

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
<b>Agency Comments</b>			
<b>Bell Canada</b>	September 24, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments or concerns at this time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>acknowledged</li> </ul>
<b>Blue Water District School Board and Bruce-Grey Catholic District School Board</b>	September 27, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Boards urge the Town to ensure that sufficient land is allocated for new school sites in areas experiencing rapid growth.</li> <li>The Boards request that the Town integrate school capacity planning within its housing strategies.</li> <li>The Boards fully support the Town’s commitment to sustainable development, energy efficiency and green building standards as they align with the objectives of the Boards.</li> <li>Land should be set aside in the Community Living Area [of Thornbury and Clarksburg] for the development of new schools.</li> <li>The Boards encourage the Town to work closely with the School Boards to identify future school sites in areas of significant growth, particularly Thornbury/Clarksburg and Craigleith.</li> <li>Parks and Open Space should be located nearby new school sites as these spaces are integral for physical education and extra-curricular activities. Policy consideration should be given to promote the adjacency of schools and parks.</li> <li>The selection of future school sites should be guided by the following key principles: Access to infrastructure, traffic impact and student safety, site characteristics, size and design (Including minimum lot area, lot frontage and lot shape requirements), and compatibility with surrounding land uses.</li> <li>The Boards will continue to monitor development growth in the Town and will continue to comment on development application circulations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Town will continue to work with the school board to identify future student growth projections and preferred locations for future school sites. Existing policy direction supports the school boards direction for minimum site requirements. It is further noted that the Town has Future Secondary Plan areas that will be subject to future studies and future school sites will be considered.</li> <li>No modifications proposed to the current Official Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority</b>	September 27, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NVCA recommends some minor policy wording revisions to Policy A3.1.2 and A4.3.2 to further recognize the potential hazards associated with natural hazards, wetlands, and karst.</li> <li>The NVCA has a revised role in evaluating Natural Heritage matters as a result of changes to the Conservation Authorities Act, and modifications to Natural Heritage and Wetland policies should be completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conservation Authority recommended text changes incorporated in Section A3.1.2, B5.2.1</li> <li>No change to A4.3.2 as Karst and other wetlands features are referenced in the existing wording.</li> <li>No change to B5.2.1 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph. CA may still have interest in EIS studies as they relate to Natural Hazards.</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NVCA recommends some policy modifications to Section B5.4, C2.1, C3, C4, C6, C12, D4.2 and E7 to recognize changes to the Conservation Authorities Act, and updated roles and responsibilities of other agencies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change to B5.3 CA regulations are part of wetland evaluation requirements</li> <li>B5.4.2(b), B5.4.2(h), C2.1, C3(a), C3(c), C4.3, C6, D4.2.1(g) and E7 updated with CA recommendations</li> <li>Updated text throughout the Plan regarding changes to the Conservation Authorities Act, Ontario Regulation 151/06 to 41/24 and the overall revised mandate of the CA.</li> </ul>
<b>Public Comments</b>			
<p><b>Sandra Banks, (Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>September 27, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has serious concerns about proposed changes to Building Heights in downtown Thornbury.</li> <li>The prospect of a suburban corridor of 5-storey buildings along King and Arthur streets will irreversibly change the unique character, experience and “livability”, such that within 5-10 years current residents will not recognize the historic downtown.</li> <li>Request that Council do 3 things: 1- designate Bruce Street AND highway 26 from wellington to Victoria streets as low-rise downtown area in Thornbury, 2- adopt the recommendation of Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association for a 3-storey norm, with a maximum of 4-storeys only where there is a significant benefit for housing attainability. 3- update the remainder of the Official Plan to achieve the first two items.</li> <li>The changes as proposed will create traffic issues, create visual impacts, and although checks and balances are proposed in the new policies, it is not clear how the Town could successfully enact or enforce those policies.</li> <li>Building Heights is the most impactful means of protecting/preserving the character, heritage and small town attributes of Thornbury.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modifications are proposed to the building height policies to maintain the “as of right” building height of 3 storeys across the municipality, to recommend for an increase in height to 4 storeys in the Downtown designated areas along Highway 26 and outside of the Bruce Street corridor, and to recommend an increase in height to 5 storeys where a developer can provide a community benefit to the satisfaction of Town Council.</li> <li>Increased heights of 4 storeys and up to 5 storeys where community benefit is provided is continues to be recommended in Thornbury Downtown Area (except Bruce St. corridor) as per the recommendations of the Building Height Study and the need to consider mixed use housing units in the downtown core.</li> <li>Concerns regarding visual impact will be evaluated through the requirement of a Zoning By-law Amendment for buildings greater than 3 storeys in height. Items such as traffic, privacy, shadow impact will be evaluated against other policy</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
			<p>directions with Council ultimately making final decisions on new projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Design Guidelines to be finalized upon decision of new Height Policies of Official Plan to support site and building design considerations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association (BMRA)</b></p>	<p>February 29, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association provides a list of 12 themed items.</li> <li>A number of general comments in support or with recommended wording changes have been provided.</li> <li>Requests that special attention be given to growth management and to balance with other priorities</li> <li>Requests that no increase in building height or density be considered except in very specific cases that provide important community benefits</li> <li>Policies regarding environment and climate change should be further strengthened based on Phase 2 work.</li> <li>Housing affordability is a top priority and policies should promote greater housing stock diversity and seek out opportunities to encourage/require affordable housing</li> <li>Regarding intensification, the association supports gentle intensification through infill, ADU’s and building conversions. Additional intensification should only be done in limited instances and under strict policy controls.</li> <li>Proposed Building Heights represent a radical departure from traditional development and should be limited to 4 storeys only in instances where significant community benefit such as affordable housing is provided. An assessment should be completed to identify the locations for 4-storey buildings and should be part of additional public engagement and ultimately identified by site specific policy in the OP. additional measures such as stepbacks, metres tall, traffic assessment, minimum lot standards, and a requirement for Zoning BY-law updates and Community Design Guidelines to be in place prior to consideration of a taller building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A3.1, D8 to be updated from Sustainable Path to Future Story</li> <li>A1.1(7) updated to include</li> <li>A1.1(4) no changes as direction is provided throughout the remainder of the subsections listed in A1.1</li> <li>Page 24 repetition removed</li> <li>A3.1 updated</li> <li>A3.3 deferred to CANN comments below</li> <li>A3.4 water wastewater allocation by-law changes</li> <li>No change to A3.5</li> <li>No change to A3.6 future changes to be considered when NAI/NHS project is complete.</li> <li>No change to A3.8. strategic objectives are generally directed municipal wide vs. area specific. Section B3,12,3,1 includes text similar to what is requested here.</li> <li>A3.10 water and wastewater allocation ref</li> <li>A3.11 new strategic objective added to recognize the Housing Needs Assessment objectives to address the housing gaps in the Town.</li> <li>A4.1 updated removing reference to Thornbury East FSP area.</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete communities should be evaluated particularly in Craigleith where additional commercial and/or employment lands may be required.</li> <li>• Commercial and Employment lands require further study and updated community design guidelines are required particularly on commercial and mixed use buildings in Thornbury, Clarksburg and Craigleith.</li> <li>• Proposed changes to Parks and Open Space policies are generally supported with a number of recommended considerations for parkland, trails, facilities, etc.</li> <li>• The limited capacity of Highway 26 is a concern with existing traffic issues already impacting travel. Additional growth will further these concerns, and the Town in consultation with the County and Province should examine opportunities for safety and efficiency changes, and consider a Highway 26 by-pass.</li> <li>• Regarding infrastructure and servicing, work has been completed or is well underway on the Drainage Master Plan and Natural Heritage study that should form an integral part of the OP update to ensure strong and resilient infrastructure system. Enabling of a Capacity Allocation By-law can further require community benefits in new development.</li> <li>• Community Character and Design across the urban and rural areas of the Town is a long standing priority. Quality design is integral and intensification/greenfield policies are required along with updated community design guidelines.</li> <li>• Support the inclusion of a community planning permit system enabling policies however substantial work is still required to understand when and where this system can be used.</li> <li>• Detailed comments from the Association have also been received throughout the Official Plan Review project and all other previous letters have been and will be considered in the Final Draft and as part of a future Recommendation Report to Council.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Homefield Communities (Area Developer)</b></p>	<p>September 24, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Homefield Communities is a local developer with an interest on a development parcel located on Grey Road 2. Nine items have been raised including general support, concerns and requests for clarification on a number of policy areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of requests have been received to consideration the redesignation of development lands in order to recognize/advance active or future development project. It is noted that the redesignation of land use designations was</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Homefield also requests consideration to redesignate the lands from Rural to Community Living Area as these lands are located within a recognized County and Municipal settlement area.</li> </ul>	<p>not considered as part of this Official Plan 5-Year Review, and that any requests for redesignation other than those providing clarification or error corrections should be considered outside of the 5-Year Review process, and be considered through its own Official Plan Amendment including public process and Council Decision.</p>
<p><b>Blue Mountain Resorts (BMR)</b></p>	<p>September 24, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blue Mountain Resorts provides a list of 23 specific items including general support, concerns and requests clarification on a number of policy matters and sections to the Plan.</li> <li>Requests policy additions to the Economic Development section to recognize that Tourism is a major economic driver for the Town.</li> <li>Requests that references to recreational uses be expanded to pick up on new recreational uses that are anticipated through innovation and evolution.</li> <li>Clarification should be added to Section B3.10.10 to also recognize the role of the Village Master Development Agreement, as well as the broader range of Development Agreements that are in place.</li> <li>Requests the modernization of a number of policy sections to update a number of existing policies that have been in place since the 1980's to early 2000's. These relate to the terminology used, to recognize innovation of tourism/recreation uses, and to consider additional flexibility in some of the more prescriptive policy requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text added to identify recreational/tourism uses under economic development in A3.8</li> <li>Text added to also include innovative recreational uses among the list of recreational uses in B3.7.4.7</li> <li>No proposed changes to B3.10.9 which identifies a maximum of 1000 units within the Blue Mountain Village Resort Area Boundary</li> <li>Existing policy B3.10.6.1(c) and B3.10.10(b)(iii) recognizes the role of the Master Development Agreement to ensure the orderly development of the Village Core. No changes proposed to B3.10.10</li> <li>Items 12 and 13 of the BMR letter have been added, it being noted that a Zoning By-law Amendment may be required for the establishment of a new base lodge in the Recreation Ski designation, however an OPA would not be required.</li> <li>Request to modify the mandatory requirement for full services at the top of hill base lodge to consider new technology and environmental impacts associated with partial services was considered with no changes proposed at this time.</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional text included to recognize partnerships with the private sector as a new opportunity for public access to Georgian Bay shorefront.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Joan De Visser (Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>September 25, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Tourism sector is undergoing significant change. If we are to continue a designation as a four seasons recreational resort community, greater criteria, definitions and guardrails are needed to effectively manage how the tourism sector will be accommodated. Recommends that the Town also include a requirement for a Tourism Strategy and update various policy sections throughout the Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modifications have been proposed to modernize some of the tourism/recreation policies.</li> <li>A Tourist Strategy Project was initiated in September 2024 and is still in its early stages. Planning Staff will be monitoring the project and recommendations may come forward for amendments to the Official Plan. Once the study has concluded and recommendations are endorsed by Council a future Official Plan Amendment may be considered to implement any required policy updates.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Jim Oliver (Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>September 27, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides general support in the overall process and policy updates. Active Transportation should be expanded to recognize the transport corridors linking all community assets.</li> <li>Regarding sustainability and climate change, policies should ensure, not encourage the use of green development standards.</li> <li>Compact, higher density development should be considered while also reducing the maximum lot coverage for single detached dwellings to less than the current 30% standard.</li> <li>Housing projects should include designs that reduce its overall carbon footprint</li> <li>Strongly supports the proposed intensification and density policies including taller buildings in the Downtown area at 5-storeys.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modifications to the Active Transportation sections are included, and are enhanced from the previous 2016 Official Plan.</li> <li>Additional commentary is provided under the Climate Action Network Now section with detailed summary on hardening of environmental policies.</li> <li>Lot coverage requirements are addressed at a policy level in the Plan. Specific percentages and/or reduction of percent lot coverage should be addressed through the update to the Zoning By-law</li> </ul>
<p><b>Janet Findlay, (Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>September 29, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a former Blue Mountains Attainable Housing Corporation board member, I wish to provide the following:</li> <li>1- Support an increase of height from 3 storeys to 4 storeys except between Victoria and wellington streets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments have been provided earlier regarding the proposed modifications to Height, and the location of taller buildings.</li> <li>Relation of ground floor commercial vs ground floor residential is addressed in the Zoning By-law that currently</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2- Support the recommended 12m setback from front lot lines for taller buildings along highway 26 to allow for landscaping.</li> <li>3- Consideration should be given to permitting ground floor residential for new developments in the Downtown area that do not face the street. This may be beneficial for those lands that have larger lot depths.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>permits ground floor residential on side streets and/or internal to the site where appropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>Bruce Taylor, (Area Resident)</b>	September 30, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association regarding building heights in Thornbury including a maximum 3-storey limit along highway 26 from Wellington to Victoria street, and a maximum of 4-storeys outside of the historic downtown area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Blue Mountain Ratepayers response regarding building height comments.</li> </ul>
<b>Craigeith Waterfront Development Inc. (Royalton-Aquavil)</b>	September 30, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the most part, the Draft Official Plan does not raise any concerns save and except for some implementation details and questions regarding the status of existing approvals/agreements and other statuses of projects. Some further commentary may be provided regarding constraint mapping on the subject property, as well as the implementation of the new affordable/attainable housing policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>acknowledged</li> </ul>
<b>Georgian Triangle Development Institute (GTDI)</b>	October 1, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GTDI was incorporated in 1992 as a private sector non-profit organization representing the development industry in South Georgian Bay Region.</li> <li>Supports and commends the efforts to update the 2016 Official Plan</li> <li>Introductory population and household context requires corrections and clarification on numbers</li> <li>Section A3 has several “strategic objectives” that are not objectives for the purpose of the Plan</li> <li>Section D introduces several detailed policies addressing Affordable and Attainable Housing that are welcome, however some directions represent significant implementation issues for the Town/Developers</li> <li>Section E1 has new direction seeking ‘streamlining; of process that warrants support and implementation. There are other sections that may prove problematic with regards to the Planning Act and may counter any proposed measures to streamline process.</li> <li>GTDI continues to review the Official Plan and will provide further detailed comments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged. See comments response to October 15 letter for further details</li> </ul>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
<p><b>Georgian Triangle Development Institute (GTDI)</b></p>	<p>October 15, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New restrictive density range and height policies for the Residential Recreational Area designation is difficult to implement 100 UPH in 3 Storeys</li> <li>• Conflicting terms (Household, Dwelling Unit, Unit) consider updates</li> <li>• Population number need to be clear, particularly with swings from permanent to part-time/seasonal population. Demand for services must account for both population types</li> <li>• Seasonal households are not defined in the Plan. what is the basis for the forecasted decline?</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph Page 16 states 1370 units. It is unclear what this number refers to.</li> <li>• Introduction section could be enhanced to recognize that all relevant policy directions are to be considered, and that no one single policy will determine conformity or not.</li> <li>• Page 17 Official Plan intent should have stronger reference to the agricultural sector</li> <li>• Requests revision to new draft sentence at Guiding Principle 9 (A1.1, Page 19) to read “The provision of affordable housing will be a priority for the Town.”</li> <li>• Consider revising the Goals and Objectives as many of the objectives in Section A3 are not specific and cannot be measured.</li> <li>• Green Development Standards are not defined and the existing policy direction is vague.</li> <li>• What is meant by “net gain enhancements” in Section A3.2.2(1) Page 27</li> <li>• The Goal statement of A3.3 is long. Suggest that the first 2 sentences be deleted for clarity.</li> <li>• A3.8 and A3,8,3,4 and E1 seeks to streamline development reviews and are supported</li> <li>• Policy to “ensure” a full range of housing “for those who work” in the Town (strategic objective A3.11.2 4, page 36) is not appropriate as housing should be for all</li> <li>• A3.13.11 is vague and could be modified to “Improve consultation with Indigenous Communities in the early stages of development plans proposals and studies”</li> <li>• B2.7(g) is unrealistic to expect two additional units on new builds is excessive. Suggests a revision to “New ground related housing may include design options that would allow up to two additional residential units per property”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maximum density range of 100 UPH is a maximum and also applies to parcels where up to 5 storeys may be considered. As an example, the Riverwalk Phase 1 building located at 10 Bay Street East is a 5 storey residential apartment building constructed at 100 UPH</li> <li>• Population, seasonal households and other growth related data are pulled directly from the Growth Allocations Paper prepared by Parcel Economics under Phase 1 of the OP Project.</li> <li>• 1370 units was the expected 15 year growth under the 2016 Official Plan. 3560 households is the expected 25 year growth.</li> <li>• Agricultural resources added to page 17.</li> <li>• A1.1 affordable housing revision added.</li> <li>• A3 Goals and Objectives reviewed.</li> <li>• Green Development Standards are described in further detail in Section D8.1</li> <li>• Net-gain refers to those situations where natural features are removed, that a solution be achieved that results in an improved situation.</li> <li>• No change to A3.3</li> <li>• A3.8 and E1 comments acknowledged</li> <li>• No change to A3.13(11)</li> <li>• B2.7(g) is worded as a “should” not “shall” direction is provided that up to 2 additional dwelling units should be considered in design options</li> </ul>



**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do allowances for ADU’s measure against density restrictions? Is there a specific policy statement that nullifies the ADU potential from density calculations? How is municipal water/sewer infrastructure accounted for?</li> <li>• Has the Town considered the implementation of the new 5 storey building height criteria on sample areas, or considered where higher buildings are most likely to meet the restrictive tests?</li> <li>• Building heights more than three storeys outside of the Downtown Area will require an amendment to the Plan. Affordable/attainable housing usually takes the form of higher density dwelling types. How does the Town rationalize restricting potential housing forms that tend to provide less expensive housing, ie, mid rise five storey buildings.</li> <li>• The intensification criteria in B2.16 (page 59) is overly prescriptive and will discourage intensification that is at the root of updated Plan policy in other sections (Example policy sections provided) Many of the criteria in B2.16 are more appropriately addressed through design guidelines. How can the Town reconcile the requirements of B2.16 against Official Plan land use objectives?</li> <li>• It is respectfully submitted that Sections B2.13 and B2.16 will combine to thwart the objectives that support land use efficiency, servicing efficiency, active transportation initiatives, re-development and a diverse housing stock. These sections should be further critically reviewed to ensure seamless alignment with policies supporting housing and land use efficiencies.</li> <li>• Section B2.17 is overly prescriptive which may be better suited in the urban design guideline document</li> <li>• Section D1.5 does not reference the allocation policy approach now being considered</li> <li>• Strongly feels that Section D mandated requirements need to be revisited and discussed between the industry/town</li> <li>• D7,4 affordable housing policies include a background narrative and does not constitute policy. Paragraph 4 reads as a section A4 Guiding Principle and repeats the statements and directions provided in A3.11.2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADU’s permitted in addition to density restrictions. New policy section added to Section B2.7 to acknowledge this. ADU’s are tracked annually for municipal water/sewer allocation purposes.</li> <li>• Building Height Study was completed to assess 5 storey building height criteria including three sample sites where criteria is applied.</li> <li>• Council direction is to require OPA for taller buildings outside of Downtown Area.</li> <li>• Council direction through Phase 1 is to include prescriptive details to outline intensification requirements.</li> <li>• Comments regarding B2.13 and B2.16 acknowledged and will be shared with Council</li> <li>• Council direction through Phase 1 established B2.17</li> <li>• Servicing Allocation Policy response</li> <li>• Section D requirements have been reviewed throughout the Official Plan review process. Policy updates are based on the discussions completed to date.</li> <li>• No change to Section D7.4 narrative paragraphs</li> <li>• D7.4(a) policy wording to be modified from “ demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units” to “demonstrate how affordable housing units can be provided.” The policy shifts more to the ‘encourage’ level, with a requirement on new development to at least examine opportunities to include affordable housing, or confirm why it can’t.</li> <li>• D7.4(b) page 238, in agreement that innovation and cooperation with development industry is required to come</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D7.4 a) (page 238) requires “all development proposals with more than 10 residential dwelling units proposed to demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units”. This is unduly onerous, impractical and unnecessary. This policy ignores the reality of the private sector market realm, it effectively mandates provision of affordable housing units, it ignores other Plan policy that emphasizes policy approaches that “encourage”, it ignores Plan policy that provides less intrusive and prescriptive approaches (eg, subsections c,e,g,h) and, we respectfully note, is inconsistent with the Planning Act, PPS and County Official Plan.</li> <li>• Section D7.4 b) (page 238) is an aspirational objective. To achieve even a portion of that objective requires innovation and cooperation with the development industry. GTDI is a willing partner to work with the Town</li> <li>• D7.4(d) requires design options for up to 2 additional dwelling units. This policy will add more work and costs to the process that will likely result in additional housing costs. Requests that this policy be deleted.</li> <li>• D7.4(F) requires an affordable housing report, and how the industry can explain how it will supply affordable/attainable housing that in most cases may not be able to do.</li> <li>• D7.4 may have an unintended impact of reducing new housing supply worsening the local housing situation, and may also result in higher housing costs.</li> <li>• Concerned that Policy E1.2 enables the Community Planning Permit System with policies that may be too prescriptive</li> <li>• E1.3 and E1.4.1 and E1.5.3 enables the delegation of minor By-law approvals and similar. File processing and information requirements should be reviewed for further efficiencies in the process.</li> <li>• E1.5 Holding provisions policies appear too open ended, and may exceed the allowances under the Planning Act.</li> <li>• E1.5.2 is redundant</li> <li>• E1.8 Public Consultation Strategy is unduly onerous</li> <li>• How are the E10 Complete Application requirements enabled through the Planning Act.</li> </ul>	<p>up with fresh ideas and methods to deliver a range of housing types that may also include affordable housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D7.4(d) policy wording has been modified to require consideration for and that one or two additional dwelling units could be considered.</li> <li>• D7.4(f) housing report will continue to be part of complete application submission requirements. If affordable housing cannot be included with new development, it must be demonstrated why.</li> <li>• D7.4 is intended to provide further direction on new housing projects to look at ways to consider affordable housing as part of the background study on a project. Current housing situation as outlined in the Housing Needs Assessment and Growth Allocations Paper identify the trajectory of housing supply and gaps that need to be filled.</li> <li>• Community Planning Permit System is anticipated as a future project to look at efficiencies in the Planning Review process. proposed policies provide current direction on CPPS and may be subject to refinement through the CPPS future project.</li> <li>• E1.3, E1.4 and E1.5 acknowledged.</li> <li>• E1.5.2 removed</li> <li>• E1.8 removed all requirements and replaced with language to encourage enhanced public consultation for large scale projects in the Town.</li> <li>• Section E10 modified to match E1.8</li> <li>• School boards were directly circulated notice and the Town has received comments. Local hospitals and emergency services were provided notice and no comments received.</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have the public and separate school boards, local hospitals and emergency services provided comments?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Climate Action Now Network (CANN)</b></p>	<p>October 1, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CANN was formed in 2019 and is a local volunteer group with a goal to reduce the carbon footprint of the area, and work together towards a more sustainable community.</li> <li>Climate Change mitigation and adaptation cuts across all aspects of land use. Bold actions should be included.</li> <li>There is no reference to the risks caused by climate change and how these will be mitigated at the local level</li> <li>No reference to the Net Zero CO2 reduction target and how it will be accomplished</li> <li>The Plan describes urban and tourism aspects of our economy while agriculture is the largest land use and employer and can make a significant contribution to climate change mitigation</li> <li>The Future Story should be included in the introduction and its measures mandated throughout the text</li> <li>There is no direction to endorse, follow and implement the Grey County Climate Action Plan</li> <li>Language throughout the document that references climate mitigation should be more firm. Terms such as may/consider/promote should be changed to mandate/require.</li> <li>Environment and Open Space policies need to be strengthened and incorporate the Natural Heritage Study and Natural Asset Inventory findings/mapping.</li> <li>More is required on tree/forest protection. Targets are needed for urban canopy cover and protection of natural assets.</li> <li>Need to implement Green Development Standards</li> <li>Question: “Are you willing to seriously consider strengthening the Official Plan to PROTECT our area by – mandating the conservation and protection of natural areas, utilizing nature-based solutions, and directing the Town, and community developers and builders to implement net zero practices?”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A second letter has been submitted by CANN on October 3, 2024 with duplicate and additional commentary. Please see October 3 Comments for further details.</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
<p><b>Blake Roussell (Area Resident)</b> <b>Pure Blue Cannabis (Local Business)</b></p>	<p>October 1, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends that the minimum setback of 150 metres from a Cannabis Production Facility from Sensitive Land Uses be increased to 300 metres.</li> <li>• Issues related to noise, light emissions, waste incineration and security can be considered nuisances to neighbours. Many of these issues are minimum requirements and cannot be modified on-site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan to be modified to 300 metres. Industry ranges are 150 to 300 metres in general with some up to 600 metres. 300 metres remains consistent with other municipalities of similar size and uses.</li> <li>• Consider an exception to allow for reductions to the 300 metres where it can be demonstrated that there are no adverse impacts.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Bruce Taylor (Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>October 1, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the comments from the BMRA, 3 storey maximum should apply from Wellington to Victoria as well as Bruce Street. Four storeys only along Hwy 26 inside Thornbury and outside of the area mentioned prior.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on the BMRA letter and on height are provided in this comments summary</li> </ul>
<p><b>Joanne De Visser (Area Resident and Library Board Member)</b></p>	<p>October 1, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation: Expand the inclusion of Libraries and library services in the Official Plan</li> <li>• Libraries (Also Museum) to be formally recognized as town priority and land use for healthy communities</li> <li>• Public Libraries directly support the purpose of the Official Plan. Text adaptations from North Vancouver and Innisfil Official Plan include:</li> </ul> <p>1. A1 THE COMMUNITY VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES In the list under the two principles of Planning (page 5 ), “...On the basis of the above, The Blue Mountains is a community that should continue to:..” Provide accessible library services and resources to facilitate healthy and complete communities for residents of all ages, backgrounds and abilities * Provide responsive and appropriate library, arts, cultural and recreation services to current and developing neighbourhoods*</p> <p>2. Include Libraries/Library services in all instances where Arts and Culture and Recreation are mentioned</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals and objectives recognize complete communities and mix of uses. Libraries are one of many critical important components in the goals.</li> <li>• Specific new references to Libraries added to A3.5.2(7), A3.8.3(8)</li> <li>• D5.10 updated to include the recommended Goal</li> </ul>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>3. Add Libraries/Library services to the definitions of Arts and Culture, Recreation and Leisure, Urban Character sections.</p> <p>4. Add libraries as a possible use to all land use designations (except Environmental and Open Space Designations)</p>	
<p><b>Paul Reale</b> <b>(Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>October 1, 2024</p>	<p>Detailed questions have been provided on the themes below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allowing 5 storeys could bring in too much density, altering the small-town character of Thornbury. Alternatives like capping at 3 storeys with stricter design controls should be explored to preserve the town’s feel and manage traffic flow effectively</li> <li>• There are few specifics on how the town’s infrastructure will cope with this increased density. Clear, enforceable policies are needed to ensure that development aligns with infrastructure capacity.</li> <li>• Regarding Affordable and Attainable Housing: Relying on height and density alone is not a sufficient solution. The plan needs clear mechanisms and incentives to ensure developers include purpose-built affordable and employee housing in new projects.</li> <li>• The plan encourages high-density growth without clear safeguards to protect natural assets, such as wetlands and woodlands, or to maintain service levels. More concrete restrictions are required to manage sprawl and preserve the town’s natural resources.</li> <li>• The lack of secondary planning policies leaves a gap in guiding development in Thornbury West, especially with the Campus of Care opening up a future secondary plan area. Clear timelines and structured guidelines are essential to plan for future growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modifications are proposed to the Height policies, however recommendation continues to proposed 3 storeys maximum, with 5 storeys in certain locations and subject to strict controls.</li> <li>• Infrastructure is planned for the Official Plan 25 year planning horizon and expected growth rates.</li> <li>• A number of policy updates are proposed regarding affordable/attainable housing including height/density, 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> units, maximizing mixed use development sites, large home conversions, and others. The Official Plan is one tool to achieve affordable/attainable housing. Other tools such as the CIP provides incentive programs, Development Charge rebates, and others. It is also recognized that there are limitations under the planning act, and differing opinions on the indirect impacts of some policy directions.</li> <li>• The future secondary plan areas are not proposed to be utilized for growth under this Official Plan. the Town will continue to monitor growth and growth patterns and will reconsider future secondary plan area needs under future study.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Climate Action Network Now (CANN)</b></p>	<p>October 3, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second Letter submitted by CANN with specific requests for edits to the Plan:</li> <li>• <b>A1.1 GUIDING PRINCIPLES:</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A1.1(4), A1.1(6) and A1.1(7) updated</li> <li>• A3.1 updates have been prepared to recognize the Future Story work.</li> <li>• No change to A3.1.2.1, A3.1.2.8, A3.1.2.15</li> </ul>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policy #4: delete “economically and socially viable” and replace with “sustainable neighbourhoods”. (Sustainable neighbourhood incorporate economically, socially and <b>environmentally</b> viability)</li> <li>○ Policy #6: After “associated ecological functions so that they “<b>add: are connected throughout the community</b>, and can be enjoyed...”</li> <li>○ Change Principle 7 to read: “Direct climate change policies and actions that result in reduction in greenhouse gases, ensure energy efficiency, and embed Climate Change mitigation and/or adaptation policies and actions into all relevant planning and development policies, to increase our community’s resilience to the effects of climate change.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>A3 GOALS AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES</b></li> <li>A3.1 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: The Blue Mountains Sustainable Path is referenced, and we support this Vision. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Our Future Story needs to be referenced here and implemented throughout the implementation section.</li> <li>▪ A3.1.2.1 – Change to: “Ensure development is “<b>planned</b> and built...”</li> <li>▪ A3.1.2.8 – add, after automobiles “<b>establish a modal shift target which ensures</b> transit, cycling, walking ...”</li> <li>▪ A3.1.2.15 Replace “Encourage” with “Ensure”</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ A3.2 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goal: Delete “work towards the” and “replace with “<b>establish a connected natural heritage system</b>”</li> <li>▪ A3.2.2.1 Change to read: “Protect <b>and ensure</b> net gain enhancements to significant natural heritage and hydrologic features and their associated habitats and ecological functions <b>in all relevant planning and development decisions</b>”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No change to A3.2, A3.2.2(1), A3,2,2(5). Also awaiting the future recommendations of the Natural Heritage Study for additional policy direction and updates.</li> <li>● No change to A3.3, A3.3.7, A3.3.8, A3.4.1 and A3.9.</li> <li>● formatting error to A3.2 has been corrected</li> <li>● A3.7 updated with additional text and subsection</li> <li>● A4.1.15 Thornbury East has been removed as a secondary plan area in this version</li> <li>● No Change to B2</li> <li>● B5 policy changes are deferred until future direction is received on the Natural Heritage Study. comprehensive policy updates will be considered at the conclusion of that stage of the project.</li> <li>● No change to C1, C7, C8</li> <li>● Text added to C10</li> <li>● No change to D2.5, D2.7, D5.6, D6.6.3.</li> <li>● Date for D7 is annually and will consider monitoring Jan 1 to Dec 31 each year</li> <li>● D8 policy changes are deferred until future direction is received on the Natural Heritage Study. comprehensive policy updates will be considered at the conclusion of that stage of the project.</li> <li>● E1.2 enabling policies related to CPPS By-law are being introduced and may be refined as part of the future CPPS By-law project</li> <li>● No change to E1.5, E1.7, E3.1, E3.5</li> <li>● Unclear what comment reference to E4 (j) is referring to</li> </ul>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A3.2.2.5 Change “discourage the loss of” and replace with “<b>prohibit the loss or fragmentation of significant woodlands</b>”</li> <li>▪ Add: Set targets for forest and urban tree cover – utilizing the Natural Heritage Study and Natural Assets Inventory. Reference Grey County and Conservation Authorities’ targets.</li>   <li>○ A3.3 CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION: Strategic objectives include recognition of declaration of a Climate Change Emergency, and references to land use planning that supports resilience, active transportation, intensification and reducing heat island effect.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strengthen the language in goal A3.3.1 – in the 6<sup>th</sup> line, change “needs” to “<b>will</b>”</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ A3.2.2 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CORRECT THIS NUMBER TO A3.3.2</li> <li>▪ <b>Add A3.3.7 Implement climate change mitigation policies and actions that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions from land uses such as housing, institutional, commercial, tourism, recreation and industrial development at all scales;</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Add A3.3.8 Implement climate change adaptation policies and actions by designing our Town’s growth with resilient infrastructure, increasing the use of renewable resources and establishing green development standards that achieve net zero carbon by 2045.</b></li> </ul> </li>   <li>○ A3.4 GROWTH AND SETTLEMENT: Strategic objectives include references to intensification, and efficient use of land and infrastructure.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A3.4.1 #4 – Delete “encourage” and add “<b>Lead net zero</b> greenfield development that efficiently uses land and infrastructure”</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ A3.7 AGRICULTURE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E7(a) corrected</li> <li>• No change to E10</li> <li>• Definitions Section updates to be considered</li> </ul>

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Note the importance to agriculture of climate mitigation and adaptation measures;</li> <li>▪ A3.7.11 Change to read: “....to conserve a farm’s soil, water <b>quality and quantity, and prevent runoff to water courses</b> without sacrificing productivity”</li> <li>▪ Add: Support food security and a resilient agricultural economy by protecting agricultural land and diversification of farming operations.</li> <li>○ A3.9 TOURISM: Refer throughout to “<b>Sustainable</b> Tourism”. Define Sustainable Tourism in the definition section. A3.9.6 – Add: <b>Protect and enhance the Beaver River Trail system, including all naturalized access points. (Identify the Beaver River Trail on the Land Use maps and schedules. It is currently missing.)</b></li> <li>○ A3.10 INFRASTRUCTURE: A3.10.3 Change “encourage the establishment of...” to “Establish an integrated...”</li> </ul> <p><b>A4 LAND USE CONCEPT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>A4.1.15</b> Future Secondary Plan areas: Missing Thornbury East (noted in A2.2) and included in B3.13.2</li> </ul> <p><b>B. LAND USE DESIGNATIONS</b></p> <p><b>Insert as a goal:</b></p> <p><b>“All new building shall comply with the Town’s Green Building Standards”</b></p> <p><b>B2.17</b> Establish Green Development Standards, working with Grey County and other municipal partners to establish standards for green buildings in both the Town buildings and community buildings that achieve net zero emissions by 2045.</p> <p><b>B5 ENVIRONMENT AND OPEN SPACE</b></p> <p>Recommended changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen policies by adding data and findings from the Natural Heritage Study (NHS) and Natural Asset Inventory (NAI) so that natural features can be accurately identified and</li> </ul>	



PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>mapped. <b>Establish ambitious targets.</b> Incorporate reference to the importance of natural services to climate mitigation and adaptation. This work must be completed, approved by Council, and incorporated into the OP as an Official Plan Amendment as soon as possible. More details and a timeline for implementation are required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B5.2.1 (b) Development and Site Alternations – delete <i>“unless it can be demonstrated...”</i></li> <li>• There should be <b>no development</b> where Karst exists.</li> </ul> <p><b>C. WATER, ENVIRONMENTAL AND HAZARD POLICIES</b></p> <p>There is a need to ensure that the Goals, Principles and Strategic Objectives are applied to Section B. Please check that the commitments in Section A are reflected in their intent and entirety in Sections B-E.</p> <p><b>C1. OBJECTIVES</b></p> <p>d) Add “Support and implement the Grey County Climate Action Plan and continue to implement and update the Town’s Energy Conservation and Demand Management Plan (2019)</p> <p><b>C7. WATER TAKING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Prohibit water taking for commercial sale.</li> </ul> <p><b>C8 WATERSHED PLANNING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Include cross-reference to source water protection plans in C.4</li> <li>○ C8.1 – Reference Nottawasaga and Grey Sauble Conservation Authorities</li> </ul> <p><b>C10. WASTE DISPOSAL</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Incorporate TBM’s position that waste is considered a resource, and it is a policy of this Plan to achieve maximum reduction, re-use, recycling and composting to minimize the amount of waste going to landfill.</li> </ul> <p><b>D. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES</b></p> <p><b>D2 TRANSPORTATION</b></p> <p>Policies in this section that are most directly relevant to climate change action focus on active transportation, public transit and transportation demand management:</p>	

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D2.5 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION: Some strengthening of language required (e.g., replace “encourage” and “promote” with “require” or “mandate”</li> <li>• D2.7 PUBLIC TRANSIT: Language should be strengthened to drive implementation.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Remove “support the development of” and insert “develop a transit strategy for the Town”</li> <li>○ Within this strategy, plan for shuttle services to beaches, trail heads and popular tourist areas.</li> <li>○ In (e) Refer to the Trail plan, which includes crosswalks across Hwy. 26</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>D5.6 RURAL CHARACTER</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to b) “protection of forested areas”</li> </ul> <p><b>D6.3.3 PARKS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate protection of natural services and the requirement to set aside naturalized areas in parks.</li> </ul> <p><b>D7.</b> Include a date for the plan.</p> <p><b>D8 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D8.1 GREEN DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS: The current list of GDS topics should be expanded to include efficient use of municipal infrastructure, reducing GHG emissions from buildings and transportation, energy efficiency, complete communities, green space, and climate change resilience. Continue to take leadership in GDS, while coordinating with Grey County, the Province, and neighbouring municipalities. There is a requirement to develop GDS but no timeframe.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ D8.1(c) remove “minimum standards” in (i) and (ii)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• D8.2 TREE CANOPY: Include a stronger policy statement on the protection of established trees in settlement areas as well as woodlands, watersheds and other natural features. Update/expand this Section to reference available tools/resources such as the Tree Inventory and the NHS/NAI. Ensure protection of mature trees on Town-owned land, including parks, open spaces and boulevards, and all Natural Heritage areas. Add policies</li> </ul>	

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>to prevent clear-cutting of developable lands, to require tree canopy assessments as part of approvals processes, and to specify tree replacement requirements in cases where removal is required. Include policies to guide and enable a Tree Protection By-law applicable to TBM settlement areas and incorporate a target of 40% urban tree canopy protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D8.4 ENERGY CONSERVATION AND EFFICIENCY MEASURES: Strengthen policies to reduce energy consumption in Town owned facilities/equipment. Strengthen language by replacing “promoting” with “requiring” or “implementing policies that require...”               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Add to (g) heat pumps, net zero technology</li> <li>○ Reference the requirement to implement and update the Town’s Energy Conservation and Demand Management</li> </ul> </li> <li>• D8.5 AIR QUALITY: Expand policies to encourage reduced vehicle idling times through measures that reduce congestion on Highway 26 and in settlement areas.</li> <li>• Mandate ecologically sustainable natural buffers between the built environment and rivers, streams, wetlands, watersheds, and other natural assets; extending this to include prevention of sprawl and strict protection of all natural assets.</li> <li>• Enable implementation of the policies listed above through tools such as Zoning, CPPS, GDS and Community Design Guidelines.</li> <li>• D8.6 – (g) New Development               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “Implement Green Development Standards”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>E1 PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E1.2 COMMUNITY PLANNING PERMIT BY-LAW:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Add a direct reference to climate change mitigation and adaptation in b) iii.</li> <li>b. Need criteria for identifying the areas to be considered for the community planning permit by-law. Incorporate community engagement on the principles/goals/objectives etc. and land uses identified in the Community</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>Planning Permit. Specify that the intent of this Official Plan must be recognized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E1.5 Add to (d) the Principles and Policies of this plan must be demonstrated and followed.</li> <li>• E1.7 SITE PLAN CONTROL: Add a reference to climate change mitigation/adaptation measures, including tree canopy protection/enhancement, tree planting, minimum buffering to protect natural assets such as watersheds, wetlands, etc.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Add a new (c) Prioritize the use of nature-based solutions and ecosystem services such as carbon sinks and flood attenuation measures.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• E3.1 Secondary Plan Areas. Refer to the Official Plan Principles, and add climate mitigation plans and reference the importance of nature-based services.</li> <li>• E3.5 COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT: Add implementation of climate change adaptation/mitigation measures to goals and objectives. Encourage restoration and protection of natural heritage.</li> <li>• Add a subsection on Green Development Standards.</li> <li>• E4 (j) Council must decide. There should be no delegation of authority.</li> <li>• E7 (a) Question the date – 2026. We have enough land identified until 2046.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In amendments – include clear direction that the Principles and Strategic Objectives must be followed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• E.10 – Add “adhere to net zero principles, goals and objectives.</li> </ul> <p><b>DEFINITIONS - GLOSSARY:</b></p> <p>There is a need to add definitions for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Complete Communities</li> <li>○ Sustainable Communities</li> <li>○ Climate Emergency – reference this directive in full</li> <li>○ Climate Change</li> <li>○ Sustainable Tourism</li> </ul>	

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sustainable Development</li> <li>○ Net Gain</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Fiona Orr (Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>October 3, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Concerns about the servicing limitations in Clarksburg, the implementation of mandatory septic inspections, and the overall general direction for provision of services to un-serviced areas of Clarksburg</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Servicing limitations in Clarksburg impact the available options for intensification and new development. No policy changes are proposed to the Official Plan. New development including new lot creation / new subdivisions will generally be prohibited until full services are made available.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Julie Tipping (Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>October 3, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The new Provincial Policy Statement 2024 will be activated on October 20, 2024. The Official Plan project should be updated in consideration of the Provincial changes and after Council is informed of the PPS changes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Provincial Policy Statement 2024 has been reviewed and minor edits have been made throughout the Plan to ensure that the Official Plan remains consistent with the new Provincial Policy Statement</li> </ul>
<p><b>BMR GP Inc. (Freed Blue Mountain)</b></p>	<p>October 9, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● BMR GP Inc. and Blue Mountain Building B Nominee Inc. is the owner of multiple parcels in the Town including Site B and Site E/F in the Village, Mountainwalk which is located North and adjacent to the Village Core, and Monterra Phase 2 located at the corner of Monterra Road and Grey Road 21.</li> <li>● All new attainable and affordable housing policies are of concern. Policy D7.4 requires that development proposals with more than 10 units must provide affordable housing with the proposed amount being 30% and that smaller developments will have no such requirement. The owner is concerned with the legality, practicality and planning merits of the policies written. The Planning Act has a legislative regime to impose affordable housing requirements under specific circumstances, and for the owners lands, there are no general power for zoning by-laws to impose market pricing on land owners. Alternative means to accomplish affordable housing targets in the Official Plan such as CBC credits, municipal incentives, and other means. As drafted a blanket target may result in driving up costs of market housing or may result in no homes being constructed. Recommend that the municipality work with the housing industry to develop an alternative solution, and that any requirement for affordable or attainable housing be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● D7.4(a) policy wording to be modified from “ demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units” to “demonstrate how affordable housing units can be provided.” The policy shifts from ‘require’ and more to the ‘encourage’ level, with a requirement on new development to at least examine opportunities to include affordable housing, or confirm why it can’t. The recommended Official Plan policies are one component in achieving affordable housing targets that can work alongside alternative means and programs already in place and under future considerations.</li> <li>● Employee Housing is a new section that provides the ability to consider employee housing as a unique form of housing generally permitted in many areas of the Town. There is no requirement that employee housing must be provided or be affordable.</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>removed from the Plan for the Residential/Recreational Area, and Village Core designations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employee housing policies under B2.18 is understood to be important to ensure workers within the Town are able to access housing. However, it is recommended that the policy be reworded to an objective rather than a requirement as the Owner has no way of guaranteeing access for all employees to affordable and liveable employee housing.</li> <li>No objections to the Short Term Accommodation policies under B2.5 provided that the existing permissions are not removed for the operation of commercial resort units and village commercial resort units in the village.</li> <li>Access policies under D2.2.2 states that “single access to new residential developments will be considered up to 85 units...” Request that the policy remove the reference number threshold and instead reference that “suitable access can be provided” as the number is a technical standard that the owner does not support in the Official Plan.</li> <li>No transition policies are included in the Official Plan. Policies should be added to recongize existing development approvals and to allow for implementing applications to proceed in a manner which is deemed to conform to the Official Plan.</li> <li>The new implementation and administration policies and increased ability for Staff Delegation are positive and should assist with processing timelines. Additional clarity is need on Policy E1.8 and how the “minimum requirements” outlined in this policy will work in relation to the prescribed requirements under the Planning Act, and if the policy is intended that these requirements are ‘in addition to’.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the existing Short Term Accommodation, Commercial Resort or Village Commercial Resort units from the last OP Amendment #3.</li> <li>D2.2.2 text updated to match Town Engineering Standards of one access for 0-100 units, one access plus emergency access or two or more accesses beyond 100 units.</li> <li>Transition policies are as set out in the Planning Act.</li> <li>Section E1.8 Public Participation policies are modified from being required to being suggested.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tyrolean Village Resorts (TVR)</b></p>	<p>October 9, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for Hazard Mapping modifications and 177.9 elevation line modifications at Tyrolean Village Beach Property based on the Shoreline Hazard Assessment and Shoreline construction works that have been completed. It is noted that a topo map has been provided, that the former pond used for a former greenhouse business is shown on the constraint maps and was removed 20+ years ago</li> <li>Requests clarification of dedication of publicly available shoreline. Propose to dedicate northerly end of the subject lands.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised 177.9 line can be included based on as constructed works and updated topo map provided.</li> <li>Policy direction for future park is provided in Section D6.3.6</li> <li>B3.7.4.1 updated to remove the 2<sup>nd</sup> table.</li> <li>Request to modify the 100 Commercial Resort Units to be in addition to (as per OMB Decision Section 1.1(2) page 8) also recognizes additional policy requirements not otherwise</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification requested on Policy B3.7.4.1 and the potential conflicts/confusion between the two tables provided.</li> <li>For Tyrolean Lowlands property, clarification is requested to indicate that the 100 Commercial Resort Units may be permitted in addition to the residential densities permitted on the property. Ontario Municipal Board Minutes of Settlement have been provided to confirm the “in addition to”. See policy B3.7.6.6(c)</li> <li>Inconsistent text is used in the Plan regarding “units” vs. “rooms” in policy B3.9.4(d) and B2.2</li> <li>Short Term Accommodation Mapping to be updated under Policy B2.5(c) and B3.7.6.14 to include the B3.7.6 exception area mapping.</li> </ul>	<p>included in the existing exception (ie- maximum 625 units) no change proposed at this time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text updated to be consistent with “rooms or units” throughout Plan</li> <li>Mapping updates from OPA #3 (Short Term Accommodation OPA) added.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Great Gulf – Castle Glen and Lora Bay (Submitted by MHBC)</b></p>	<p>October 9, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great Gulf are the owners of Castle Glen (Great Dale Manor Limited) and Lora Bay (NG Lora Bay Limited).</li> <li>For Castle Glen Secondary Plan - It is noted that no changes are proposed to the Castle Glen Secondary Plan Area as part of the Town Official Plan update. Great Gulf has no concerns with this approach. It is important that the Official Plan update not impact existing development permissions implemented by the site specific policy framework for Castle Glen.</li> <li>For Lora Bay Land Use Schedule ‘A1’ - Lora Bay, provided with the Draft Official Plan, remains the same as the current approved Schedule ‘A1’. The applicable land use designations are “Recreational Commercial Area”, “Residential Recreational Area”, “Hazard” and “Rural”. We request confirmation of our understanding that the Draft Official Plan of September 2024 does not propose any change to Schedule ‘A1’.</li> <li>The Owner is requesting that the Rural designated lands that form part of the NG Lora Bay Limited land holdings and approximately 15ha in size be redesignated to Residential/Recreational Area. The request is based on information previously provided to Council and Staff while also updating an historical anomaly and to allow for the logical extension of the master planned Lora Bay Community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes are proposed to the Castle Glen Secondary Plan.</li> <li>No changes are proposed to the Lora Bay Land Use Schedule.</li> <li>A number of requests have been received to consideration the redesignation of development lands in order to recognize/advance active or future development project. It is noted that the redesignation of land use designations was not considered as part of this Official Plan 5-Year Review, and that any requests for redesignation other than those providing clarification or error corrections should be considered outside of the 5-Year Review process, and be considered through its own Official Plan Amendment including public process and Council Decision.</li> <li>Height policies allow for taller buildings subject to a site specific OPA. It is noted that the above request for redesignation could also consider new height policies for the Lora Bay Community through the Master Development Agreement update and OPA process.</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The permitted uses in the Residential/Recreational Area designation do not pose a concern, however the policies that apply to apartment type dwellings are also subject to B2.13 in addition to B2.16 and should be clarified in the OP. B2.13 also limits the height of buildings to 3 storeys which is a restrictive limit on apartment dwelling type structures. Under B2.13 an OPA is required for buildings greater than 3 storeys and this height limit results in low rise apartment dwelling type structures which may prove challenging to design and bring to market.</li> <li>• Requests confirmation that the policies of Section B3.8 for the Recreational Commercial Area are not proposed to be modified.</li> <li>• The density policies introduce new restrictive policies on density ranges and maximum height. Although density ranges generally match industry standards, it is noted that it is difficult to achieve 100 units per hectare in an apartment at 3 storeys.</li> <li>• It is requested that Lora Bay be exempt from requiring a minimum of 10 units per hectare due to the master planned nature of the development. Should the proposed densities remain, it is requested that confirmation be provided that the updated open space and density requirements and related policies remain applicable to the Lora Bay master planned community as a whole and are not applicable to separate sub-phases</li> <li>• Regarding the proposed affordable/attainable housing provisions, these policies have the potential to result in required affordable units being subsidized by the remainder of units in a development project and provide no guarantee that units will remain affordable through resale. There are other policies and mechanisms to rely on for the provision of affordable housing units including using viable incentives and it is requested that these policies be removed for this reason.</li> <li>• Confirmation is requested that the 30% requirement for affordable/attainable housing is to be implemented town-wide and not on a development basis. Additionally, if the policy is to remain, the policy should be revised to include “attainable housing” in addition to affordable housing to provide further flexibility and additional range in the housing types to be provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One minor edit proposed to B3.8.4 (d) to recognize that small scale commercial resort accommodation uses may be permitted and limited to 30 rooms or units. Proposed wording is consistent with Policy Section B2.2</li> <li>• 100 UPH can be considered in buildings up to 5 storeys, subject to an approved OPA.</li> <li>• Request for exemption from minimum 10 UPH is not supported. Intent of new minimum density is to be able to offer additional housing types beyond majority of single detached dwellings. Consideration for rowhouses or other multi-attached residential should be consider with future phases. It is noted that the Master Plans are required to be updated and that a refreshed vision for the remaining development parcels be considered.</li> <li>• D7.4(a) policy wording to be modified from “ demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units” to “demonstrate how affordable housing units can be provided.” The policy shifts from ‘require’ and more to the ‘encourage’ level, with a requirement on new development to at least examine opportunities to include affordable housing, or confirm why it can’t. The recommended Official Plan policies are one component in achieving affordable housing targets that can work alongside alternative means and programs already in place and under future considerations.</li> <li>• 30% affordable housing is to be provided town-wide AND on a per-development basis. Although one site may not be deemed a suitable location for affordable/attainable housing, consideration of alternative solutions should be identified</li> </ul>



**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Castle Glen and Lora Bay are master planned areas that have planned functions to provide for resort residential and residential recreational developments. These land uses are unique from other residential areas in the Town and it is recommended that the Official Plan be clear in not requiring affordable or attainable housing to be a component to resort residential or residential recreational developments.</li> <li>• Natural Heritage – Under Section A 3.2.2 of the draft Town Official Plan, the following are noted as strategic objectives:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect and seek out opportunities for net-gain enhancements to significant natural heritage and hydrologic features and their associated habitats and ecological functions.</li> <li>• Prohibit the loss or fragmentation of Provincially Significant Wetlands and significant habitat of endangered and threatened species.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed revision to the first strategic objective takes the natural heritage policies beyond the no negative impact test outlined in the Provincial Policy Statement. It will not be viable with current prohibitions to development in various significant features and functions (e.g., significant woodlands, significant wildlife habitat). We should clarify what protect and seek out opportunities means.</p> <p>Similarly, the second provision does not recognize situations in which permits and agreements allow for the removal of habitat of endangered and threatened species. The term “significant habitat” is not well defined or available/acceptable in practice.</p> </li> <li>• Staging Categories – Section D1.4 is proposed to be updated to in a manner which requires a proponent is required to confirm ‘system capacity’, in addition to ‘plant capacity’. It is requested that clarification be provided around how this policy will be interpreted and what mechanisms will be available for proponents to determine system capacity and ensure conformity with this policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of Castle Glen and Lora Bay without consideration of affordable/attainable housing is not supported. All areas of the Town have a role to play in supporting housing goals of the Town.</li> <li>• Natural Heritage policies are proposed to remain unchanged at this time. Updates will be considered after Council consideration of recommended direction from the Natural Heritage Study. This will likely be completed through a future OPA or through a non-decision at this time with Notice of Decision on final policy updates at a future date.</li> <li>• The Town wishes to confirm with all development projects that the ‘system capacity’ (including plant, pump stations, storage systems, pipe capacity, outfall, etc.) are all evaluated. The Town has retained a third party firm to develop water and waste water models for the Town, and is currently developing a stormwater model. These models are available to provide feedback on system capacity. Use of the models may be subject to agreement and/or cost recovery.</li> <li>• General Road Design criteria are set out as a tool to understand and compare the general road design. These items have been updated as per the Transportation Master Plan and are technically described (and updated from time to time) in the Town Engineering Standards.</li> <li>• D2.2.2 text updated to match Town Engineering Standards of one access for 0-100 units, one access plus emergency access or two or more accesses beyond 100 units.</li> <li>• Transition policies are as set out in the Planning Act.</li> </ul>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads - Section D2.2 provides very specific paved shoulder / multi use trail requirements for different roads in the Town. These requirements are too prescriptive and not suitable for an Official Plan. It is recommended that principles be included but that any specific requirements be removed from the Official Plan.</li> <li>• Access policies under D2.2.2 states that “single access to new residential developments will be considered up to 85 units...” Request that the policy remove the reference number threshold and instead reference that “suitable access can be provided” as the number is a technical standard that the owner does not support in the Official Plan.</li> <li>• No transition policies are included in the Official Plan. Policies should be added to recognize existing development approvals and to allow for implementing applications to proceed in a manner which is deemed to conform to the Official Plan.</li> <li>• The new implementation and administration policies and increased ability for Staff Delegation are positive and should assist with processing timelines. Additional clarity is need on Policy E1.8 and how the “minimum requirements” outlined in this policy will work in relation to the prescribed requirements under the Planning Act, and if the policy is intended that these requirements are ‘in addition to’.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section E1.8 Public Participation policies are modified from being required to being suggested.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association (BMRA)</b></p>	<p>October 1, 2024 AND October 10, 2024</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Timing on some Phase 2 project elements have been extremely compressed.</li> <li>2. The Town is facing unprecedented growth and is accepting additional growth at a faster rate that what is reasonable for a municipality of our size. Much of the proposed growth is more appropriate in the GTA and not in TBM.</li> <li>3. The Town already has lands available to cover growth for the next 25 years and the number of units in the approvals pipeline (4500) exceeds the total number of units required over the next 25 years (3590)</li> <li>4. Growth should be restricted and managed carefully to protect and enhance the livability, functionality, and sustainability of our Town.</li> <li>5. Support OP policies that carefully manage intensification within settlement areas that use infrastructure efficiently, build compact communities, and provide affordable/attainable housing options</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment Received</li> <li>2. Comment Received</li> <li>3. Sufficient lands are available. It is also noted that the approvals pipeline of 4500 units includes a large range of units from those with historic approvals from the 1990’s to those under construction and recently occupied. Draft Plan Approved units plus those under an active planning application are approximately 3000 units.</li> <li>4. Agreed</li> <li>5. Agreed</li> <li>6. Sufficient Lands are available. Modifications to Height/Density policies is also to encourage a broader</li> </ol>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Town has sufficient land to accommodate growth needs without major increases to building heights/densities.</li> <li>7. Building Heights should be limited to 3 storeys for Downtown Core of Thornbury along Hwy 26 from Victoria to Wellington streets as well as Bruce Street. 4 storeys can be considered along HWY 26 in Thornbury and Craigeith Village Community provided that the proposed 12 to 16 m setback from the highway and the 45 degree angular plane from lot lines are approved and strictly enforced. Any requests for building heights greater than 3 storeys outside of the designated areas will require an OPA.</li> <li>8. Do not support 5 storeys, except where already permitted in the Blue Mountain Village Resort Area.</li> <li>9. For Community Living Area designation: Do not support a minimum density of 25 Units Per Hectare (UPH) as proposed. Should be reduced to 20 UPH as per the County of Grey Official Plan.</li> <li>10. For Residential/Recreational Area Designation: Do not support the minimum/maximum of 10/15 UPH. Minimum should be set at 10 and maximum set at 12.</li> <li>11. Community Design Guidelines are essential and must be prepared and approved prior to the OP update. Clear policy links must be made between the Guidelines and Building Height/Intensification/Greenfields.</li> <li>12. Additional references throughout the Plan to the Water/Wastewater Allocation Policy should be added in areas such as infrastructure, housing, etc. This policy are intended to strengthen the Town’s ability to control growth and find efficiencies in infrastructure.</li> <li>13. Water/Wastewater Allocation Policy, Community Improvement Plan and proposed CPPS will see results of key community benefits.</li> <li>14. Intensification and efficient land use requires stopping costly and inefficient sprawl. Principles in the OP are strong, however gaps exist in detailed policies,</li> </ol>	<p>range of housing types. Keeping densities low encourages more large lot, large home single detached dwellings which already represents 80% of the built form in the Town.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Similar comments received from others. Requested extent of 3 storey height limit is significant and severely reduces the opportunity to seek out taller buildings in Thornbury. Modification can be considered to increase building heights up to 4 storeys and that 5<sup>th</sup> storey only permitted where community benefits (such as affordable housing) can be included in the project.</li> <li>8. See Comment 7.</li> <li>9. Current County requirement is 20 UPH except Hanover/Owen Sound at 25 UPH. Grey County is currently looking at 25 UPH for all settlement areas. consideration for increased density is to seek out a larger range of housing types.</li> <li>10. RRA designation may have opportunities for additional mix of housing types beyond single detached and semi detached dwellings. Providing a range between 10-15 provides additional flexibility (particularly on smaller sites) compared to 10-12 UPH.</li> <li>11. Community Design Guidelines are lined up to be completed as soon as direction is received on the Official Plan update. Items such as density and height will impact the direction of the guidelines. It is anticipated to bring in the guidelines early in the new year.</li> <li>12. Comment Received</li> </ol>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>implementation and enforcement. The Natural Heritage Study and Natural Asset Inventory are required to update the relevant OP policies</p> <p>Recommended modifications list:</p> <p>15. A1 THE COMMUNITY VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a reference to the Community Sustainability Plan: The TBM Future Story. A1.1 GUIDING PRINCIPLES</li> <li>• Add a reference our Town’s Declaration of a Climate Emergency to Guiding Principle No. 7.</li> <li>• Strengthen Guiding Principle No. 4 by adding that compact communities require a full range of public and commercial services including, schools, local businesses, etc.</li> </ul> <p>16. A2.2 SETTLEMENT AREAS and A2.3 OTHER COMPONENTS OF THE COMMUNITY STRUCTURE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the repetition of the list of Future Secondary Plan Areas on page 24 intentional?</li> </ul> <p>17. A3.1 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a reference to the Community Sustainability Plan: The TBM Future Story. A3.3 CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION</li> <li>• Strengthen the Goal and Strategic Objectives as per CANN TBM recommendations. A3.4 GROWTH AND SETTLEMENT</li> <li>• Strengthen this Section to support and implement the Water and Wastewater Allocation Policy. A3.5 URBAN COMMUNITY CHARACTER</li> <li>• In Section A3.5.2.6 replace “consider” with “must include”. A3.6 RURAL AND OPEN SPACE CHARACTER</li> <li>• Add a Strategic Objective that references conformity with the Natural Heritage Study and Natural Asset Inventory.</li> </ul>	<p>13. Comment Received</p> <p>14. Natural Heritage Study is nearing completion. Recommendations from that study will be inserted into the Official Plan when available. This may be completed by area of non-decision or future Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>15. Future Story added throughout and updated from Sustainable Path, declaration of climate emergency added, no change to A1.1(4) as themes are picked up in other subsections.</p> <p>16. Duplication deleted</p> <p>17. A3.1 updated as per CANN comments as noted in this matrix, no change to A3.4, A5.5.2(6), A3.6 to be considered after further direction is received on the Natural Heritage Study.</p>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>18. A3.8 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a Strategic Objective that recognizes the specific economic development needs of Craigeith Village, with a focus on building a complete, fully serviced community.</li> </ul> <p>19. A3.10 INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a reference to the Water and Wastewater Allocation Policy. A3.11 AFFORDABLE AND ATTAINABLE HOUSING</li> <li>• Add a reference to the Housing Needs Assessment and the Community Improvement Program. A4.1 URBAN DESIGNATIONS</li> <li>• The definition of Future Secondary Plan Area in Section A4.1.15 differs from the definition used in A2.3.</li> </ul> <p>20. B2.5 SHORT-TERM ACCOMMODATION USES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Official Plan Amendment No. 3, adopted by the passage of By-law 2023-58 on August 28, 2023, is not fully integrated into the updated OP. Section B2.5 c) should be changed to refer</li> </ul> <p>21. specifically to Section B3.7.6.14 (i.e., replacing B3.7.6). Section B3.7.6.14 (Schedule A-1, which defines the Exception Area for OPA No. 3) has not yet been added to the updated OP and must be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections B2.5 c) and B2.5 d) i) clearly prohibit all short-term accommodation uses in residential neighbourhoods outside of the Exception Area defined in Section B3.7.6.14. Further</li> </ul> <p>22. clarification and the elimination of potential confusion is therefore required in Section B2.5 a) by deleting the following statement: “In some cases, such commercial accommodations may be considered appropriate in some residential areas, provided they are adequately regulated to avoid land use conflicts with the surrounding area”.</p> <p>23. B2.9 CONVERTED DWELLINGS</p>	<p>18. Goals and Objectives include those focused on Craigeith.</p> <p>19. No references added to Allocation Policy, Housing Needs Assessment or Community Improvement Plan. Future Secondary Plan Area duplication is corrected. It being noted that the Area East of Thornbury has been removed as it contains one parcel and does not warrant a full secondary planning exercise to be completed.</p> <p>20. Short Term Accommodation OPA #3 has been added</p> <p>21. See Comment #20</p> <p>22. No change. B2.5(a) identifies a wide range of accommodation uses such as bed and breakfasts that may still be appropriate in residential areas. remaining policies are quite clear when it comes strictly to where STA’s shall be located under B2.5(d)</p> <p>23. No change. No definition for large single/semi other than what will be inserted through the future Zoning By-law update where a minimum floor area requirement will be provided. Until such time as a the Zoning By-law is updated an amendment to the By-law will be required for any converted dwellings at the discretion of Council.</p>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We support up to four units permitted within an existing building footprint in the Community Living Area designation, provided the intensification criteria are satisfied.</li> <li>• Further clarification is required to distinguish “Converted Dwelling” from “Additional Dwelling Unit” (as defined in the Glossary) and specify what constitutes a “larger single or semi- detached dwelling.”</li> </ul> <p>24. B.2.13 BUILDING HEIGHT Change wording in the third paragraph in Section B2.13 to “Compatible intensification up to four (4) storeys (or 16 metres) is encouraged along Highway 26 in the Craigeith Village Community, and along Highway 26 in Thornbury outside of the low-rise downtown Thornbury core. For the purpose of this Plan, the downtown Thornbury core consists of properties within the Downtown Area designation along Bruce Street, and along Highway 26 between Victoria Street and Wellington Street.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change wording in the fourth paragraph in Section B2.13 to clarify that 4 storey buildings may be permitted through a site-specific ZBA only within the designated areas: “In the designated areas of Craigeith and Thornbury noted in the above paragraph, 4 storey buildings may be permitted through a site-specific Zoning By-law Amendment, provided the height criteria and general intensification criteria set out in Section B2.14 are met: “</li> <li>• Add a direct reference to the required setback of 12-16 metres from the Hwy 26 road allowance (see Section B3.3.4.1).</li> <li>• Add a reference to a requirement for affordable or attainable housing</li> </ul> <p>25. B2.14 EXISTING RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note typo: “now” housing.</li> </ul> <p>26. B2.16 INTENSIFICATION CRITERIA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The word “considers” in items i) and j) should be replaced by “adheres to” or “conforms with” or another term/phrase to require implementation.</li> </ul>	<p>24. Modifications to the height policies. See Comment 7 Maximum metres also added to Height section: 3 Storeys = 11 m 4 storeys = 14 m 5 storeys = 16 m Setback of 12-16 metres added from B3.3.4.1 to B2.13(f). Affordable housing added to 5<sup>th</sup> storey as a community benefit.</p> <p>25. Corrected.</p> <p>26. No change to use of “considers” Council decision required to determine how these matters have been considered and incorporated into a project.</p>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a requirement to conform with the updated Community Design Guidelines.</li> <li>• Add a requirement to link intensification to community benefits such as affordable/attainable housing, GDS, etc. Repeat this requirement in the last paragraph of this Section so it applies specifically to pre-zoning.</li> <li>• Clarification is required to ensure that the definition of “intensification” in the Glossary does not enable overriding of any of the density or height limits in the OP.</li> </ul> <p>27. B2.17 GREENFIELD CRITERIA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The word “considers” in item i) should be replaced by “adheres to” or “conforms with” or another term/phrase to require implementation.</li> <li>• Add a requirement to conform with the updated Community Design Guidelines.</li> <li>• Add a requirement in B2.17 i) to link Greenfield development to the provision of community benefits.</li> </ul> <p>28. B3.1.4 Density and Height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Maximum Height limits in the accompanying chart should be expressed in metres as well as number of storeys.</li> <li>• “Half storey” should be defined.</li> <li>• BMRA’s position is that a maximum of 100 units per hectare for multiple &amp; apartment units would represent an extreme and unprecedented change for most of the Community Living Area and difficult or impossible to achieve without compromising open/green spaces, vegetation, compatible yards/setbacks and other compatibility requirements as defined in Sections B2.16 and B2.17.</li> <li>• Consider re-inserting the following statement to accommodate circumstances where achieving the stated minimum density may not be possible: “It is recognized that in some areas maximum density may not be appropriate.”</li> </ul>	<p>27. See Comment #26, No change to B2.17(i) as updates to B.13 include commentary on community benefit.</p> <p>28. Metres added, Half storey defined in Zoning By-law, 100 UPH comment received, flexibility to reduce density has been overused in the past and should be removed, comments on 25 vs 20 UPH provided under Comment 9</p>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain the minimum density of 20 units per net hectare in new Greenfield areas in accordance with the direction of the County of Grey Official Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>B3.3 DOWNTOWN AREA</b></p> <p>29. Change language in B3.3.1 to: “establish Downtown Thornbury along Highway 26 (Arthur Street West/King Street East) as the Town’s primary focus area for intensification, while preserving the low-rise character of the Downtown Core, which includes properties along Bruce Street within the Downtown Area designation, and properties along Highway 26 between Victoria Street and Wellington Street;”</p> <p>30. Change language in B3.3.4 d) to: “limiting the height of new and renovated buildings to a maximum of three storeys within Thornbury’s downtown core, which includes properties along Bruce Street, all of Downtown Clarksburg, and along Highway 26 between Victoria Street and Wellington Street, in order to maintain consistent facades and preserve the character of each main street;”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change language in B3.3.4 e) to: “encouraging mixed use intensification and the progression of taller buildings up to four (4) storeys along Highway 26 (Arthur Street West/King Street East) in Thornbury, outside of the downtown core and in accordance with Section B2.13;”</li> <li>This statement in Section B3.3.41 concerning setbacks from Highway 26 is important and should be repeated in B2.13 BUILDING HEIGHT, : “j) to maintain and enhance the open space landscape character of properties along Highway 26, and to ensure the continued and improved feeling of spaciousness along the well-travelled Highway 26 corridor, buildings shall be setback a minimum of 12 metres and a maximum of 16 metres from the front property line. “</li> </ul>	<p>29. See previous commentary on building height</p> <p>30. See previous commentary on building height, B3.3.4.1 policy also added to B2.13 (f), Downtown Core is referring to Thornbury general, Downtown Area is referring to land use designation, B3.3.5.3 updated.</p>



Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule A-2 should be amended to ensure that the mapping and terminology used is consistent with definitions of Downtown Core, Downtown Area, etc. in the OP text.</li> <li>• This language in Section B3.3.5.3 requires a change to be consistent with earlier sections: “Outside of the downtown core, compatible intensification up to four (4) storeys is encouraged in the Downtown Area designation in Thornbury, along Highway 26 (Arthur Street West/King Street East) on appropriately sized and situated lots and subject to the height criteria set out in Section B2.13 and the general intensification criteria set out in Section B2.16.”</li> </ul> <p>31. B3.4 COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a requirement to conform with Section B2.16 INTENSIFICATION CRITERIA and the Community Design Guidelines. Ensure that the specific setback requirements for 4 storey buildings (12-16 metres from Highway 26, 45-degree plane from adjacent lot lines) apply within this land use designation.</li> </ul> <p>32. B3.7.4.1 Density and Open Space Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMRA supports the addition of a Minimum Density requirement of 10 units per gross hectare.</li> <li>• BMRA does not support the Maximum Density of 15 units per gross hectare. This represents a major increase of 50%, and raises concerns about whether the Minimum Open Space Component of 40% can be maintained and enforced. We recommend a Maximum Density of 12 units per gross hectare in the Residential/Recreation Area.</li> <li>• Note typo in B3.7.4.2 Further Lot Creation: Delete “the”. B3.12 CRAIGLEITH VILLAGE COMMUNITY</li> </ul>	<p>31. B3.4 Commercial Corridor does not permit buildings taller than 3 storeys. OPA required should one be proposed. Development criteria may seek direction from B2.16 and B2.13 and ultimately considered by Council</p> <p>32. See earlier comment on density limits. No change to 40% open space requirement, “the” deleted, Craigleith Village Community includes those areas with ‘Craigleith Village’ land use designations however the community is not intended to have a hard border and may spill into adjacent lands such as with hazard and open space lands, no change to B3.12.3.1.1(f) regarding building heights. Craigleith density numbers were carried forward from the original Official Plan Amendment and master planned community for the Aquavil development. Residential densities are to meet all policy criteria.</p>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B3.12.1 Location; Note that “Craigleith Village Community” is not shown on Schedule A-4. Components such as Craigleith Village Commercial and Craigleith Village Residential are represented.</li> <li>• There is confusing language is B3.12.3.1.1 f) regarding building heights. Clarification is required.</li> <li>• Clarification is required to determine the maximum number of residential units permitted in the Craigleith Village Community. Section B3.12.3.2.1 a) specifies the maximum number of units per Sub-area. Does this override the maximum units determined by allowable densities permitted by housing unit type, as referenced in B3.12.3.2.1 a)</li> </ul> <p>33. B5.2 NATURAL HERITAGE FEATURES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intensification and efficient land use within Settlement Areas requires protecting our valuable and unique natural heritage features, including wetlands, watersheds, woodlands, tree canopy, and other natural assets. It is acknowledged in this Section that “the location and significance of these features has yet to be determined in some cases”. Policies must be updated by integrating findings from the Natural Heritage Study (NHS) and Natural Asset Inventory (NAI) as soon as possible.</li> <li>• Mandate ecologically sustainable natural buffers between the built environment and rivers, streams, wetlands, watersheds, and other natural assets; extending this to include prevention of sprawl and strict protection of all natural assets. Policies in B5.2.1 that specify minimum distances between development and Natural Heritage Features should be strengthened and updated to ensure consistency with NHS/NAI findings.</li> <li>• Policies that direct potential site alteration or development within Natural Heritage Features must be updated to ensure that no development is permitted on these lands under any circumstances. Examples include:</li> </ul>	<p>33. Natural Heritage Study and Natural Asset Inventory require further direction from Council on proposed recommendations and direction. Once received updates will be considered by way of Official Plan Amendment or similar to the Official Plan, No change to separation distances and buffering from natural heritage features as these requirements are working well. Recommendations from NHS may provide modifications, strict prohibition of site alteration and development within natural heritage features may go too far. NHS may provide modifications. No change at this time to B5.2.1(b) and B5.4.2(c)(v)</p>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>B5.2.1 b): Delete the statement that would allow development if “it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.”</p> <p>B5.4.2 c) v): Delete the statement that would allow development if “there is no feasible location for the development outside of the Hazard Lands designation.”</p> <p>34. B5.4 HAZARD LANDS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add Stormwater Management Ponds to the definition of Hazard Lands.</li> </ul> <p>35. C4 GROUND AND SURFACE WATER RESOURCES (SOURCEWATER PROTECTION)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate findings from the NHS and NAI where relevant and as soon as possible.</li> <li>• Strengthen policies to mandate stronger adherence to the 30-meter setback from watercourses and protect abutting local, non-invasive vegetation and trees on along watercourses, and within or near watersheds and wetlands.</li> <li>• What is the rationale for deleting the requirement to map sensitive groundwater areas (Section C4.2)?</li> <li>• Expand Section C4 to include water quality related to public beaches. Protection must be given to ensuring water quality is not compromised for the safety of residents and visitors</li> </ul> <p>36. C4.3 GENERAL POLICIES, C4.4 SIGNIFICANT THREATS, C5 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the specific requirements in these Sections are consistent with the most up-to- date standards for flood control and resilience to extreme weather events. Connect with CANN</li> </ul> <p>37. C8 WATERSHED PLANNING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Watershed planning must become top priority in TBM. Watershed and Sub-watershed Plans must be completed as soon as possible, along with OP policies that reference and mandate adherence to these Plans.</li> </ul>	<p>34. Stormwater Management Ponds are only partially recognized for their hazardous conditions where development should not be considered. Site alteration and structures are required for these facilities including maintenance and modifications.</p> <p>35. NHS recommendations to be considered. Lakes and watercourses (30 metres) added to table under B5.2, B5.4.2 and C2.1 modified for consistency. No development within 30 metres, unless authorized by the Conservation Authority and the County of Grey.</p> <p>36. Comments regarding CANN submission are addressed in this matrix</p> <p>37. Comment Received</p> <p>38. Comments on Allocation policy provided</p>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>38. D1.4 STAGING CATEGORIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is unclear where/how the Water and Wastewater Allocation Policy, including the evaluation of community benefits associated with development proposals, fits into the staging policies in Section D1.4. References to the Water and Wastewater Allocation Policy should be included in this Section and in the Sections B3 URBAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS and B2 RURAL COUNTRYSIDE DESIGNATIONS where relevant.</li> </ul> <p>39. D2 TRANSPORTATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional policies to address traffic congestion on Highway 26 are required. An Objective to revisit the 2015 study by MTO on a potential bypass around Thornbury and Clarksburg has been added, but it is well-known that this is a long-term goal with multiple complexities and uncertainties. In the meantime, increased building heights and densities along Highway 26 are proposed, with no clear policies to address the inevitable increases in traffic along a route that is already at capacity during peak times, according to the Town’s Transportation Master Plan.</li> </ul> <p>40. D2.2 ROADS IN THE TOWN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BMRA supports the integration of active transportation design guidelines within the General Design Guidelines in Table 1. Updated Community Design Guidelines must include the infrastructure improvements required to support Active Transportation to support community and neighbourhood compatibility, in addition to transportation safety and efficiency. Policies to reference and ensure adherence to the Community Design Guidelines must be added to this Section.</li> </ul> <p>41. D2.5 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some strengthening of language is required (e.g., replace “encourage” with “require” in items o) and p) regarding bicycle racks.</li> </ul> <p>42. D5.1 OBJECTIVES</p>	<p>39. No change to D2</p> <p>40. No change to D2.2</p> <p>41. D2.5(o) updated. No change to D2.5</p> <p>42. Comment received</p>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The importance of ensuring that developments adhere to high quality design principles is clearly stated in Section D5.1, and supports BMRA recommendations regarding ensuring high- quality design and compatibility with established neighbourhoods and communities.</li> </ul> <p>43. D5.2 DESIGN POLICIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The link to Town-wide Community Design Guidelines is established in D5.2. The OP should not be approved without the updated Community Design Guidelines in place. This Section should ensure all developments must conform to the Community Design Guidelines, as well as other relevant Town plans and policies where relevant.</li> </ul> <p>44. D5.4 HIGHWAY 26 CORRIDOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A definition of “buffer strips” is required.</li> </ul> <p>D6 PARKLAND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parklands and Trail Networks play an important role in the protection and enhancement of tree canopy and other natural heritage features. Policies are required in Sections D6.3.1 and D6.3.5 to ensure that opportunities to protect and enhance these features are identified and implemented.</li> <li>• Include a policy to prevent clear cutting of trees on TBM Parks and Open Spaces.</li> </ul> <p>45. D7 HOUSING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMRA supports the policies set out in Section D7, while recognizing that these policies will only be successful with the application of tools such as the Water and Wastewater Allocation By-law, the CPPS, and the CIP, which incorporate mechanisms to require or provide incentives to ensure that housing objectives and targets are achieved.</li> </ul>	<p>43. Existing Community Guidelines remain in effect. Commentary on timing provided earlier in this comments matrix</p> <p>44. Buffer strips are defined as 10 metres with new developments subject to approval by Town Council, new policy added at D6.3.1(l) “Consider minimizing tree and vegetation removal on Town owned parks and open spaces and include consideration of existing tree/vegetation cover in the planned function of a proposed park.”</p> <p>45. Comments Received, D7.4 policy updated. D7.3 updated by re-inserting original text and reference to the Housing Needs Assessment. Section D7.1 of the Plan requires annual housing monitoring which will become a standard update to Council after year end.</p>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMRA does not support the use of “voluntary contributions” in lieu of affordable builds without an approved and fair regulatory framework. This framework should be enabled in the OP.</li> <li>• Add a reference to the Housing Needs Assessment, which should include targets for affordable, attainable and/or rental housing units. Policy should state that the Housing Needs Assessment and targets require continuous updating.</li> </ul> <p>46. D8 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update this Section to address environment and climate change priorities, including alignment with the Recommendations and Bold Actions from the TBM Future Story.</li> </ul> <p>47. D8.1 GREEN DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand the current list of GDS topics to include efficient use of municipal infrastructure, reducing GHG emissions from buildings and transportation, energy efficiency (link to D8.4), complete communities, green space, and climate change resilience. Continue to take leadership in GDS, while coordinating with Grey County, the Province, and neighbouring municipalities.</li> <li>• Delete “minimum” in Section D8.1(c) i) and ii).</li> </ul> <p>48. D8.2 TREE CANOPY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen and expand this Section by referencing available tools and resources, such as the Tree Inventory and NHS/NAI. Develop stronger community tree protection policies. Ensure protection of mature trees in parks, open spaces and boulevards, and all Natural Heritage areas.</li> <li>• Add policies to prevent clear-cutting of developable lands, to require tree canopy assessments as part of approvals processes, and to specify tree replacement requirements in cases where removal is required.</li> <li>• Include policies to guide and enable a Tree Protection By-law applicable to TBM settlement areas.</li> </ul>	<p>46. Minor edit to recognize Future Story completed. Bold actions outlined earlier in Official Plan.</p> <p>47. D8.1 modified to include additional text. ‘minimum’ text not removed as minimum standards are targeted</p> <p>48. It is anticipated that the results from the NHS/NAI will recommend modifications to this section.</p>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a stronger policy statement on the protection of established trees in both settlement areas as well as woodlands, watersheds and other natural features.</li> <li>• Require implementation of tree canopy protection/enhancement policies through tools including a Tree Inventory and a Tree Protection By-law applicable to TBM Settlement Areas.</li> <li>• Ensure that tree canopy protection and enhancement is fully integrated within Community Design Guidelines.</li> </ul> <p>49. D8.4 ENERGY CONSERVATION AND EFFICIENCY MEASURES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen language in Section D8.4 by replacing terms such as “promote” and “encourage” with “require”, “ensure”, or “mandate”.</li> <li>• Note missing words in e) iii) (e.g., maximizing use of existing buildings).</li> </ul> <p>D8.5 AIR QUALITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand policies to encourage reduced vehicle idling times through measures that reduce congestion on Highway 26 and in settlement areas.</li> </ul> <p>50. D8.6 WATER CONSERVATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a “support the implementation of Green Development Standards as they relate to water conservation.</li> </ul> <p>51. E1.2 COMMUNITY PLANNING PERMIT BY-LAW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply a CPP By-law on a pilot basis in a carefully selected area as an initial stage of CPPS implementation. This approach is required to test the effectiveness of this planning tool, determine how it can be applied effectively in TBM, and promote widespread public awareness and understanding of how the CPPS differs from established planning processes.</li> <li>• Ensure extensive public engagement prior to the implementation of a pilot CPP By-law.</li> <li>• Add direct references to the protection/enhancement of natural heritage features and climate change mitigation/adaptation in Section E1.2.</li> </ul>	<p>49. No change to D8.4 and D8.5</p> <p>50. D8.6 and D8.1 covers this item</p> <p>51. CPPS project is scheduled to begin in 2025. Official Plan policies provide the framework/options that Council may consider as part of the CPPS. As part of the project an OPA may be needed to refine the OP policies related to the CPPS to be implemented.</p> <p>52. Site Plan Control powers are provided under the Planning Act and does not include the references provided. It is noted that other policies of the Official Plan may be relied on for Site Plan applications or for combined applications to the Town.</p> <p>53. No Change to E3.1</p> <p>54. No Change to E3.5</p> <p>55. No Change to E10</p>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>52. E1.7 SITE PLAN CONTROL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add direct references to protection/enhancement of natural heritage features and climate change mitigation/adaptation.</li> </ul> <p>53. E3.1 SECONDARY PLANS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a policy to ensure that development is not permitted on lands in any Future Secondary Plan Area prior to Plan completion and approval. The policy should not preclude single family dwelling construction on vacant property.</li> </ul> <p>54. E3.5 COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add direct references to protection/enhancement of natural heritage features and climate change mitigation/adaptation to Section E3.3.3 I).</li> </ul> <p>55. E10 COMPLETE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add Green Development Standards to Section E10 e).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Pamela Spence (Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>October 14, 2024</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the Open House and Public Meeting presentation materials do not reflect the Draft Official Plan document policies.</li> <li>No need to increase densities as sufficient development is already approved or designated to cover growth needs without increasing density.</li> <li>The growth forecasts of 1.8 people per household is different than other Town documents that use 2.1 people per household</li> <li>Page 16 Paragraph 1 states that 80% of growth is going to Thornbury/Clarksburg however actual data indicates that majority of growth is going to Lora Bay / Craigleith</li> <li>Craigleith has 1200 units at various approval stages, should additional attention be given to commercial needs? School sites?</li> <li>References to “Sustainable Path” are outdated and should refer to the direction of the “Future Story” the Bold Actions and policies of Future Story must be engrained in the Plan up front and throughout. See also comments from the CANN.</li> <li>Other Town Plans should be outlined and incorporated into the guiding principles.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment received</li> <li>Comment received</li> <li>Growth allocations paper suggests 2.21 persons per unit in 2021 with a decline to 2.04 persons per unit by 2046. Not clear where the 1.8 people per household reference is located</li> <li>Sentence referring to 80-85% is deleted as it was based on previous growth management work completed for the 2016 Official Plan update.</li> <li>Commercial needs were not examined as part of this update. Discussions with school boards remain active regarding the need for additional school sites and where.</li> <li>Sustainable Path / Future Story updates completed. (See CANN and BMRA commentary)</li> <li>No changes to Guiding Principles</li> </ol>



**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>8. The Town does not want to be considered “urban” and terms throughout the Plan should be removed.</p> <p>9. More clear differentiation is required between affordable housing and attainable housing. Alignment between Section A3.11 and D7.3 and D7.4 should be reviewed.</p> <p>10. Section D7.3 has no content and Housing Needs Assessment Study information should be inserted here</p> <p>11. Section D7.4(b) should be re-worded by deleting “planning to achieve” and replacing with “setting”</p> <p>12. More work is required regarding critical housing mix and affordability</p> <p>13. Maximum building heights should be clarified where an OPA and/or ZBA application or as-of-right permissions exist. A maximum height in metres should also be added. Clarification on where the 12-16 metre setback requirement policy is located in the Plan.</p> <p>14. Intensification definition is confusing, and there are no requirements for the provision of community benefits in exchange for intensification.</p> <p>15. Clear linkages are required between building heights and intensification with Community Design Guidelines. Existing references are few and weak. Updated Guidelines and supported by the community are required prior to accepting height/density changes.</p> <p>16. Density increases are too high at 50% from existing levels. Increases should be limited to 10-12% only. Density increases should be tied to the provision of community benefit and not just town wide. The density charts are confusing as maximum densities are proposed at 10-15 UPH, however apartment units can be built up to 100 UPH and may not support housing affordability.</p> <p>17. If more compact neighbourhoods are the goal, consideration should be given to increasing the minimum open space requirement and not density.</p> <p>18. Do not support 5 storey height limit except in Blue Mountain Village. How will the increased height permissions impact the buildout of Craigeith commercial corridor?</p>	<p>8. No changes to the use of “urban”</p> <p>9. Affordable and Attainable housing definitions are provided. Details on prices, income requirements, etc. are set out by the province and also the Town CIP</p> <p>10. Previous text from D7.3 re-added. New addition to recognize the Housing Needs Assessment has been added.</p> <p>11. No change to D7.4(b). it is noted updates are proposed to D7.4(a)</p> <p>12. Comment received</p> <p>13. Building Height commentary provided earlier in this document. Modifications have been included.</p> <p>14. No change to intensification. Community benefits are not required.</p> <p>15. Community Design Guidelines are scheduled to come forward after Council provides direction on Official Plan policy early in the new year.</p> <p>16. Density comments are similar to those provided by BMRA and addressed above. Density charts have been edited. Apartments in the RRA at 100 UPH are unlikely based on the requirement to not exceed 10-15 UPH on a development site.</p> <p>17. No change to the 40% open space requirement</p> <p>18. Height commentary provided above</p> <p>19. Highway 26 includes policies for buffering from adjacent development.</p> <p>20. NHS and NAI to be inserted after Council has provided direction on the final report and recommendations provided.</p> <p>21. Recommendations from Drainage Master Plan to be considered after completion</p>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<p>19. Highway 26 corridor should be preserved as a parkway road except for Thornbury and Craigeith Village areas. The Georgian Trail should be recognized as a linear park and preserved for active transportation and access to side trails.</p> <p>20. Findings to date on the Natural Heritage Study and Natural Asset Inventory must be integrated and implemented in this version of the OP</p> <p>21. Findings from the Drainage Master Plan should be added to the OP</p> <p>22. Stormwater Management Ponds / Facilities should be recognized as hazardous and not open space. Therefore put into a 'Hazard' or 'Environmental Protection' designation.</p> <p>23. Concerned that 2016 objectives of watershed planning sections are unchanged and that these objectives have still not been implemented.</p> <p>24. Five additional pages are provided of page specific recommended wording modifications.</p>	<p>22. Comments on Storm Ponds provided with BMRA responses</p> <p>23. Comment received</p> <p>24. Changes to be reviewed</p>
<p><b>Richard Lamperstorfer</b> <b>(Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>October 15, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly supports the proposed increase in building heights and density.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>acknowledged</li> </ul>
<p><b>Betty Muise</b> <b>(TBM Tree Trust)</b></p>	<p>October 15, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree Trust TBM is a registered charity and part of an expanding network of chapters across Ontario,. Active in TBM since 2020, initiating, managing and participating in numerous tree care, tree protection and tree planting programs.</li> <li>Preservation of established trees must be prioritized and recommendations are provided to Section D8.2 Tree Canopy:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add language to recognize the critical role of established trees in environmental protection, climate change adaptation/mitigation, and maintaining the natural beauty, recreational amenities, and identity of our Town. Language should acknowledge the importance of large, established shade trees vs ornamental shrubs.</li> <li>Add policies to ensure that the preservation of existing trees is a priority in all development on public and private lands in TBM.</li> <li>Add policies to guide and enable a Tree Protection By-law applicable to all TBM Settlement Areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree Canopy policies are not proposed to be modified at this time. The completion of the Natural Asset Inventory and Natural Heritage Study requires further direction from Council to undertake further policy review that will be brought into the Official Plan once Council endorses the next stage of those Studies and recommendations. The Comments raised here will be shared through the Natural Asset Inventory / Natural Heritage Study for consideration.</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:				Staff Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add policies to prevent clear-cutting of trees on developable lands. Mandate the preparation and approval of a Tree Inventory and Tree Preservation Plan as part of the development approval process. These documents must clearly identify mature trees by DBH (diameter at breast height) and include measures for their preservation. Native, healthy species and trees with an estimated age of greater than 40 years should be highlighted and alternatives to removal considered and incentivized.</li> <li>• Ensure that tree removal is permitted only as specified in an approved Tree Inventory and Tree Preservation Plan. If removal is necessary, a high replacement ratio should be required based the on cumulative DBH of the tree removed, not a stem ratio, which significantly under-represents the ecological value of mature trees.</li> <li>• Ensure that tree canopy protection and enhancement is fully integrated within Community Design Guidelines.</li> </ul>				
<b>Royalton Homes</b>	October 21, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In light of the Master Development Agreement we suggest that Section B3.12.3.2.1 d) be clarified by modifying the second sentence to read as: “Specifically, the dedication to the Town, or, the availability of shorefront access to the community to the satisfaction of Council for lands including 6.0metres southerly of the 15.0 metre wave uprush zone”.</li> <li>• Likewise, under Section B3.12.4 d) be clarified by having the second sentence read as; “ It therefore shall be a policy of this Plan to require the provision of recreational lands and/or facilities including the dedication, or availability to the community to Councils satisfaction, of shorefront lands.”</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modifications included to B3.12.3.2.1(d) and B3.12.4(d)</li> </ul>
<b>County of Grey</b>	November 6, 2024	1	B2.7	<p><b>Policy/Matter Considered</b></p> <p>ARU provisions apply to all land use designations, allowing for two ARU units in main dwelling, and one within a detached accessory structure.</p> <p>Note: Section 4.3.2 (5) of PPS 2024, Lands now states:</p>	<p><b>Change suggestions; refs</b></p> <p>County Staff suggest that revision is required to B2.7 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify a maximum of two ARU’s are permitted. The current wording could be interpreted as permitting a total of three ARU’s. These</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarification changes completed</li> <li>2. Garden suites policies are proposed to be removed and replaced by additional residential units section B2.7. it is recognized that a garden suite is intended to be temporary and that temporary buildings/structures including trailers or similar could be considered.</li> <li>3. Clarification added to definition of Cannabis Production Facility. Buffers are proposed to increase to 300 metres</li> </ol>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:		Staff Response:
			<p><i>Where a residential dwelling is permitted on a lot in a prime agricultural area, <b>up to two additional residential units shall be permitted in accordance with provincial guidance, provided that, where two additional residential units are proposed, at least one of these additional residential units is located within or attached to the principal dwelling, and any additional residential units:</b></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) comply with the minimum distance separation formulae;</i></li> <li><i>b) are compatible with, and would not hinder, surrounding agricultural operations;</i></li> <li><i>c) have appropriate sewage and water services;</i></li> <li><i>d) address any public health and safety concerns;</i></li> <li><i>e) are of limited scale and are located within, attached, or in close</i></li> </ul>	<p>two ARU units may both be in the main residential unit (detached, semi-detached, row) or one of the units may be located within a building or structure ancillary to the main residential building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Agriculturally Designated lands, any revision should reflect that where two ARUs are proposed, at least one of the additional residential units is to be located within or attached to the principal dwelling, and that MDS applies</li> </ul> <p>based on comments received and further research. The concept of using a holding ‘-h’ symbol appears to be an option that can be considered through the Zoning By-law update stage.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Excellent point raised with regards to demonstrating that the housing form enhances the range of housing options in the Town and that new development does not need to match the existing character, as much as the evolution of character and change of the community. Changes proposed to B2.13 (3<sup>rd</sup> last paragraph)</li> <li>5. No change. Proposed policy identifies a test of ‘minimal adverse impact’ recognizing that impacts are anticipated, that the impacts may be adverse, however adverse impact shall be minimal.</li> <li>6. Definition updated. Permitted uses updated. OP to recognize ‘Child Care Facilities’ which include licensed child care for Child Care Centre, Home Child Care (maximum 6 kids) and unlicensed child care (maximum 5 kids) as defined in the Child Care and Early Years Act.</li> <li>7. See #6</li> <li>8. Office uses removed, paragraph 1 edited, new last paragraph removes adult entertainment establishments and identifies prohibited uses as per PPS 2024. Section B2.1 remains in place</li> <li>9. See #6</li> <li>10. Table of contents to be updated</li> <li>11. See #6</li> <li>12. See #6</li> </ol>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:		Staff Response:
			<p><i>proximity to the principal dwelling or farm building cluster; and</i>  <i>f) minimize land taken out of agricultural production.</i></p>	<p>13. Extra table removed. The min/max densities shall be followed. On larger sites where a mix of housing types can be provided, single detached units at lower densities may offset higher density uses. Removed table set target densities by housing type, however site specific considerations must be given to appropriate density that still meets the min/max densities provided.</p> <p>14. Grey County added where other agencies are listed against stormwater policies. Changes made to to B3.10.9(j) and C2.1</p> <p>15. Cannot find the reference to B3.10.9(s) and B3.10.9(t). No change at this time</p> <p>16. Comments are too general to consider overhaul of Section B4. Further discussion required on this item</p> <p>17. B4.1.1 updated to also recognize temporary farm help and ARU's along with full time farm help.</p> <p>18. OFDU chart is included in B4.1.9. Wineries have been added to the chart with permissions to exist on Ag parcels &lt; 20ha and special Ag parcels &lt;10ha using the same standards under the rural designation.</p> <p>19. See #18</p> <p>20. See #18</p> <p>21. Section B4.1.8 deleted and replaced with OFDU, Agricultural Related Uses, and Agricultural Uses in Chart B4.2.3.1</p> <p>22. Paragraph 1 of B4.2.4.3 has been deleted.</p> <p>23. Last paragraph of B4.4.4.1 (b) modified to clearly require the Nitrate Study in accordance with MECP D5 guidelines.</p> <p>24. No change to B4.4.4.5. await the outcome of GCOPA #23</p>
2	B2.9	<p>This section relating to Garden Suites has been removed in its entirety.</p>	<p>Curious regarding associated rationale. Despite provisions relating to ARU's, there may still be times where a temporary/removable unit is desirable.</p> <p>Should this be reincorporated, please note that a garden suite would be counted towards total permitted ARU's on a lot, where one exists. Section 4.2.6 of the GCOP applies. Also, the related definition should be read within the definitions section of the Plan.</p>	
3	B2.12	<p>Sensitive land uses shall be setback a minimum of 150 metres from a <i>cannabis production facility</i> unless noise and air quality studies are undertaken to demonstrate a lesser setback can be justified through a site-specific amendment to the Zoning By-law.</p>	<p>Staff suggest revision to the definition of <i>Cannabis Production Facility</i>, to reflect that these restrictions would apply to licensed facilities, and not production under personal use permissions (4 plants/residence), nor in the case of a cannabis registration or designation for personal medical production.</p>	

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:		Staff Response:	
				<p>With respect to the intent to apply the 150m setback from sensitive use on a reciprocal basis, perhaps policy wording could be included noting how this will be implemented. For example, will a 150m wide holding provision be placed on the surrounding lands? If so, by what process and how will those landowners be consulted? Will this be measured from buildings, or the lot line? Will accessory and agricultural buildings be permitted within this setback area? Etc.</p>	<p>25. Town Staff agree that modifications to the Town Official Plan should be considered by way of modification should GCOPA #23 come into effect prior to the County issuing a decision on the TBM OP update.</p> <p>26. See #25</p> <p>27. Added reference to Section B4.1.1</p> <p>28. Aggregate Resource Areas have been updated</p> <p>29. Policy text added.</p> <p>30. New Section B4.7.4.9 added</p> <p>31. Policy added to B5.2</p> <p>32. Policy B5.5.7 includes additional policy text</p> <p>33. Policy B5.5.3 deleted and replaced with County Official Plan Text</p> <p>34. County of Grey added.</p>
		4	<p>B2.13</p> <p>“It is recognized that residential intensification can promote a walkable community, invest in vacant and underutilized properties, minimize land consumption, make efficient use of existing infrastructure and services and provide for a broader and more inclusive range of <i>affordable</i> and <i>attainable housing</i> options. However, it is important that taller buildings are appropriately designed and are appropriate to the local context. Development shall analyze existing character, prevailing heights and constraints.”</p>	<p>Staff appreciate that the intent here is likely to convey that a height increase is not ‘a given’ and that the building needs to be appropriately designed and sited. Staff suggest however that the creation of a full range of housing options across the entire housing spectrum including multi-residential, rental, and especially the provision of affordable and attainable housing, may well demand greater height and density so that these projects can achieve economic viability. Staff have some concern that positioning these</p>	<p>35. Clause e) deleted from section C4.2. it is noted that substantial changes similar to this County comment have been made to Section C4.3 and C4.4</p> <p>36. Modifications made to C4.3 to remove ‘environmental site screening questionnaire’ and replace with ‘in consultation with the Risk Management Official.’</p> <p>37. New subsection C9.2 (i) added with County OP reference</p> <p>38. No changes. It is noted that Section D1.2 has been modified to include the referenced changes.</p> <p>39. No change at this time.</p> <p>40. “Descendant Communities” added to Section D3.4 title</p> <p>41. Comment acknowledged</p> <p>42. See Comment #2</p> <p>43. Affordable housing references added.</p>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
				<p>important objectives directly against consideration of character (which tends to be rather subjective) may intensify the challenge faced by decision makers in balancing these factors, holding the status quo in place.</p> <p>Respect for the existing character is of course important. But if it is a “housing crisis” as declared by the local Council, then there rationally <i>must</i> be situations where viability could or should be more heavily weighted in decisions, so as to realize the range of housing options needed to maintain economic and social sustainability for the municipality. In these situations, we could as a community accept a carefully considered <i>evolution</i> of character, in recognition that our current built form and planning policy create practical limitations to realizing the range of housing options needed in our communities.</p>	<p>44. “Planning Act” text added to E10(a)</p>
		5	B2.16	<p>Intensification Criteria Clause (f) notes ‘overlook’ and ‘privacy’ as considerations.</p> <p>A taller building will, by its nature, have some degree of overlook. Like the comment above, Staff wonder if inclusion of these references may</p>	

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:		Staff Response:
				create additional tension for decision makers in balancing height/density, character and the supply of a fulsome range of housing options.
		6	<p>B3.1.3 Permitted Uses, Community Living Area</p> <p>Clause j) notes 'Day nurseries' and 'private home daycare'</p>	<p>Suggest all references to 'Day Nursery Act' and Day Nurseries, be updated to reflect the <i>Child Care and Early Years Act</i>.</p> <p>Please note that differing definitions applicable to licensed, unlicensed child care (nuance here may impact any existing as of right permissions).</p>
		7	<p>B3.1.6 Day Nurseries and Institutional Uses</p>	<p>Suggest all references to 'Day Nursery Act' and Day Nurseries, be updated to reflect the <i>Child Care and Early Years Act</i>. Please note that differing definitions applicable to licensed, unlicensed child care (nuance here may impact any existing as of right permissions).</p>
		8	<p>B3.2.3 Permitted Uses, Urban Employment Area</p> <p>While no redline changes are proposed here, the PPS 2024 does establish some changes as apply to designated Employment Lands,</p>	<p>Section B3.2.3 of the TBM identifies (b) Office Uses as permitted. It notes that accessory commercial uses are also permitted provided they occupy a limited floor area and are accessory/incidental.</p>



PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:		Staff Response:	
			<p>such as the Urban Employment Area designation.</p> <p>PPS Section 2.8.2 of PPS 2024, clause (3) notes that in employment areas, residential uses, commercial uses, public service facilities and institutional uses are prohibited. Retail and office uses that are not associated with the primary employment use are also prohibited.</p>	<p>Based on PPS direction, it appears that 'Office Uses' should be removed from the permissions list, and perhaps included together with the commentary in the paragraph following item (e) something to the effect of:</p> <p><i>Accessory office uses and accessory retail commercial uses such as sales outlets, are also permitted provided they occupy only a limited amount of the gross floor area and are clearly accessory and incidental to the main/primary use.</i></p> <p>The following paragraph, permitting limited 'ancillary uses' may also require revision, perhaps to specify that they must not comprise those uses prohibited per the PPS?</p> <p>The final paragraph also requires revision/consideration – adult entertainment establishments do not appear to fit here any longer based on provincial policy.</p>	

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:				Staff Response:
		9	B3.3.3	Permitted Uses, Downtown Area Clause (k) lists 'day nurseries'	Suggest all references to 'Day Nursery Act' and Day Nurseries, be updated to reflect the <i>Child Care and Early Years Act</i> . Please note that differing definitions applicable to licensed, unlicensed child care (nuance here may impact any existing as of right permissions).	
		10	B3.4.1	Commercial Corridor	Just a note that it's not currently showing in the TOC – fields likely just need to be updated.	
		11	B3.6.3	Permitted Uses, Institutional Clause (f) speaks to day nurseries	Suggest all references to 'Day Nursery Act' and Day Nurseries, be updated to reflect the <i>Child Care and Early Years Act</i> . Please note that differing definitions applicable to licensed, unlicensed child care (nuance here may impact any existing as of right permissions).	
		12	B3.7.3	Permitted Uses, Residential/Recreational Area Clause (h) references 'private home daycare'	Suggest all references to 'Day Nursery Act' and Day Nurseries, be updated to reflect the <i>Child Care and Early Years Act</i> . Please note that differing definitions applicable to licensed, unlicensed child care (nuance here may impact any existing as of right permissions).	

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:	
		13	B3.7.4.1	<p>Density and Open Space Requirements; Residential/Recreational Area</p>	<p>Staff request clarification.</p> <p>How are the min/max density and open space requirements in the blue table, intended to relate to the newly added table below which outlines permitted density ranges and max heights for permitted residential dwellings by type?</p> <p>For example, the bottom table outlines that Townhouses are permitted at a density range of 25-50 units/gross ha, however in the blue table above, the maximum permitted density is noted as 20 units/gross ha in BM Area and 15 in other areas. Does this mean that this unit type cannot be accommodated? Similarly for multiple &amp; apartment dwellings noted as permitted at a density range of 40-100 units/gross ha per the lower table.</p>	
		14	B3.10.9	<p>General Dev Policies (Village Resort Area)</p> <p>Clause (j) speaks to SWM in consultation with CA, MNR, and/or other applicable agencies.</p>	<p>Staff request that Grey County be specifically identified here (and in similar clauses across the plan). Given our redefined ecology/natural heritage role, County Staff will be engaged regarding water quality</p>	

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
					considerations, as well as in relation to any significant groundwater recharge areas or highly vulnerable aquifer areas, potentially alongside the Risk Management official. The Conservation Authority would continue to be engaged around stormwater quantity and hazard considerations.
		15	B3.10.9	<p>Clause (s) speaks to MNR, NEC, GSCA for endangered, threatened, special concern, rare species.</p> <p>Clause (t) speaks to no development within 30m of watercourse 1 (Craigleith, Camperdown) including removal of vegetative cover, without approval from GSCA, DFO if applicable.</p>	As above, Grey County ecology is now tasked with offering comment and consultation relating to species per clause (s) and in relation to natural heritage components of (t). Please add Grey County to the lists of parties involved.
		16	B4	Rural Countryside Designations	Staff suggest generally that this section of the Plan could be reorganized for greater clarity and ease of interpretation. Similar work was undertaken in recent update of the Municipality of Meaford's Official Plan, with the countryside policies being arranged so as to describe agricultural use permissions and policy tests; agriculturally-related use

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
					permissions and policy tests; and on-farm diversified use permissions and policy tests, with specified permissions/policy directions nested under each respective category of use.
		17	B4.1.1	Accessory residential uses on Farm Properties	<p>Staff suggest that this section doesn't capture the full range of accessory residential use on Farm properties, focusing only on permission for one additional dwelling unit, or trailer/mobile home for farm help purposes.</p> <p>Other uses such as ARU's (rural, ag special ag), Garden Suites, and temporary farm help accommodation could also fit here.</p>
		18	B4.1.2	Agri-tourism uses as On-Farm Diversified use (OFDU)	<p>OFDU's are size/scale limited per Table 8, Grey County Official Plan (GCOP), these scale requirements are not reflected within the polices of the local plan.</p> <p>Staff suggest that the plan could include reference to the OFDU sizing considerations and applicable OFDU siting and sizing policies of GCOP.</p>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:	
					<p>Importantly, OFDU’s are not permitted on Ag lands less than 20ha in area, or on Special Agricultural lands with less than 10ha of agriculturally productive area (except for B&amp;Bs and home occupations within the dwelling).</p> <p>Size requirements apply per Table 8 GCOP, generally with the OFDU not exceeding 2% of the lot area; and associated buildings not exceeding 20% of the total OFDU footprint on the lands. There are maximum square footages also noted within the table.</p>	
		19	B4.1.3	Estate Winery	<p>A winery is a combination of Agricultural and Agricultural-related use, with OFDU policies/considerations applying for any tasting/hospitality components. Staff suggest these policies will need to be revised in a minor fashion, so as to ensure consistency with the updated OFDU framework and building size, footprint and lot size relationships.</p> <p>The ‘winery’ component is an ag-related use and so would not be size-limited by policy, however a</p>	

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
				<p>tasting room or similar hospitality use component would be considered under the OFDU policies, and thus size considerations apply (e.g. on lands greater than 20ha in Ag; 10ha in Spec Ag). A retail component relating to sale of products produced by the farm operation, on the farm, may fall under the category of ag-related use (size-unlimited) however Estate Wineries often include broader retail offerings e.g. <i>"wine related products"</i> which may not meet the definition of ag-related use and would be better considered under the OFDU policies alongside hospitality uses.</p> <p>With consideration to the existing estate winery policies, for a lot of 8ha:  <math>8ha * 2\%(\text{max. ofdu footprint}) = 1600m^2 * 20\% = 320m^2</math> building area max. per sliding scale sizing under OFDU framework.</p>	
		20	B4.1.4	Farm Winery	As above, again for clause (c) staff recommend that revision be considered to place permissions in context of updated OFDU

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:	
					<p>framework and size and lot size relationships.</p> <p>For this item, and Estate Winery above, may refer to updated <a href="#">Meaford OP</a> – we worked through some similar OFDU/Winery considerations via their recent OP review and update process.</p>	
		21	B4.1.8	Small Scale commercial or Industrial Uses	<p>This framing comes from prior GCOP and Provincial policy frameworks and doesn't reflect current permissions on a standalone basis. Such uses are either farm-related comm/industrial (Ag-related) or are OFDU uses (per OFDU policy tests and scale limitation).</p>	
			B4.2.4.1	Creation of new lots (Ag)	<p>Para on Page 133 notes that smaller parcel sizes may be available of a size that is appropriate for the type of ag use.</p> <p>Staff note that Section 5.2.3 of the GCOP goes into detail here, speaking to justification required, which includes provision of an Agricultural Report by a qualified individual, addressing certain criteria. The local plan could be</p>	



PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
				<p>perhaps a bit simpler, just noting that a smaller parcel may be considered by OPA (to County OP also) s/t policy tests outlined within GCOP.</p> <p>Note also: GCOP &amp; PPS contemplate also lot creation for ag-related uses. This isn't reflected in the creation of new lots policies in Ag/Spec Ag in TBM OP.</p>	
		22	B4.2.4.3 and B4.3.5	Other types of consent	Please note that 4.3.3.3 (2) of the PPS specifies that lot adjustment in prime ag may be permitted for legal or technical reasons only. Revision is recommended.
		23	B4.4.4.1	Non-farm land uses (Rural designation)	For small lots, please note Nitrate provisions updated in GCOP: Section 8.9.1 GCOP 'servicing' clause 18 notes that: <i>"New lot creation less than 0.4 hectares in size on individual private services, or on partial services using private individual septic systems, shall only be considered with the successful completion of a nitrate study demonstrating that the lot can be serviced in accordance with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) D-5 Series Guidelines, or any successor thereto. Municipalities may choose</i>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
				<p><i>to require a nitrate study for additional residential units on lots less than 0.4 hectares in size.”</i></p> <p>Note also, ribbon dev policies have been removed from GCOP (re: TBM clause ‘f’) – this section could be deleted, at the Town’s discretion.</p>	
		24	B4.4.4.5	<p>Recreational uses</p> <p>Recreational uses are permitted on Ag, Special Ag and Rural lands as an OFDU per Table 7 of the GCOP, subject to size/scale limitations applicable to OFDU’s under the GCOP and Permitted uses in Prime Ag Areas provincial guidance. The policy tests noted in B4.4.4.5 should be compared against the OFDU policy provisions within the GCOP and updated accordingly.</p> <p>Resource Based Recreational Uses are permitted in the Rural designation potentially at a scale beyond OFDU permissions, subject to Section 5.4.1 (2) of the GCOP (as is expected to be further refined via OPA 23).</p>	
		25	B4.4.4.6	<p>Resource Based Recreational Uses and recreational/tourist based rural clusters</p> <p>Note: Pending County OPA#23 may amend these policies as proposed, s/t County Council approval. In that</p>	

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
				<p>case, a future conformity update would be indicated to the TBM OP to bring the local policies into conformity.</p> <p>Given the overlapping timelines of these two processes (OPA 23; TBM OP Update), staff offer that the local OP could be revised so as to direct/refer readers to the County OP for applicable policy tests.</p> <p>Alternately, with the Town’s consent, should OPA23 be approved following adoption of the Town’s plan but prior to County approval, this section could potentially be brought into conformity ‘by modification’.</p>	
		26	B4.4.4.7	Residential Farm Cooperatives and Agri-miniums	As above, re: OPA23
		27	B4.5.3	Permitted uses, Hamlet (Heathcote, Ravenna)	Clause (b) notes ARUs s/t Section B2.7 –may want to consider a ‘countryside’ ARU policy section for consideration of rural ARU’s (i.e. not fully serviced) vs. referring all to B2.7. This could potentially be included within a revised ‘Accessory Residential Uses’ section B4.1.1, as noted above.

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
		28	B4.7.4.6	Areas of Potential Mineral Aggregate Extraction	<p>Staff note that such areas are now referred to in the County OP as 'Aggregate Resource Areas'. This appears to be properly noted on the Legend to Appendix 1 to the TBM OP however is not reflected through the text of the plan.</p> <p>Staff suggest revision to this section as follows:</p> <p>Delete all text from "Uses permitted by this Plan on lands so designated..." through the end of clause (d).</p> <p>Insert policy wording reflective of Section 5.2.2 (7) of the GCOP.</p> <p><i>This could read, as follows:                      (7) In Aggregate Resource Areas shown on Appendix 1, new non-agricultural uses may be considered on existing lots of record, where they are a permitted use in the Agricultural, Special Agricultural, or Rural land use types. Where such non-agricultural uses are not permitted by those land use types, and an official plan amendment is required, new non-</i></p>

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
				<p><i>agricultural uses may only be permitted if:</i></p> <p><i>a)The extraction of the aggregate resource is not feasible due to the quality or quantity of material or the existence of incompatible development patterns. The quality and quantity of the material will be determined by having a qualified individual dig test pits within the area proposed for the non-agricultural development as well as the lands within 300 metres of the aggregate operation; or that</i></p> <p><i>b) The proposed land use or development serves a greater long term interest of the general public than does aggregate extraction; and</i></p> <p><i>c) Issues of public health, public safety, and environmental impact are addressed.</i></p> <p><i>Notwithstanding the foregoing, a proposed land use that conforms with the Official Plan and Zoning By-law, but requires Site Plan approval pursuant to Section 41 of the Planning Act, shall not be required to address the above criteria.</i></p>	

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:	
		29	B4.7.4.8	Rehabilitation	<p>Staff suggest additional wording be provided at the end of the second paragraph within this section, to the effect of the following:</p> <p><i>The Grey County Official Plan provides additional guidance regarding site rehabilitation, outlining also those circumstances under which complete rehabilitation for agricultural purposes may not be feasible and identifying considerations that would apply to rehabilitation in those situations.</i></p>	
		30	NEW (B4.7.4.9) to follow after B4.7.4.8	Bedrock and/or Shale Resources Area	<p>Staff suggest a new Section be inserted as B4.7.4.9 called Bedrock and/or Shale Resources Area. Staff suggest policy text be included, to the effect of the following:</p> <p><i>The Province has provided mapping for Bedrock and Shale Resource Areas, within 8 metres of the surface, which have been shown on Appendix E of the Grey County Official Plan. This mapping identifies areas subject to a potential development constraint to non-farm sized lot creation and establishment of certain non-</i></p>	

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:	
					<p><i>Agricultural uses on subject properties within the Town of the Blue Mountains. The related policies of Grey County Official Plan shall apply.</i></p>	
		31	B5.2	Natural Heritage Features	<p>Staff note that the GCOP plan also addresses the mapped Natural Heritage System (NHS) which includes Core Areas and Linkages, as well as specifying 120m Adjacent lands to the Core Areas.</p> <p>It is recommended that reference to the County NHS, Core, Adjacent Land and Linkages be included at the end of Section B5.2 of the TBM OP, perhaps as follows:</p> <p><i>Additional policies relating to components of the Natural Heritage System within Core Areas, Linkages and their adjacent lands are included within Section 7 of the Grey County Official Plan. The Natural Heritage System Core Areas and Linkages are shown on Schedule C to the County Official Plan and the related policies of that plan shall apply. Generally, development proposed within core areas, their 120m adjacent lands,</i></p>	

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
				<p><i>or Linkages will be required to undertake an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) unless exempted by the policies of the Grey County Official Plan.</i></p> <p>In future, at such time of more fulsome revision of the Town’s Natural Heritage policies, County Staff suggest that more fulsome integration of the NHS mapping and policies into the local OP may be beneficial, for example, the inclusion of Core/Linkage mapping within Appendix 1 ‘Constraints’ for reference.</p>	
		32	B5.5.7	<p>Valleylands</p> <p>Staff suggest update to this policy section, as Significant Valleylands have been identified via the County’s Natural Heritage System Study, now embedded into the GCOP. Revised policy could be included here, perhaps as follows:</p> <p><i>“Significant Valleylands were identified through the County of Grey’s Natural Heritage System Study. Detailed delineations of Significant Valleylands are illustrated within Schedule C of the GCOP and should be evaluated on a</i></p>	



PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
				<p><i>site-specific basis thru an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) using the criteria included within Section 7 of the Grey County Official Plan.</i></p> <p><i>No development or site alteration may occur within Significant Valleylands of their 120m adjacent lands unless it has been demonstrated through an EIS that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.</i></p> <p><i>Significant Valleylands will not be required to be mapped in municipal zoning bylaws, as these features are generally already covered by Hazard Land and Regulation mapping across the County."</i></p> <p>In future, at such time of more fulsome revision of the Town's Natural Heritage policies, County Staff suggest that more fulsome integration of the NHS mapping and policies into the local OP may be beneficial, for example, the inclusion of Valleylands mapping</p>	

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
		33	B5.5.3	Karst Topography	Staff suggest fulsome update to this policy section, as the related section at 7.5 of the GCOP has been updated, identifying more fulsome consideration of landscape features indicative of karst, and altering the detail of site investigations to be undertaken in areas of known karst.
		34	C2.1	Function of Watercourses	In the paragraph, below the itemized list, Staff ask that Grey County be identified, alongside the Conservation Authority.
		35	C4.2	C4.2 Ground and Surface Water Resources	Staff suggest that this section be revised to reflect that a Source Protection Plan is now in effect. A reference to direct the reader to that plan/additional info should be added.
		36	C4.3 (b)	Ref: Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire	Staff are not familiar with the site screening questionnaire approach. Is this still in use (when, by whom?). Additional information is appreciated.
		37	C9/9.2	C9/9.2 EIS Requirements	Staff suggest that this section should make reference to the relevant policy of the GCOP regarding EIS requirements. Such added policy could also perhaps

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:	
				<p>make reference to the technical guidance that is additional offered by the County from time to time- we have an updated EIS guide now available online, here: <a href="#">Planning Application Form Guidelines   Grey County</a></p>		
		38	D1.2	<p>Preferred Means of Servicing in Settlement Areas</p>	<p>Staff would highlight revised wording in PPS 2024, Section 3.6(5) as relates to the use of partial servicing in (b)settlement areas and (c) rural settlement areas.</p> <p>Staff suggest review of the added text regarding partial services, with consideration to the servicing types available in the settlement areas/rural settlement areas to which these policies would apply locally. The updated PPS wording appears to limit use of partial services within rural settlement areas to situations of failed servicing, or via individual on-site water services with municipal sewage services (and not municipal water, with individual on-site sewage services).</p>	
		39	D3.3	<p>Built Heritage and Cultural Landscape Resources</p>	<p>A fulsome review of this section prior to adoption is suggested given recent changes to the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> via the <i>More</i></p>	

PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
		40	D3.4	D3.4 Archaeological Resources & Indigenous Consultation	<p><i>Homes, More Choice Act, 2019</i> (Bill 108) and issuance of Ontario Regulation 385/12.</p> <p>Staff suggest that references within this section could perhaps be expanded to speak also to consultation with descendant communities in relation to important cultural heritage sites/resources and through the archaeological assessment process, where applicable.</p> <p>Grey Roots has recently published a Black History Map of Grey County, available online here: <a href="#">Black History Map of Grey County   Grey Roots</a></p> <p>Staff note that an <a href="#">Archaeological Management Plan</a> is in preparation by the County of Grey, beginning with the creation of a GIS-based Archaeological Potential Model. Later stages of this work will include the preparation of updated policy and procedures in relation to archaeological sites and resources, as may inform future conformity updates to this Plan.</p>
		41	E1.2	E1.2 CPPS By-law	County Staff appreciate the research and efforts by local staff

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:
		42	E1.4	Temp Use by-laws	<p>to bring in this new type of framework for targeted use. Further detailed review of the CPPS policy section will be completed post adoption.</p> <p>A conversation between County and local Staff is appreciated in this regard, to confirm the anticipated ancillary processes that will also need to be completed to support implementation of this framework (for example, CPPS by-law; Community Benefits Strategy &amp; by-law, etc.)</p> <p>Staff note that references here to 'Garden Suite' have also been removed. Despite added provisions relating to ARU's, there may still be times where a temporary/removable unit is desirable.</p> <p>Should this be reincorporated, please note that a garden suite would be counted towards total permitted ARU's on a lot, where one exists. Section 4.2.6 of the GCOP applies.</p>
		43	E3.5.2-4	Community Improvement Goals, Objectives, Selection of Project Areas	County staff would highlight that Section 28 (1.1) of the Ontario Planning Act specifies that

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:			Staff Response:	
					<p>'community improvement' includes provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Staff suggest that consideration be given to making specific reference within this section to the use of a CIP to support affordable housing creation. Such CIP programs may still be considered under the more generally-stated goals and objectives (i.e. improve social conditions, facilitate community economic development, improve community quality, safety and stability) however addition of this application of the CIP may offer greater clarity, or express greater commitment to this intent.</p>	
		44	E10	Complete Application Requirements	Staff note that Clause (a) speaks to the types of applications that complete application requirements apply to. We suggest minor revision, to include the specific Act section references that empower these requirements.	
<p><b>Thornbury Commercial Corridor Lands</b>  <b>ARN#424200001700300</b>  <b>(Submitted By: Plan Wells Associates)</b></p>	<p>November 7, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that Exception B3.4.7.1 remain in the Official Plan (currently shown on mapping, removed from Exceptions list that also includes a larger area and surrounding properties)</li> <li>Request that Section B3.4 be added to the Table of Contents</li> <li>Also attached are the letters from August 2022 and October 2021 for the same lands.</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The former exceptions have been in place since at least 1986 with the former Town of Thornbury Official Plan when the lands were under one ownership and considered a commercial resort hotel complex over all of the lands. Since that time, the lands have been subdivided into multiple ownerships and portions have been developed or have active</li> </ul>	

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
			<p>approvals. The former exception which has been carried forward through 2 previous Official Plans does not appear to remain valid and is proposed to be removed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledged. To be corrected</li> <li>• Attached letters were previously reviewed under the Phase 1 portion of the project with detailed comments provided as part of Planning Staff Report PDS.22.114 (Attachment #3)</li> <li>• In summary: Site specific requests outside the scope of the Official Plan review should be considered under an individual application process. The Phase 2 background papers did not provide any new direction on the Commercial Corridor designation. Although retirement home / long-term care facility may be considered a needed use within the Town, an evaluation on the proposed location and impacts on Commercial Lands does need to be considered.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Part Lot 24, Concession 7</b> <b>ARN#4242000080400</b> <b>(Submitted By: Plan Wells Associates)</b></p>	<p>November 12, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests a site specific exception to also allow for a single detached dwelling on lands designated Escarpment 'E'. Dwellings are not permitted under this designation, however a Zoning By-law Amendment was granted in the past to establish a building envelope for the property and to permit a new dwelling that does not have frontage on to an open and maintained street</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Blue Mountain Watershed Trust</b> <b>(Carl Michener)</b></p>	<p>November 20, 2024</p>	<p>Resubmission of August 27, 2022 letter. It is noted that this letter was received after the last Public Comments Matrix was released for Phase 1 and before Council issued the Phase 1 decision. 3 requests were made to: Increase the town's focus on watershed-based planning, expeditiously conclude the studies of the town;s natural heritage features, and current surface and municipal wastewater drainage patterns, both sewage and drainage, and make watershed-based planning a routine practice in the Town. (specific Plan revisions are provided)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New text proposed under Introduction Section.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Text added in Phase 1</li> <li>2. Text added to A1.1</li> <li>3. Text added to A2</li> <li>4. Policy Section A3.1 has been overhauled to remove direction from Sustainable Path and has been replaced with the refreshed direction under the TBM Future Story</li> </ol>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. New text proposed under Guiding Principles A1.1</li> <li>3. Policy A2 to also include natural heritage features reference</li> <li>4. New text proposed to A3.1</li> <li>5. New text proposed to A3.1.2</li> <li>6. Formatting correction to A3.3.2</li> <li>7. New text proposed to A3.3.2</li> <li>8. New text / remove text proposed to A3.4.1 and A3.4.2</li> <li>9. New text edits to A3.5.2</li> <li>10. Proposed additional text to C8.2 and C8.3</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. A3.1.2 modified through previous recommended changes. Some additional text changes also included.</li> <li>6. Completed</li> <li>7. Similar Text added in Phase 1 and Phase 2 updates</li> <li>8. Minor edits completed. Most no change.</li> <li>9. Minor edits included</li> <li>10. Minor edits included</li> </ol>
<p><b>Mike Robbins (Area Resident)</b></p>	<p>November 22, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions some of the vision statements regarding community character, unique character and enhancing the quality of life for residents and businesses, and that there are no definitions of these terms</li> <li>• References should be made to the Beaver Valley Destination Stewardship initiative, a unique and forward-thinking community resident and civil society group. It should not be up to government to define community character. residents and civil society must also be engaged. The BVDS group are best qualified to identify what ‘quality of life’ means in the context of TBM.</li> <li>• Definitions are proposed for Destination Stewardship, Eco-Tourism</li> <li>• Commentary is provided on ecosystem-based planning and management</li> <li>• The Niagara Escarpment Corridor is not identified as a Key Corridor on the OP and should be included.</li> <li>• Indigenous engagement should also include references to United Nations Declaration on Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) emphasizing the importance of recognizing and upholding the rights of Indigenous peoples and ensuring effective and meaningful participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision statements are intended as a narrative that is defined through goals and objectives and all policies.</li> <li>• All residents and stakeholders are recognized as community partners and are invited to discuss policy changes, new development proposals, and other initiatives through public engagement processes and providing their views to Council for consideration</li> <li>• Definition added for Ecotourism</li> <li>• Ecosystem is defined in Section E with additional direction and background on the ecosystem-based management policies found in Section B5.1 and B5.2. The contents and direction in the proposed definition are included in B5.2</li> <li>• References to Niagara Escarpment Corridor are not included in the Plan, however existing policies and mapping identify the Niagara Escarpment lands that flow through the borders of the Town and does defer policy direction to the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) to ensure policy and growth do not conflict with the NEP.</li> </ul>



**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comments / Concerns / Questions Summary:	Staff Response:
<b>Eleanor Ward (Area Resident)</b>	November 25, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Craigeith has been experiencing significant growth with 1200 units being built. Does not support increased densities beyond 10 units per hectare. Overdeveloping the Niagara Escarpment planning area was not intended as these lands should be protected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments received.</li> </ul>
<b>Local Winery/Cidery businesses (Robert Ketchin, John Ardiel, Darcy Hagerman and Michael/Jessica Maish)</b>	November 25, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking out additional flexibility to the 400m2 restriction to Farm and Estate Winery tasting room / hospitality areas. Requests similar permissions to those provided under On-Farm Diversified Uses</li> <li>• Discussion on TBM as a recognized growing wine and cider region.</li> <li>• Discussion on requirements for value-add components to wine and cider businesses including ability to host weddings, conferences, overnight accommodations, and similar uses in support of the agricultural use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing policy sections related to Farm and Estate Wineries have been updated to recognize Wineries (which also include cideries, distilleries, meaderies, and similar uses). New policies require a minimum of 2 ha (5 acres) of agriculturally planted lands (provincial minimums), and depending on farm parcel size the winery use shall have additional opportunities to provide on-farm diversified uses (OFDU) in accordance with standard OFDU requirements. It is noted that agricultural and agriculturally related uses are not included in the OFDU requirements.</li> <li>• See Policy updates to Section B4.1 to B4.4</li> </ul>
<b>Escarpment Corridor Alliance (Jarvis Strong)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applauds the Town’s work on the Natural Heritage Study. Comments are submitted for the Official Plan and for the Natural Heritage Study:</li> <li>• Supports the Natural Heritage policies with some attention to strengthening: ecological resortation and by providing a definition of net-gain enhancements and what may qualify as net-gain enhancements.</li> <li>• Policy A3.2 should be expanded to ensure that no net loss, and ensure compensation</li> <li>• Consider refining Grey County linkages and corridors as part of a linked natural heritage system</li> <li>• The Town should consider a “Restoration Opportunities Overlay” to identify those areas of the Town where restoration opportunities may exist.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some minor modifications have been completed to the Natural Heritage policies, however as indicated earlier in this matrix, the Town is waiting for the completion of the next stage of the Natural Heritage Study and Natural Asset Inventory project and direction from Council so that the recommendations from that work can be incorporated into the Official Plan by way of an Official Plan Amendment or similar.</li> </ul>

**PLANNING STAFF COMMENT Matrix**

Official Plan 5-Year Review

Last Updated: November 26, 2024

Public Meeting Date: October 1, 2024