfied. Additionally, through the GSCA permit process an updated environmental impact study, and an engineered water management plan would be required prior to development including future site alterations.

GSCA Regulations
The entire property is regulated by Ontario Regulation 151/06: Regulation of Development, Interference with Wetlands & Alteration to Shorelines & Watercourses. Under this regulation, a permit is required from this office prior to the construction of buildings or structures, the temporary or permanent placement of fill within the designated area, interference with a wetland, and/or the straightening, changing, diverting or in any way interfering with an existing channel of a river, lake, creek, stream or watercourse. The regulated area includes the Provincially Significant Silver Creek Wetland Complex and the 120 metre adjacent lands of the wetland.
As noted above, a permit was issued for the storage building (south end) on the property in 2009.

Any future development on the property would subject to a similar permit process and would need to comply with the GSCA's Regulation policies.

Recommendations
Provided the proposed zoning by-law amendment includes the recommended hazard zone as outlined on the enclosed map, the GSCA has no objection the approval of the noted application.

We note that any future development on the site would need to be located outside this recommended hazard zone, would require a permit from the GSCA under Ontario Regulation 151/06 and is subject to the holding provision in section 10.2.1. of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law.
If any questions should arise, please contact the undersigned.

Regards,

Andrew Sorensen
Environmental Planning Coordinator

enclosure

cc Andrew Pascuzzo, Pascuzzo Planning Inc. Agent
Andrtea Matrosovs, Authoirty Director
Shawn Postma, Town of The Blue Mountains
August 26, 2019

Corrina Giles
Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street, Box 310
Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0

Dear Corrina:

Re: Proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment
    Harrington (234 Brophy’s Lane)
    Part Lot 21, Concession 1, (Lot 102 to 103 and Part Lot 177 Plan 529)
    Town of The Blue Mountains, Grey County

We have reviewed the proposed zoning by-law amendment to recognize revised Hazard zone boundaries based on a 2007 County OPA 68 and an Environmental Impact Study 2009. We offer the following staff comments.

The subject lands are located within the boundaries of the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) and are designated Escarpment Recreation Area. The subject lands are not within the area of Development Control. Permitted uses within the Escarpment Recreation Area are subject to Part 2, Development Criteria of the Niagara Escarpment Plan and the requirements of official plans and zoning by-laws that are not in conflict with the NEP.

We understand that the boundary of the Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) on the subject property was revisited by MNRF staff and that the southerly limit of the PSW is identified on the survey that forms part of the scoped EIS prepared by Hensel Design Group 2009. NEC had no objection to OPA 68 to re-designate a portion of the property from “Wetland” to “Escarpment Recreation Area.”

The revised PSW boundary, however, does not correspond to the Hazard land boundary reflected in the correspondence from the GSCA.

The NEP does not permit development on sites prone to natural hazard and supports zoning that appropriately reflects the natural hazard area as a Hazard zone.

It is not clear from the proposed ZBA if any development is planned. Development on adjacent lands to the redefined PSW would need to demonstrate that the feature and functions of the PSW will not be negatively impacted in accordance with Part 2.6 of the NEP and the PPS. An update to the scoped EIS is advised if further development is proposed.

We have no objection to the proposed zoning by-law amendment, provided that the area prone to natural hazards is appropriately zoned Hazard.
The Commission requests notification of the decision. Please contact me at (519) 599-3464, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Judy Rhodes-Munk
Senior Planner

Cc: Shawn Postma, Town of The Blue Mountains
    Andrew Sorensen, GSCA
August 23rd, 2019

Shawn Postma, Senior Policy Planner  
Town of Blue Mountains  
PO Box 310 – 32 Mill Street  
Thornbury, ON  
N0H 2P0  
*Sent via E-mail

**RE:** Zoning By-law Amendment ZBA 234 Brophy’s Lane  
234 Brophy’s Lane  
Town of the Blue Mountains  
Applicant/Owner: Dave Harrington

Dear Mr. Postma,

This correspondence is in response to the above noted application. We have had an opportunity to review the application in relation to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the County of Grey Official Plan (OP), Recolour Grey. We offer the following comments.

The purpose of this application is to consider a Zoning By-law Amendment to recognize revised Hazard ‘H’ zone boundaries for the subject lands based on a 2007 County of Grey Official Plan Amendment (OPA 68) and an Environmental Impact Study completed in 2009. The effect of this application is to modify the boundaries between the Residential ‘R1-1’ Zone and the Hazard ‘H’ Zone in accordance with OPA 68 and as supported by the 2009 Environmental Impact Study.

Schedule A of Recolour Grey designates the subject lands as ‘Recreational Resort Area’. Section 3.8 of the OP states,

1) The Recreational Resort Area land use type as shown on Schedule A of this Plan applies to settlement areas which have developed as a result of site specific amendments to the County of Grey Official Plan and/or local official plan consisting of a defined development area, specific recreational amenities, residential development (including second units as per Section 4.1.5) and serviced with full municipal services (sewer and water).

The subject application conforms to the above noted policy; therefore, County planning staff have no concerns.

Grey County: Colour It Your Way
Schedule A of Recolour Grey indicates the subject property also contains ‘Provincially Significant Wetlands’ designation. Section 7.3.1 of the OP states,

1) No development or site alteration is permitted within the Provincially Significant Wetlands and Significant Coastal Wetlands land use type (shown on Schedule A), except where such activity is associated with forestry and uses connected with the conservation of water, soil, wildlife, and other natural resources but does not include buildings and will not negatively impact the integrity of the Wetland.

2) No development or site alteration may occur within the adjacent lands of the Provincially Significant Wetlands and Significant Coastal Wetlands land use type unless it has been demonstrated through an environmental impact study, as per Section 7.11 of this Plan, that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.

$\textit{Development or site alteration}$ within the adjacent lands of the Provincially Significant Wetlands and Significant Coastal Wetlands land use type will require a permit from the appropriate conservation authority.

Further, Appendix B indicates that the subject property contains ‘Significant Woodlands’. Section 7.4 of Recolour Grey states,

1) No development or site alteration may occur within Significant Woodlands or their adjacent lands unless it has been demonstrated through an environmental impact study, as per Section 7.11 of this Plan, that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions. Appendix B also identifies the existence of ‘Other Identified Wetlands’ on the subject property.

County planning staff recommend receiving detailed comments from the Conservation Authority regarding the above noted natural heritage features.

Of a general planning nature, the proposed Hazard Land changes are supported by an EIS completed in 2009. County planning staff recommend having the Conservation Authority review the scope EIS to ensure the study is reflective of the present environmental hazards that exist today on the subject property.

Provided that positive and detailed comments are received from the Conservation Authority regarding the Provincially Significant Wetlands, the Significant Woodlands, and the Scoped EIS, County staff have no further concerns with the subject application.

The County requests notice of any decision rendered with respect to this application.
If you wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,

Hiba Hussain
Planner

www.grey.ca
CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I attended the meeting re Harrington’s request for Variance Monday August 26. I had not intended to write anything but since the Mayor was very adamant we do so here goes. My initial concern was if we bend the rules re Harrington who next will becoming before Council to have things changed due to wet lands which seem to be growing not shrinking as per the 2009 Report.

But my concern is also now on Harrington being able to build on the property. The individual who spoke on Harrington’s behalf kept saying he was not doing this so he could build and staff from the Town told me the same thing. My experience in life has taught me that when you hear things being repeated many times that is actually what is intended.

So that said I am against the Variance and it makes me concerned as who on Council has the Engineering degree to change the report.

I hope this meets the Mayors request.
Good morning Mr. Kerr,

I acknowledge receipt of your comments in response to the August 26 Public Meeting Notice and confirm I have forwarded the same to Council for their information and consideration. Your comments will be included in the record of the August 26 Public Meeting, and attached to a future 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 Fax: 519-599-7723
Email: [redacted] | Website: www.thebluemountains.ca

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Planning@thebluemountains.ca
townclerk@thebluemountains.ca

We have reviewed the material associated with the application for rezoning 234 Brophy’s Lane and the construction of a storage building. We plan to attend the Public Meeting on August 26.

We note that the planned building is only 6 metres from the PS Wetland at one point. This buffer width is much less than is normally required for site alteration. In our experience, buffer widths for avoidance of potential harm are typically 15 to 30 metres. Therefore, prior to any site alteration, development or re-zoning, an assessment is required by an independent expert to determine conformity with the PPS and OP. In addition, ground-proofing by
an impartial expert using the OWES should be required since the PS Wetland borderline determination is at least 10 years old, perhaps 13 years.

Submitted on behalf of the Blue Mountain Watershed Trust.
Don Kerr, Collingwood
Lucy Richmond, Craigleith
Good morning Mr. MacDonald,
I acknowledge receipt of your comments in response to the Public Meeting Notice scheduled for August 26, 2019 and confirm I have forwarded the same to Council for their information and consideration. Your comments will be included in the record of the August 26, 2019 Public Meeting, and 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 Fax: 519-599-7723
Email: " | Website: www.thebluemountains.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: Cathy MacDonald <townclerk@thebluemountains.ca>
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2019 4:34 PM
To: Town Clerk <townclerk@thebluemountains.ca>
Subject: Re:HARRINGTON (234 BROPHY'S LANE)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

attn: Ms. CORRINA GILES Town Clerk
With regards to the APPLICATION for ZONING. AMENDMENT

My family have been residents on BROPHY'S Lane for 72 years before it was even named BROPHY'S Lane. My parents built here in 1947 so I think I know the area quite well.

I know this property that is involved here very well. The original owners (the Well’s family) were friends and neighbours of ours in Toronto. They purchased these lots years ago with the idea of giving one lot to each of their 3 daughters with the intention of building on them. When they went to apply for building approvals they were informed — no chance of that because of it being wetlands — game over.

Now Mr. Harrington being a builder of high end homes I’m sure has the same thoughts in
mind. Therefore if this application is approved that means this property will be bulldozed down and tons of land fill brought in. This to me appears to be extremely environmentally unfriendly. It has been swamp lands ever since we have been here (now called wet lands) and as far as I am concerned should remain that way. It must remain that way.

Many forms of wild life inhabit this area and to destroy it would be criminal. Therefore I am totally NOT in favour of this application being approved.

I would appreciate being notified in writing of any decision made by Council on this matter.

Thank you and regards

Howard MacDonald
Sent from my iPad
Good morning Ms. Poncelet,

I acknowledge receipt of your email in response to the August 26 Notice of Public Meeting (hyperlink below) and confirm I have forwarded the same to Council for their information and consideration. Your comments will be included in the record of the August 26 Public Meeting, and attached to a followup staff report regarding this matter.

https://thebluemountains.ca/document_viewer.cfm?event_doc=2284

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 Fax: 519-599-7723
Email: | Website: www.thebluemountains.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: Karen Poncelet
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2019 10:17 AM
To: Town Clerk <townclerk@thebluemountains.ca>
Subject: Zoning application Lot 102-103&177 Plan529

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Ms Giles, I am formally responding to the notice of application and public meeting for the above zoning application. Please include my comments in the public record.

I have known the owners of the aforementioned Lots - both the Wells and the Harringtons. Over 30 years ago the Well’s faced a similar situation - wanting to build on these Lots. Unfortunately all these Lots are part wetlands and their application was denied. The Well’s sold the property to the Harrington’s about 20 years ago. They purchased these Lots knowing they could not build on them because they are wetlands. Since then Dave and Carol Harrington have renovated the house and rent it out and built a large workshop used for Dave’s business. They do not live here. Dave and Carol are lovely people for whom this is
strictly a business proposition.

I live at [REDACTED]. Behind my property is a designated wetland. Abutting this wetland is a proposed 19 house development. Additionally the new Aquaville development includes areas that are protected wetlands. My concern is that allowing anyone to fill in a wetland will set a precedent and embolden the others to do the same.

I know that our community needs to grow. The Township needs more revenue and lots of people want to live in this area. Part of what makes it so desirable are the natural resources we have. We need to do everything we can to protect those resources while allowing our communities to grow.

Once you fill in the wetlands you won’t get them back and they are a vital part of our resources. Please protect them.

Regards
Karen Poncelet

Sent from my iPhone
From: kathleen mcgregor
To: Planning Info
Subject: request for a zoning change from H Zone to R1-1 for 234 Brophy's Lane, The Town of Blue Mountains
Date: August 22, 2019 11:24:52 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Township of Blue Mountains

August 22, 2019

Dear: Corrina Giles and Dave Harrington

RE: request for a zoning change from H Zone to R1-1 for 234 Brophy’s Lane, The Town of Blue Mountains

I am writing to strongly oppose the request for a zoning change from H Zone to R1-1 for 234 Brophy’s Lane, within the Town of Blue Mountains. There are multiple elements that demonstrate this change in zoning is harmful to the aquatic ecosystem community including loss of habitat, unnecessary high risk to protected species, and large hydrological impacts to the surrounding properties. Additionally, it goes against the 2-year moratorium to not allow privately owned land owners the opportunity to request zoning by-law amendments.

The property currently contains high value, and ecologically significant wetlands. Any alteration will have high risks to the surrounding properties. The water table and ground surface are closely interlinked. Any alteration to this delicate balance will create an alteration to the hydrologic regime of the area. Flooding to adjacent land owners’ properties and destruction township infrastructure is a likely result from works associated with this zoning change.

The 2009 Environmental Impact Study is currently invalid. It is outdated and does not include recent changes in surrounding land use, changes in the hydrological regime of the area, and climate change implications. This Study needs to be updated and reviewed by external third parties to ensure accuracy, quality and real time analysis is included in the report.

My concerns include but are not limited to;
1. Importance of Wetland Storage capacity:

Hydrologic change due to infilling and altering wetlands has been well documented. Hydrology concerns the quantity, duration, rates, frequency, and other properties of water flow. Impacts to water quality and other wetland components are a function of hydrologic changes. Of all land uses, land development has the greatest ability to alter hydrology. Land development typically increases runoff peak flows and total flow volumes and damages water quality.

Increased peak flows transport more sediment to wetlands that, in turn, may alter the wetlands’ vegetation communities and impact animal species dependent of the vegetation. Additionally, an increase in runoff peak flows will damage surrounding properties homes and endanger municipal infrastructure. Therefore, this rezoning application is to be denied.

2. Climate Change:

Because warmer air can hold more water, climate change will give the potential for stronger rainfall events. Floods can be caused either by an excess of rainfall leading to greater surface runoff or by storm surges. Human activity can increase the risks, for example by paving over areas which were previously covered by vegetation, reducing the capacity of the land to absorb rainfall and causing it to run off more quickly. Planning decisions – such whether to build houses in wetlands can also affect society's, including adjacent properties, vulnerability to floods. Therefore, this rezoning request should be denied.

3. Ecological High Risk: Significance of destroying a wetland

Ontario Endangered Species Act protects at risk species. Protecting and recovering species at risk and their habitat is a key part of conserving Ontario's biodiversity.

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) (OMMAH 2005) provides direction on matters of provincial interest that relate to land use planning and development. Policy 2.1 of the PPS deals with natural heritage and states that natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term (Policy 2.1.1), as well as

“The diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area, and the long-term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems, should be maintained, restored or, where possible, improved, recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features” (Policy 2.1.2).

Ontario’s Biodiversity Strategy Target 12 mandates that by 2015, “natural heritage systems plans and biodiversity conservation strategies are developed and implemented at the municipal and landscape levels” (Ontario Biodiversity Council 2011). It is well documented the Town of Collingwood is doing its due diligence in ensuring its Official Plan is consistent with provincial policy and direction. It is my understanding the Town of Blue Mountains supports and is following this direction. The destruction of the biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem habitat, and hydrologic storage capacity proposed in this zoning request does not align with Provincial,
Regional and Municipal commitments. The rezoning request should therefore be denied.

4. Two Year Moratorium

As of September 18, 2018, the Town of Blue Mountain has accepted a 2 year moratorium to not allow privately initiated zoning by-law amendments.

Recent changes to the Planning Act under Bill 73 places a 2-year moratorium on privately initiated zoning by-law amendments and minor variances to a new Comprehensive Zoning By-law.

Therefore, this zoning request should be denied.

Please send me an email confirmation of receipt of this email requesting the rezoning of 234 Brophy’s Lane, within the Town of Blue Mountains be denied.

Sincerely,

Heidi Kathleen McGregor BSc. MSc.          Brigitte Eaton
Aquatic Habitat Biologist                   Neighboring Property Owner,
Brophy’s Lane                               Brophy’s Lane
Dear Ms. Giles,

I am formally responding to the notice of application and public meeting for the Property Location Lot 102 to 103 Part Lot 177 Plan 529. Please include my comments in the public record.

This proposed zoning amendment should be denied for the above properties based on the following arguments.

Wetlands should not be filled in. Once they are filled in you will never get them back. Wetlands are vital to the health of our province, giving us clean and abundant water, protecting us from flooding, and reducing the effects of climate change.

About 15 years ago, there was a vast wetland in front of the sewage treatment plant at the end of Brophy’s Lane. This wetland was clandestinely filled in without permits, or permission from either the Town or any other environmental agency. I believe it was the owner of the Tyrolean Beach that filled it in. Today the property just sits there, and the wetland adjacent to it on the east side (Town of Collingwood) is now dried reeds. It is only wet this year because of the high waters on Georgian Bay.

I live at [redacted], and there is a proposed development of 16 large homes with a significant designated wetlands buffer zone behind my cottage. The Aquavil Development is just nearby, and hopefully that too will have a wetlands buffer zone as well.

What it really boils down to is, giving in to developers, whether large corporations or just the small entrepreneur who may not care too much about wetlands. It is important that there are investments and controls in wetland conservation as it will be cost effective for us in the future for various services such as water filtration, flood mitigation, and soil retention.

If this zoning amendment is passed it will give way for others to move boundary lines and affect, or fill in wetlands without consideration for the future environmental impact of the area.

Thank you very much for allowing me to comment.

Paul Fox [redacted]