Grey County Logo Committee Report

| **To**: | Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council |
| --- | --- |
| **Committee Date:** | July 12, 2018 |
| **Subject / Report No:** | Addendum to PDR-CW-21-18 Final Report |
| **Title:** | Boulter Estates Re-Submission of Plan of Subdivision 42T-2013-04 |
| **Prepared by:** | Scott Taylor |
| **Reviewed by:** | Randy Scherzer |
| **Lower Tier(s) Affected:** | Township of Georgian Bluffs |
| **Status:** | Recommendation adopted by Committee of the Whole as presented as per Resolution CW184-18; Endorsed by County Council on July 26, 2018. |

## Recommendation

1. **That Addendum to Report PDR-CW-21-18 be received; and**
2. **That all written and oral submissions received on the resubmission plan of subdivision 42T-2013-04 known as Boulter Estates were considered; the effect of which helped to make an informed recommendation and decision; and**
3. **That in consideration of the draft plan of subdivision application 42T-2013-04, for lands described as Part of Lot 5, Jones Range, (geographic Township of Keppel) in the Township of Georgian Bluffs, the Grey County Committee of the Whole approves this plan of subdivision to create a total of twenty-two (22) single detached lots, subject to the conditions set out in the Notice of Decision.**

## Executive Summary

The County has received a resubmission of a plan of subdivision application (County file number 42T-2013-04) to create 22 single detached residential lots in the Township of Georgian Bluffs. This lapsed plan of subdivision was originally draft approved in 2015. The resubmitted plan is the same as the plan that was draft approved. Access to the new lots will be off a new road connecting Galloway Road and Sunset Boulevard to Wilson Drive. Servicing to the proposed subdivision will be via municipal water and private septic services. Based on agency review and comments received regarding the proposed plan of subdivision, it is recommended that the proposed plan of subdivision be given draft approval subject to the conditions set out in the attached Notice of Decision.

## Background and Discussion

The County received a resubmitted plan of subdivision application, known as ‘Boulter Estates’ to create 22 new residential lots on lands described as Part of Lot 5, Jones Range, Township of Georgian Bluffs (geographic Township of Keppel). This application is the same as the recently lapsed plan of subdivision that was draft approved in March 2015. The subject application would extend Sunset Boulevard from the northeast to connect with Wilson Drive to the southwest. All 22 lots will have direct frontage off this new road extension. The subject lands are located on the waterfront, approximately 1.6 kilometres east of Wiarton and one kilometre west of Oxenden. See Map 1 below for an aerial view of the subject property and surrounding area, while Map 2 shows the proposed plan of subdivision.



### Map 1: Airphoto of Subject Lands

The subject property is approximately 7.1 hectares in size. The lands are designated as ‘Escarpment Recreation Area’ and ‘Niagara Escarpment Plan Area’ in the County Official Plan.

The majority of the lands surrounding the subject property have been developed for residential or cottage purposes. To the southeast, there is a slightly larger parcel with a house, barn and shed on it. Further to the southeast of the subject lands, across Grey Road 1 are the airport lands.

A link to the staff report and draft conditions from the 2015 draft approval of Boulter Estates has been included in the Attachments section of this report.



### Map 2: Proposed Plan of Subdivision

The proposed plan of subdivision is proposed to be serviced by municipal water and private septic systems.

In support of the proposed plan of subdivision, the proponent has submitted a number of background studies and reports, some of which have been updated since the initial application. Copies of all background reports and plans can be found at [this link](https://www.grey.ca/planning-development/planning-applications).

The proposed plan of subdivision also requires Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) Development Control Permits. These permit applications are still in effect and have not lapsed, and as such no new permit applications have been filed at this time.

### Public and Agency Comments Received

There were members of the public that made oral submissions at the public meeting which was held on June 20, 2018 in the Township of Georgian Bluffs, as well as additional written comments received. The minutes from the public meeting can be found at [this link.](https://docs.grey.ca/share/s/2ipg_YivQlCf2NBJ64ippQ) Comments raised at the public meeting are as follows;

**Kathryn O’Hagan-Todd** – expressed concerns regarding;

* ‘drainage should drain on their own property via the central watercourse and not towards the non-existent ditch in Wilson Drive,
* the providence of the drainage needs to be explored, i.e. there is no existing drain along the southwest boundary of the site,
* traffic concerns,
* road safety concerns – a safety assessment needs to be completed,
* the road does not need to and should not connect to Wilson Drive,
* a connected road will be used as a ‘short cut’ or ‘drive-through’ and the traffic will impact existing residents and cottagers,
* some trees were already removed and burned,
* people will drive through Wilson, especially during real estate sales, and
* enforcement of conditions on-site has already been an issue, including tree removal and construction conditions on Wilson Drive.’

**Jim Mosgrove** – ‘concerned for over 20 years with the water running off the airport property, and this development will just exacerbate those drainage concerns, as the water will run downhill.’

**Frank Staubitz** – ‘the drainage should follow the natural water flow. Erosion will also be a concern with the current plan.’

**Ed Howe** – ‘there are existing drainage problems from both the airport lands and the County Road, both of which need to be fixed. The airport does not drain where it’s supposed to and the County needs to ditch and tile along Grey Road 1.’

A summary of those written comments received has been included below.

**Kristen Parente** – expressed concerns including;

* 1. ‘Environmental Impact: The proposed subdivision would change the natural integrity of the shoreline, therefore impacting the biodiversity on the bay. This would negatively impact the water and land animals that inhabit these waters and the lands surrounding the bay.
  2. Noise and Increased Population Concerns: Currently the neighbourhood where my property is located is used as cottage properties and several year-round residential properties. People love coming to and living in Georgian Bluffs because it is a quiet escape from the busy nature of dense cities. If this dense subdivision was to occur, the neighbourhood and bay would become very noisy, taking away from the current serenity of the properties in the area.
  3. Property Tax Increase Concerns: With additional properties in the area as a result of this subdivision, it would be likely that our own property taxes would increase as the roads and services connecting my neighbourhood would be joined with the proposed subdivision, as well as perhaps an increase in property values.
  4. Have local indigenous communities been notified and consulted regarding the proposed subdivision plans?
  5. You asked for public input, and the existing owners that abut the property proposed for development all expressed their concerns, and yet the proposal remains unchanged. Why did you ask for input if these concerns were not going to be addressed?’

**John Parente Sr.** – similar concerns to Kristen Parente above, in addition to;

* + ‘Respect and Courtesy of Long Term Land Holders: Local residents may not be able to appreciate this point, but cottagers cherish the serenity and peacefulness of getting away to a cottage. This is why we invest so much time and money in properties far from where we live. If a new subdivision is put in without it's own access road then the increased traffic through the cottagers lots will only lead to increased frustration and anxiety. Putting the lives of cottagers, their children and grandchildren at risk for the sake of putting in another subdivision is both inconsiderate and irresponsible.’

**John Parente** – ‘Why is it still being proposed to connect Wilson Drive to the new road even though all of the public input has been opposed to that? The road should not go through to Wilson Drive. There should be a new road coming from Grey Road 1 to the subdivision if it is built. There is no good reason for us to have all of that traffic passing by our quiet cottage that has been that way for the last 60 years. A potential compromise could be to have a road that connects for city use only and have another road for public access to the new community. More options need to be explored and discussed so that the voices of the people who are already there are respected.

If 22 new properties go in that are likely being used as homes, not cottages, and each household has at least one vehicle, that is a potential minimum of 2200% increase of traffic by my property. To say that a minimum increase of this magnitude is not overwhelming ignores the truth of the matter. If all of the neighbouring communities are being connected, there will be more than 50 lots combined. We are not only having the 22 new lots added to our community, we are also having all of the lots on the other community added to ours.

The contradiction I am pointing out is that County staff are saying there will not be enough traffic to impact my community enough for safety, etc., however, there will be enough traffic for it to be an issue for the County Road (i.e. to discourage another intersection). If there will be enough added traffic that it will be an issue for the County Road if there was one more intersection, it will surely be an issue within the community.

Also, the water from the new subdivision needs to be drained away from our community, not into it. How are the road and the drainage being justified? If they go through with the plan this way, I will be extremely outraged, as will the rest of the community. My family has multiple properties in the community and we are not alright with traffic and water drainage because someone wants to build a new subdivision. If the subdivision is built, it should be self-contained, as ours is, and should not negatively impact us with no benefit. If it does make servicing and maintenance easier for the Township how will this be reflected in my taxes? I keep hearing benefits for others, but absolutely none for those in my community.

The timing of both the public meeting and the Committee of the Whole meeting is not good for community members, as many live and work out of town, and cannot attend the meetings on a weekday. More thought needs to be given to when these meetings are held.

Why have changes not been made to the plan based on the community input received? Why is the review period for this subdivision being so rushed? Furthermore, the concerns that were submitted prior to the public meeting were not shared in their entirety at the meeting.’

**Jim Mosgrove** – ‘opposed to connecting Sunset Boulevard to Wilson Drive. Lake Road is not a wide road and it can be a challenge when two cars meet each other. There is also erosion on Lake Road after heavy rains. The extra traffic could also pose concerns to children playing in the area. Instead at the end of Sunset Boulevard close to Northborne Park subdivision it is suggested that a round-about be built so that leaving Boulter Estates would be easier, and Wilson Drive would not need to be connected.’

**Norma Mosgrove** – ‘does not see the necessity of connecting Sunset Boulevard and Wilson Drive as Boulter Estates will have an entrance off Galloway Road. If the connection goes through it will have noise and traffic impacts, as well as reducing property values. Every resident in the area should be informed of this proposed change and given the opportunity to comment. Every home owner in this subdivision should have to pay for safe access onto Grey Road 1, which may mean the loss of one proposed lot.’

**Helen Grant** – ‘I would very much like to stay connected and informed with anything regarding the Boulder Estates, including the township. I live next door and my property is presently for sale so this will have an impact on me.’

Agency comments were as follows:

* **Hydro One** – no comments or concerns.
* **Enbridge Gas** – no comments as Enbridge has no gas infrastructure in Georgian Bluffs.
* **Union Gas** - as a condition of final approval that the owner/developer provide to Union the necessary easements and/or agreements required for the provision of gas services for this project.
* **Historic Saugeen Metis** – no objections.
* **Grey Sauble Conservation Authority** – as the proposal is the same submission the Conservation Authority’s recommended draft conditions remain the same.
* **County Transportation Services** – no further comments.
* **Drinking Water Source Protection** – no policies currently apply to the activities identified in the subdivision application.
* **Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC)** – generally no concerns provided the same conditions of draft approval from 2015, with some administrative amendments, are applied to the resubmitted plan of subdivision. The administrative amendments reference the most recent development permit applications, as well as the master vegetation plan and the landscape plans.
* **Georgian Bluffs –** the Township is satisfied with the original conditions of draft approval and note that a subdivision agreement is in the draft stage.

#### Analysis of Planning Issues

Planning authorities must have regard to matters of Provincial interest, the criteria of the *Planning Act* and be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Within Grey County they must also make decisions that conform to the County of Grey Official Plan. Within this part of the County the Niagara Escarpment Plan also applies.

This resubmitted application was processed under a very similar policy regime to that which the original application was draft approved under. As noted above the Niagara Escarpment Development Permit applications have already been granted for this development. Furthermore, NEC staff have noted they have no objection to the resubmitted plan of subdivision.

For a detailed policy analysis please refer to Addendum to Report PDR-PCD-33-13, which is linked to in the Attachments section of this report.

#### Responses to Concerns Received in 2018

The two main concerns with respect to this development are the road/traffic and drainage.

There has been a number of public comments on the new road being proposed as part of this development, which can generally be broken down into three subcategories as follows:

1. Members of the public have suggested that the new road should end in a cul-de-sac rather than connecting to Wilson Drive.
2. Other members of the public have suggested that this proposed subdivision should also have a direct connection to Grey Road 1 in the form of a new intersection.
3. Concerns have been raised with respect to the level of traffic generated by this new road and proposed development.

With respect to the first issue above, the proponent explored the issue of a cul-de-sac with the Township, and the Township is of the opinion that a connection to Wilson Drive here would be preferable to having the new road terminate in a cul-de-sac. County staff also share this opinion. Maintenance of a ‘through-road’ and servicing are both easier with connected roads, hence the recommendation from the Township Operations staff. From a general planning perspective as well, planners try to promote ‘connectivity’ to allow for an easier flow of pedestrians, cyclists and automobiles, as well as creating better social cohesion between neighbourhoods. There are some properties where cul-de-sacs are necessary based on the layout of a property, or existing surrounding development, but in this case the property would allow for an easy connection between Sunset Boulevard and Galloway Road from the east to Wilson Drive in the west. A connected road is also beneficial from a servicing perspective and having the ability to loop services.

The other key benefit to a connected road is from a public health and safety perspective. Having a connected road allows for better emergency service vehicle access to both the new homes and existing homes, should an access be blocked for any reason (e.g. downed tree or accident). In this regard, emergency vehicles could access the site from either the northeast or the southwest, depending upon the quickest safe route of access.

With respect to the second issue above, based on the low estimated traffic levels (i.e. the traffic generated from 22 new homes), and the existing road service; a new intersection would not be warranted on the County Road. Furthermore, one of the objectives of the County Road network is to promote the efficient flow of through traffic, and creating additional intersections here could impede or slowdown said traffic on Grey Road 1.

With respect to the third issue above, it is not expected that the addition of 22 new homes will generate significant levels of traffic on existing roads. Neither is it estimated that there will be a significant increase in ‘through-traffic’ using the newly connected road as a ‘short-cut’ to Wiarton, as opposed to Grey Road 1. Georgian Bluffs has previously noted that Wilson Drive will not be upgraded as part of this application, or in the near future, making this ‘short-cut’ less attractive. County staff do however acknowledge that some through-traffic will occur. Wording has been included in draft condition # 28 requiring construction traffic to avoid the use of Wilson Drive.

Further to the public requests to have the new road end in a cul-de-sac rather than connecting to Wilson Drive, County staff would note the following. Section 6.12.1 of the County Plan addresses criteria to be considered in any new plan of subdivision or condominium. More specifically section 6.12.1(a)(vi) states;

*“The street pattern of the proposed plan and how it fits with the surrounding neighbourhood. Plans which utilize a grid pattern or a modified grid pattern shall be considered more favourably than those with a curvy street pattern or cul-de-sacs,”*

In this case County and Township staff are recommending that the road network be connected here to improve safety and connectivity for pedestrians, cyclists and automobile traffic. Staff view the increased traffic levels on neighbouring roads as minimal, would not see any land use incompatibilities associated with this connection.

The second key issue members of the public have raised has been the proposed stormwater management (SWM) on-site, and the existence or non-existence of a drainage swale along the southwest portion of the property. Some members of the public have questioned why the stormwater cannot all be directed to the central watercourse which already flows through the property. This possibility was investigated by the proponent, but the GSCA was not in favour of this approach, based on potential impact on fish habitat. The proponent has also confirmed existence of the drainage ditch along the southwest of the property.

Members of the public have also raised concern with the impacts of the SWM on the Bay, and in particular their favoured swimming areas along the waterfront. The proponent’s engineer provided a response to these concerns, suggesting that there should be little impact on water quality in this regard. The proposed SWM plan has been reviewed by the GSCA and the Township, and subject to the recommended draft conditions would appear to meet Township standards. Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change standards have also been met by the proposal. The proposed stormwater flows post-development will not exceed the pre-development conditions.

The proponent’s engineer has noted that although they were not able to direct any new drainage to the central watercourse, the existing drainage from the airport lands will still drain through this channel. In response to questions, the engineer has clarified that water will not be diverted to Lake Road, and that the only water flowing towards Wilson Drive will be some of the backlot drainage, while other drainage will be diverted to the ditch along Galloway Road.

The proposed draft conditions remain with same with the exception of new conditions numbers 27 and 28 dealing with the Federal Fisheries Act, and construction traffic respectively.

With the attached recommended draft plan conditions, County staff are of the opinion that the proposed development:

1. has regard for matters of Provincial interest under the *Planning Act*;
2. is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement;
3. conforms to the Niagara Escarpment Plan; and
4. conforms to the County of Grey Official Plan.

## Legal and Legislated Requirements

The application was processed in accordance with the *Planning Act.*

## Financial and Resource Implications

There are no anticipated financial, staffing or legal considerations associated with the proposed subdivision, beyond those normally encountered in processing a subdivision application. The County has collected the requisite fee and peer review deposit for this application.

## Relevant Consultation

Internal: Planning and Transportation Services,

External: Township of Georgian Bluffs, Niagara Escarpment Commission, Grey Sauble Conservation Authority required agencies under the *Planning Act*, and the public.

### Appendices and Attachments

[*Addendum to Report PDR-PCD-33-13*](https://docs.grey.ca/share/s/NUZVOUcbQWaEnNwGC-idsw)

*Draft Notice of Decision (conditions of draft approval) - attached*

**NOTICE OF DECISION**

**On Application for Approval of Draft Plan of Subdivision**

**under Subsection 51(16) of the Planning Act**

Draft Plan Approval, is hereby given by the County of Grey for the application regarding the above noted lands. A copy of the Decision is attached.

**PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE FILE**

All written and oral submissions received on the application were considered; the effect of which helped to make an informed recommendation and decision.

**WHEN AND HOW TO FILE A NOTICE OF APPEAL**

Notice to appeal the decision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal must be filed with the County of Grey no later than 20 days from the date of this notice, as shown above.

The notice of appeal should be sent to the attention of the Director of Planning and Development of the County, at the address shown below and it must,

(1) set out the reasons for the appeal,

(2) be accompanied by the fee required by the Tribunal as prescribed under the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act, and

(3) Include the completed appeal forms from the Tribunal’s website.

**WHO CAN FILE A NOTICE OF APPEAL**

Only individuals, corporations or public bodies may appeal decisions in respect of a proposed plan of subdivision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal. A notice of appeal may not be filed by an unincorporated association of group. However, a notice of appeal may be filed in the name of an individual who is a member of the association or group on its behalf.

No persons or public body shall be added as a party to the hearing of the appeal of the decision of the approval authority, including the lapsing provisions of the conditions, unless the person or public body, before the decision of the approval authority, made oral submissions at a public meeting or written submissions to the council, or made a written request to be notified of changes to the conditions or, in the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal’s opinion, there are reasonable grounds to add the person or public body as a party.

**RIGHT OF APPLICANT OR PUBLIC BODY TO APPEAL CONDITIONS**

The following may, at any time before the approval of the final plan of subdivision, appeal any of the conditions imposed by the approval authority to the Tribunal by filing a notice of appeal with the approval authority: the applicant; any public body that, before the approval authority made its decision, made oral submissions at a public meeting or written submissions to the approval authority; the Minister; or the municipality in which the subject land is located.

**HOW TO RECEIVE NOTICE OF CHANGED CONDITIONS**

The conditions of an approval of draft plan of subdivision may be changed at any time before the final approval is given.

You will be entitled to receive notice of any changes to the conditions of the approval of draft plan of subdivision if you have made a written request to be notified of changes to the conditions.

**GETTING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Additional information about the application is available for public inspection during regular office hours in the Planning & Development Office at the address noted below or by calling 519-376-2205 or 1-800-567-GREY.

**ADDRESS FOR NOTICE OF APPEAL**

**County of Grey**

**595-9th Avenue East**

**OWEN SOUND, Ontario N4K 3E3**

**Attention: Mr. Randy Scherzer, MCIP RPP**

**Director of Planning & Development**

Plan of Subdivision File No. 42T-2013-04 has been granted draft approval. The County’s conditions of final approval for registration of this draft plan of subdivision are as follows:

1. That this approval applies to the draft Plan of Subdivision File No. 42T-2013-04, on Part of Lot 5, Jones Range, (geographic Township of Keppel) in the Township of Georgian Bluffs, County of Grey, prepared by Darryl M. Robins Consulting Inc., dated August 12, 2013, with a total of twenty-two (22) residential lots, one (1) internal road allowance and other blocks as necessary indicating all other easements and reserves. That such easements, right-of-ways and reserves as required for utilities, or drainage purposes shall be acquired by the owner where necessary, and granted to the appropriate authority. The blocks are to be identified prior to registration.
2. That the owner convey 5% cash-in-lieu of parkland to the Township of Georgian Bluffs.
3. That the road shall be dedicated as a public highway, and named to the satisfaction of the Township. The ramp structure and all roads and entrances shall be designed and constructed to a standard acceptable to the Township, and such design shall be included in the subdivision agreement. The owner agrees to provide detailed plans and specifications indicating that the roads and drainage will be constructed to the standards of the Township.
4. That all entrances to lots be from the internal road of the subdivision, and that the entrances be to the satisfaction of the Township of Georgian Bluffs.
5. That the owner agrees in writing, satisfy all the requirements, financial and otherwise, of the Township of Georgian Bluffs, concerning roads, installation of services, drainage, parkland, security, and other matters as determined by the Township.
6. That property is within the area of Niagara Escarpment Development Control and therefore any development shall be undertaken in accordance with Development Permits G/T/2016-2017/9011 and G/R/2016-2017/9012-9033, or any subsequent successors thereto, to the satisfaction of the Niagara Escarpment Commission; and wording is incorporated into the Subdivision Agreement to the satisfaction of the Niagara Escarpment Commission, which addresses Development Permits G/T/2016-2017/9011 and G/R/2016-2017/9012-9033.
7. That prior to final approval the owner enter into a subdivision agreement with the Township, to be registered on title to the property and then upon each lot once the plan has been registered.
8. That prior to final approval of the plan of subdivision, a final storm and surface water management report and grading and drainage plan be prepared and submitted for review, at the expense of the owner, by the Township, the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority. The recommendations of these plans and reports shall incorporated into the subdivision agreement. The report shall include such matters as building & sewage system envelopes, lot grading, sediment control measures. The report should also ensure that run-off, including the storm water and spring snow melt, does not adversely affect neighbouring properties, and detail all necessary upgrades to existing road and or drainage structures. This report should detail all easements or rights of way required to be dedicated to the Township. The grading and drainage plan should ensure that no dwellings will be affected by flooding of the central watercourse under the regional storm event, and follow the recommendations of the Master Vegetation Preservation and Landscape Plan.
9. That this plan of subdivision will be serviced by municipal water supply from the Oxenden/Wiarton Water System, the cost of any revisions to the certificates or improvements to the existing plant required as a result of this development will be borne by the owner, and these terms shall be included as part of the registered subdivision agreement.
10. The subdivision agreement shall include provisions protecting the ecological and natural heritage features of the lands, and implementing the recommendations of the Environmental Impact Study dated April 2013 completed by AWS Environmental Consulting, as well as the Landscape Plans by Hensel Design Group dated May 2018, and the Master Vegetation Protection Plan by Azimuth Environmental Consulting dated May 2018, to the satisfaction of the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.
11. That bollards and signage shall be installed along the lot lines, adjacent to the shoreline protection areas of Lots 1 through 11, inclusive, clearly identifying the area of no development, and that bollards and signage shall be installed along the tree retention zone adjacent to the central watercourse for Lots 6, 7, 16 and 17. Similar bollards and signage shall also be installed around vegetation community number 6, as identified in the Environmental Impact Study dated April 2013 completed by AWS Environmental Consulting, as well as the Landscape Plans by Hensel Design Group dated May 2018, and the Master Vegetation Protection Plan by Azimuth Environmental Consulting dated May 2018. All bollards and signage shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and the Niagara Escarpment Commission.
12. That wording be included in the subdivision agreement, to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and the Niagara Escarpment Commission, requiring that all of the bollards and signage be in place prior to any site alterations and/or the issuance of a building permit. Details regarding spacing of the bollards and signage will be included within the subdivision agreement.
13. That wording be included in the subdivision agreement to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority stating that the 30 metres adjacent to the 177.9 m GSC shoreline contour be maintained in natural vegetative cover and enhanced where necessary.
14. That wording be included in the subdivision agreement to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority stating that no site alteration shall be undertaken within 30 metres of the 177.9 m GSC shoreline contour without the express written consent of the Township of Georgian Bluffs, the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and the Niagara Escarpment Commission.
15. That a restrictive covenant be registered on title for Lots 1 through 11, inclusive. The wording of the restrictive covenant should read something to the effect of ‘the area within 30 metres of the 177.9 m GSC shoreline contour, and identified on the property with bollards and signage, shall be left in a naturalized state and no topographical alterations, drainage works, placement of buildings or structures, removal of trees, grass or brush cutting, dumping of debris or yard waste or weed control (other than for noxious varieties) will be carried out within this area.’ Confirmation of this covenant will be to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and the Niagara Escarpment Commission.
16. That wording be included in the subdivision agreement, to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, stating that the riparian rights of the Township will not be transferred to any other party and that no development of the shore lands will be permitted without the express written approval of the Township of Georgian Bluffs, the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and the Niagara Escarpment Commission.
17. That wording be included in the subdivision agreement stating that the 15 metres adjacent to the watercourse be maintained in natural vegetative cover and enhanced as per the recommendations of the Environmental Impact Study dated April 2013 completed by AWS Environmental Consulting, as well as the Landscape Plans by Hensel Design Group dated May 2018, and the Master Vegetation Protection Plan by Azimuth Environmental Consulting dated May 2018, and that appropriate fencing be erected, to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Township of Georgian Bluffs.
18. That wording be included in the subdivision agreement stating that no site alterations shall be undertaken within 15 metres adjacent to the watercourse without the express written consent of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Township of Georgian Bluffs.
19. That a restrictive covenant be registered on title for Lots 6, 7, 16 and 17. The wording of the restrictive covenant should read something to the effect of ‘the area within 15 metres of the identified central watercourse, and identified on the property with bollards and signage, shall be left in a naturalized state and no topographical alterations, drainage works, placement of buildings or structures, removal of trees, grass or brush cutting, dumping of debris or yard waste or weed control (other than for noxious varieties) will be carried out within this area.’ Confirmation of this covenant will be to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.
20. That wording be included in the subdivision agreement, to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, that the above noted restrictive covenants will be registered on title, and that proof of such registration is provided to the Township of Georgian Bluffs.
21. That the requirement for a permit from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority for any development and/or site alterations within 30 metres of the central watercourse, or 30 metres of the 177.9 m GSC shoreline contour be included in the wording of the subdivision agreement to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.
22. That prior to final approval of the plan of subdivision wording be included in the subdivision agreement requiring the completion of a Master Vegetation Preservation and Landscape Plan to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Township of Georgian Bluffs.
23. That the subdivision agreement contains clauses recognizing that should human remains or other cultural heritage materials or features be discovered on-site that the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act shall be adhered to.
24. That all easements and or agreements for drainage, gas line or utility purposes shall be dedicated to the appropriate authority or public authority. Should the relocation of any utilities be required as a result of this development, that all associated costs be at the Developer’s expense.
25. That wording be included in the subdivision agreement requiring the siting and installation of a single Community Mail Box to service mail delivery for the twenty-two lots, to the satisfaction of Canada Post.
26. As per the requirements of the County’s Forest Management By-law 4341-06 Exemptions section 4(d), the injuring or destruction of trees for this subdivision is exempted from the requirements of the By-law, but must still be in accordance with the Master Vegetation Preservation and Landscape Plan and to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Township of Georgian Bluffs.
27. That wording be included in the subdivision agreement to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and the Township of Georgian Bluffs to ensure compliance with the Federal Fisheries Act, which will be demonstrated through a Department of Fisheries and Oceans Self-Assessment, to be completed upon receipt of final design drawings.
28. That wording be included in the subdivision agreement, to the satisfaction of the Township of Georgian Bluffs, to restrict construction traffic on Wilson drive and that construction vehicles must enter the site from the road network in the northeast, rather than via Wilson Drive.
29. That prior to final approval the County is advised in writing by the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority how Conditions 8, 10 to 22, 26 and 27 have been satisfied.
30. That prior to final approval the County is advised in writing by the Niagara Escarpment Commission how Conditions 6, 8, 10 to 12, 14 to 18, 22, and 26, have been satisfied.
31. That prior to final approval the County is advised in writing by Canada Post how Condition 25 has been satisfied.
32. That prior to final approval the County is advised in writing by the Township of Georgian Bluffs how Conditions 2 to ­31 have been satisfied.
33. If final approval is not given to this plan within three years of the draft approval date, and no extensions have been granted, draft approval shall lapse under Subsection 51(32) of the Planning Act, RSO 1990, as amended. If the owner wishes to request an extension to draft approval, a written explanation together with the applicable application fee and a resolution from the local municipality must be received by the County of Grey Director of Planning, prior to the lapsing date. Please note that an updated review of the Plan and revisions to the conditions of approval may be necessary if an extension is to be granted.
34. That the owner, submit to the County of Grey with a computer disk containing a digitised copy of the Final Plan in a format acceptable to the County of Grey.

NOTES TO DRAFT APPROVAL

1. It is the applicant's responsibility to fulfil the conditions of draft approval and to ensure that the required clearance letters are forwarded by the appropriate agencies to the County of Grey, quoting the County file number.
2. An electrical distribution line operating at below 50,000 volts might be located within the area affected by this development or abutting this development. Section 186 - Proximity - of the Regulations for Construction Projects in the Occupational Health and Safety Act, requires that no object be brought closer than 3 metres (10 feet) to the energized conductor. It is proponent’s responsibility to be aware, and to make all personnel on site aware, that all equipment and personnel must come no closer than the distance specified in the Act. They should also be aware that the electrical conductors can raise and lower without warning, depending on the electrical demand placed on the line. Warning signs should be posted on the wood poles supporting the conductors stating “**DANGER - Overhead Electrical Wires”** in all locations where personnel and construction vehicles might come in close proximity to the conductors.
3. Clearances are required from the following:

Township of Georgian Bluffs  
177964 Grey Road 18  
Rural Route #3 Owen Sound, ON, N4K 5N5

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority

237897 Inglis Falls Road, Rural Route #4

Owen Sound, ON, N4K 5N6

Niagara Escarpment Commission

99 King Street East

Thornbury, ON, N0H 2P0

Canada Post

Delivery Services Officer | Delivery Planning

955 Highbury Ave

London, ON, N5Y1A3

1. We suggest you make yourself aware of the following subsections of the Land Titles Act:
   1. subsection 144(1) requires all new plans to be registered in a Land Titles system if the land is situated in a land titles division; and
   2. subsection 144(2) allows certain exceptions.

The subdivision plan for Registration must be in conformity with the applicable Ontario Regulation under The Registry Act.

1. Inauguration or extension of a piped water supply, a sewage system or a storm drainage system, is subject to the approval of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change under the Ontario Water Resources Act, RSO 1990, as amended.
2. All measurements in subdivision final plans must be presented in metric units.
3. A portion of the subject lands are affected by Ontario Regulation 151/06: Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alteration to Shorelines and Watercourses regulation.  As such permits are required from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority prior to site alterations and/or construction within the affected area.
4. The developer will consult with Canada Post to determine suitable permanent locations for the Community Mail Boxes. The developer will then indicate these locations on the appropriate servicing plans.

The developer agrees, prior to offering any units for sale, to display a map on the wall of the sales office in a place readily accessible to potential homeowners that indicates the location of all Community Mail Boxes within the development, as approved by Canada Post.

The developer agrees to include in all offers of purchase and sale a statement which advises the purchaser that mail will be delivered via Community Mail Box. The developer also agrees to note the locations of all Community Mail Boxes within the development, and to notify affected homeowners of any established easements granted to Canada Post to permit access to the Community Mail Box.

The developer will provide a suitable and safe temporary site for a Community Mail Box until curbs, sidewalks and final grading are completed at the permanent Community Mail Box locations. Canada Post will provide mail delivery to new residents as soon as the homes are occupied.

The developer agrees to provide the following for each Community Mail Box site and to include these requirements on the appropriate servicing plans:

* + 1. Any required walkway across the boulevard, per municipal standards
    2. Any required curb depressions for wheelchair access, with an opening of at least two metres (consult Canada Post for detailed specifications)
    3. A Community Mailbox concrete base pad per Canada Post specifications.

1. The final plan approved by the County must be registered within thirty (30) days or the County may withdraw its approval under subsection 51(32) of the Planning Act RSO 1990, as amended.