Committee of the Whole
April 12, 2018 – Following Council
Council Chambers, Grey County Administration Building

1. Call to Order
2. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
   a. Kris Kreutzweiser, Auditor from Collins – Barrow
      Golden Town Financial Statements
      HDR-CW-03-18 Golden Town Residential Community (Deferred from the meeting of March 22, 2018)
      That Report HDR-CW-03-18 regarding a proposed transfer of Golden Town Residential Company assets to Grey County be received; and
      That staff be directed to carry out the process to transfer such assets to the County of Grey.
   b. Addendum to PDR-CW-39-17 Saugeen Valley Revised Memorandum of Understanding (Deferred from the meeting of March 8, 2018)
      That the comments outlined in the Addendum to Staff Report PDR-CW-39-17 be provided to the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) in response to the revised draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for plan review and technical services that the SVCA circulated to the County and the watershed municipalities, and
      That Council requests that the SVCA continue to provide both natural hazard and natural heritage comments for the County of Grey as part of its review of planning applications in order to maintain consistency with other conservation authorities and municipalities in Grey County, and
      That when providing comments on natural hazards and natural heritage matters that the comments be provided in the context of Provincial Policy Statement as well as the County Official Plan, and local planning documents for all Planning Act applications, and
      That Council supports the recommended revisions to the revised draft MoU and directs staff to circulate a copy of the Report and the revised draft MoU to the SVCA and the member municipalities within Grey County that are
located within the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority watershed and to work with the SVCA to finalize an MoU for Council’s consideration.

4. Delegations

10:40 AM  Mike Ryan, President and Hugh Simpson, First Vice President - Grey County Federation of Agriculture

Farm Assessments and Taxes

11:00 AM  Pam Hillier, Executive Director – 211

Review of 211 Service Usage Statistics, Gaps for 2017 and Program Highlights

5. Determination of Items Requiring Separate Discussion

6. Consent Agenda

That the following Consent Agenda items be received; and

That staff be authorized to take the actions necessary to give effect to the recommendations in the staff reports; and

That the correspondence be supported or received for information as recommended in the consent agenda.

a. FR-CW-13-18 Quarterly Purchasing Report – Quarter 1 2018

That Report FR-CW-13-18 regarding the quarterly purchasing report for Quarter 1 of 2018 be received for information.

b. TR-CW-19-18 Setback Exemption Request for 504569 Grey Road 1

That Report TR-CW-19-18 be received and that the request for a setback exemption of 52.49 feet (16 metres) from the centreline at 504569 Grey Road 1 in the Township of Georgian Bluffs to accommodate a garage separate from the existing residential house be approved.

c. Resolution from the Town of Hanover – Funding for Local Libraries

That the County of Grey supports the Town of Hanover’s resolution urging the Province of Ontario to reinstate adequate and appropriate funding for local libraries.

d. Resolution from the Township of Chatsworth – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority Commenting on Official Plan Policies
That the correspondence from the Township of Chatsworth regarding the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority commenting on County and Local Official Plan policies, be received for information.

e. Thank you from Township of Georgian Bluffs – Council Presentation

That the correspondence from the Township of Georgian Bluffs thanking the CAO and Warden for their presentation to Council be received for information.

f. Accessibility Advisory Committee minutes dated March 23, 2018

That the Accessibility Advisory Committee minutes dated March 23, 2018 be adopted as presented.

g. Public Meeting minutes dated March 28, 2018 – Official Plan Amendment 141 – Township of Southgate

That the public meeting minutes dated March 28, 2018 regarding Official Plan Amendment 141 be received for information.

h. Grey County-The Blue Mountains Task Force minutes dated November 28, 2017

That the Grey County-The Blue Mountains Task Force minutes dated November 28, 2017 be adopted as presented.

7. Items For Direction and Discussion

a. Homelessness Enumeration Verbal Update

For information

b. HDR-CW-07-18 Transfer of Twin Pines Property to Grey County

That Report HDR-CW-07-18 be received and that the properties identified as Part of Park Lot 8 North Side of Chester Street West Plan 500 Durham as in GS38555 except R443637; Geographic Township of Bentinck, Municipality of West Grey, County of Grey be acquired from Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario as represented by The Minister of Infrastructure; and

That the Warden and Clerk be authorized to sign the transfer agreement to transfer ownership from Her Majesty the Queen to Grey County; and

That the County proceed with option two and issue a Request for Proposal for interested parties to build affordable housing; and

That once the transfer of land is finalized, staff proceed with a notice of intent to declare the land surplus.

c. HDR-CW-06-18 Social Housing Apartment Improvement Program Additional Funding
That report HDR-CW-06-18 regarding additional funding through the Social Housing Apartment Improvement Program be received; and

That Council endorses the business plan for the additional year one funding from the Province of $111,547 and the 2018-2021 business plan and that the plans be submitted to the Province.

d. TR-CW-20-18 Award of RFT-TS-03-18 Grey Road 32 Pulverizing and Hot Mix Paving

That Report TR-CW-20-18 regarding tender award recommendations for RFT-TS-03-18 be received and that the tender be awarded to E.C. King Contracting for $1,947,652.43 excluding taxes; and

That a 5% construction contingency be added to the tender price resulting in a revised estimated project cost of $2,081,027.67 net HST; and

That the project deficit of $81,027.67 will be funded from any surplus realized from within the 2018 capital construction budget or, if a surplus is not available, from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve.

e. TR-CW-21-18 Engineering Technologist Position

That Report TR-CW-21-18 regarding the Engineering Technologist position be received and that Grey County proceed with hiring an Engineering Technologist; and

That the position be funded from the Transportation General Reserve in 2018 and included in the 2019 budget.

f. PDR-CW-14-18 Sunvale Homes Information Report

That Report PDR-CW-14-18 regarding an overview of proposed application 42T-2018-05, to establish a plan of subdivision consisting of two hundred and forty-seven (247) lots on lands described as Part of Lot 24, Division 2, Concession 1 EGR, (geographic Township of Glenelg) in the Municipality of West Grey, be received for information.

g. Ontario Municipal Board Appeals File List

That the Ontario Municipal Board Appeals File list be received for information.

8. Administration Building Addition/Renovation Update

9. Closed Meeting Matters

That Committee of the Whole does now go into closed session to discuss:
i. Advice subject to solicitor – client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose pursuant to Section 239 (2) of the Municipal Act, 2001 regarding Indigenous land rights

10. Other Business

11. Notice of Motion

12. Adjournment
Recommendation

1. That Report HDR-CW-03-18 regarding a proposed transfer of Golden Town Residential Company assets to Grey County be received; and
2. That staff be directed to carry out the process to transfer such assets to the County of Grey.

Executive Summary

Golden Town Residential Community is a non-profit housing provider that provides rent-geared-to-income and market rent housing to 63 families and 46 seniors in Meaford. After over 30 years of providing affordable housing the Board and staff of this non-profit corporation are retiring in September of 2018 and have asked that the County take over ownership and operations of Golden Town.

The non-profit corporation is in good financial position and provides much needed rent-geared-to-income housing. The transfer of the corporation’s assets to Grey County ensures the housing remains in the Grey County portfolio to count towards our required service delivery standards and provides opportunity for expanded services to tenants and the possibility of more affordable units for seniors in Meaford.

Background and Discussion

Golden Town Residential consists of three developments:
Golden Town Manor

Gold Town Manor is a federally funded building and has 18 one bedroom apartments and 3 two bedroom apartments. The 21 seniors’ only units were built in 1985 through a federal program. Of the 21 units, 15 are market rent units and six are rent-geared-to-income. This agreement is due to end in 2020 and Golden Town is no longer expected to provide rent-geared-to-income housing after the agreement expires.

Albert Place

Albert Place is a seniors’ only building consisting of 17 one bedroom apartments and 8 two bedroom apartments. This building was built through a Provincial program in 1991. The building is brick has an elevator and utilities are included. At this time only six units are rent-geared-to-income.

Victoria Village

Victoria Village consists of 63 family units of housing made up of 33 two bedroom townhouses and 30 three bedroom town houses known as Victoria Village. Victoria Village has a playground on site, a school within two blocks, coin laundry on site and a family resource centre modeled after Alpha Street Resource Centre. The townhouses are brick, no basement, electric heat and utilities are not included. All units are rent-geared-to-income

Service Delivery Standards

Grey County has provincially set service delivery standards for the number of rent-geared-to-income housing units Grey County is to maintain. Grey County’s service delivery standard of 1251 units of housing includes Grey County Housing and Non Profit Housing Providers. For this reason and due to the need for affordable housing in Grey County, the Golden Town units are required to remain as social housing units.

Golden Town is still under an agreement with Grey County to provide rent-geared-to-income housing and therefore needs the County’s approval to proceed with any plans regarding the transfer or sale of the 109 units.

Overview of Golden Town Residential Community

Finance reviewed financial statements from December 2016. The audited statements show Golden Town to be in good financial position for capital investments and operating funds. Golden Town’s year end is December and is currently working on the 2017 audit. This audit will also be reviewed by finance staff once received.

Golden Town relies on a subsidy from Grey County in the amount of $637,320 for the 2017 year for all three complexes. The majority of the subsidy is levy dollars.

Facilities staff looked at the 2014 Building Condition Assessment, Golden Town’s capital expenditures and future plans and did a tour of all three sites and determined the buildings are well maintained. Golden Town has funds for the capital needs identified in the BCA’s and by staff for the next 10 years and beyond.
Options Explored for Golden Town

Currently Golden Town Residential Community is governed by a Board of Directors and has two staff, an office manager and a custodian. There are board members still on the board from the original build in 1985 and the office manager has been involved with the non-profit since 1985.

The Board of Directors did approach another non-profit to transfer ownership and operating of the non-profit but the proposal was declined as the non-profit is currently expanding. There is no other non-profit in Grey County that has the capacity to take on another 109 units of housing at this time. The Board of Directors then approached the County with the same proposal.

The County offered to assist Golden Town in recruiting and training a new board but there was no interest in this option.

Grey County is faced with two options for this non-profit. Grey County can take over ownership and day to day operations of Golden Town permanently or Grey County can take over temporary ownership of Golden Town and look to recruit and train a Board and staff.

If Grey County assumes ownership and operations, there is potential for savings as a full time custodian would be needed but not a project manager. Current staff positions would be absorbed into our current tenant services, facilities and administration.

A full time custodian would be needed at a cost of $78,000 for salary and benefits. Currently the County subsidizes $110,698 in salary and benefits to Golden Town so there are a potential savings of $32,698 to the County. There is also potential savings in insurance, snow removal, life safety systems and other contracted services as the units would be included in bulk pricing.

Golden Town has 35 market units some of which can be transferred to other Grey County Housing units to improve profitability of other buildings in our portfolio and increase the amount of rent-geared-to-income housing in Meaford. Currently Golden Town offers only 11 of the 33 seniors units as rent-geared-to-income. Meaford has a waitlist of 30 seniors waiting for housing.

There are benefits for the tenants as Grey County has access to community relations workers to assist with any needs to remain housed or age in place. Both seniors buildings are attached to the Meaford Long Term Care Centre. There may be future opportunity for partnerships for more affordable housing units.

If the County wishes not to become owners and operate these units, the County would still have to enter into ownership for at least a year until a Board and staff members can be recruited and trained. This would require at least a part time staff person for a year and extra legal fees. This option can also happen at any time if there are concerns with the ownership of Golden Town Residential Community. Other concerns with this option are that a new board could decide to sell or no longer provide rent geared to income housing with the seniors units once operating agreements end.

Housing is entering into a time of change and as housing providers come to the end of their mortgages in the next 2-10 years, housing providers will have a choice to remain housing providers or offer market rent units only. If a provider decides to continue offering affordable housing they must enter into an accreditation process in order to become part of a registry that will have access to funding. This will put many of our small non-profits at a disadvantage. Literature from the United Kingdom and Ireland that have implemented similar programs have
noted outcomes such as: some non-profits deciding to become for profit and smaller non-profits amalgamating with other small non-profits for economies of scale. Either way, Grey County is responsible for maintaining a service delivery standard of 1251 units of rent-geared-to-income housing.

Legal andLegislated Requirements

Notification of the transfer to the Province

Legal fees for transfer of asset

Financial and Resource Implications

Savings of $32,698 in staffing and potential savings in insurance, snow removal, life safety systems and other contracted services.

Operating and Capital funds added to County Portfolio for the maintenance and operating of Golden Town.

Golden Town has remaining mortgages on all three buildings with a principal amount of $3,719,117 as of the end of December 2017. Currently Grey County pays the mortgages as part of the subsidy flowed to Golden Town Residential Community. This liability will therefore will also need to be transferred and assumed by the County. Currently non-profit mortgages are bundled with the Province for low interest rate mortgages. This option is available for Grey County as well.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal: Finance, Facilities Staff in Housing

☒ External: Town of Meaford

Appendices and Attachments

None
Committee Report

To: Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council

Committee Date: March 8, 2018/ April 12, 2018

Subject / Report No: Addendum to PDR-CW-39-17

Title: Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority – Memorandum of Understanding

Prepared by: Randy Scherzer

Reviewed by: Kim Wingrove

Lower Tier(s) Affected: Municipalities within the Saugeen Valley Watershed

Status: Report deferred per Resolution CW77-18;

Recommendation

1. That the comments outlined in the Addendum to Staff Report PDR-CW-39-17 be provided to the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) in response to the revised draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for plan review and technical services that the SVCA circulated to the County and the watershed municipalities, and

2. That Council requests that the SVCA continue to provide both natural hazard and natural heritage comments for the County of Grey as part of its review of planning applications in order to maintain consistency with other conservation authorities and municipalities in Grey County, and

3. That when providing comments on natural hazards and natural heritage matters that the comments be provided in the context of Provincial Policy Statement as well as the County Official Plan, and local planning documents for all Planning Act applications, and

4. That Council supports the recommended revisions to the revised draft MoU and directs staff to circulate a copy of the Report and the revised draft MoU to the SVCA and the member municipalities within Grey County that are located within the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority watershed and to work with the SVCA to finalize an MoU for Council’s consideration.

Executive Summary

In July 2017, the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) circulated a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) that would govern the plan review and technical services
that SVCA would provide to municipalities within their watershed. A revised draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been prepared by SVCA which addresses some of the comments and concerns expressed previously in Staff Report PDR-CW-39-17. The revised draft MoU still does not include the option for SVCA to provide natural heritage comments on planning applications. SVCA staff have indicated that if a municipality wishes SVCA to provide these services that a motion be passed by Council that clearly indicates that the County/municipality wishes for these services to continue. SVCA staff have noted that the cost for this service will increase slightly and these costs have been reflected in the attached revised MoU under Appendix A – Schedule 3(a). It is recommended that SVCA continue to provide review and technical services for both natural hazard and natural heritage matters for all applications. County staff have suggested revisions to the revised MoU as attached to this Report which are recommended to be forwarded to SVCA for their consideration as well as forwarded to local municipalities within the SVCA watershed.

Background and Discussion

On July 5, 2017, the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) circulated a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) that would govern the plan review and technical services that SVCA would provide to municipalities within their watershed. The initial draft MoA indicated that SVCA would only provide comments on natural hazard matters and that they only wanted to be circulated on applications within the regulated/screening areas. Staff Report PDR-CW-39-17 identified some concerns and suggested revisions to the MoA to ensure consistency with planning review provided by conservation authorities throughout Grey County. Following Council’s approval of PDR-CW-39-17, a meeting was held with SVCA staff, County staff and staff from each member municipality within the SVCA watershed. At the meeting there was general consensus amongst the County and municipal staff of the importance for SVCA to continue to provide natural heritage review and technical services in order to be consistent with other conservation authorities and to avoid confusion as to which agency provides these services. There was also good discussion on the importance that the review and technical comments for natural hazards and natural heritage matters not only be reviewed in the context of the Provincial Policy Statement but also under the context of County/local planning documents (e.g. official plans, zoning by-laws, etc.). Based on the comments raised in PDR-CW-39-17 as well as the discuss at the meeting with SVCA and local municipal staff, it was recommended that a revised MoA be prepared and circulated to the municipalities for further review and comment.

A revised draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been circulated by SVCA. Some of the suggested revisions were incorporated into the revised draft MoU, however it still does not include the option for SVCA to provide natural heritage comments on planning applications. SVCA staff have indicated that if a municipality wishes SVCA to provide these services that a motion be passed by Council clearly indicating that the County/municipality wishes for these services to continue and then the SVCA Board will consider it. It is recommended that a motion be passed indicating the County’s desire for SVCA to continue to provide both natural hazard and natural heritage review for all applications. County staff are also recommending some further revisions to the revised MoU to assist with clarifying roles and responsibilities. The following is a summary of the recommended revisions identified in PDR-CW-39-17 and an update on whether these have been addressed within the revised MoU. A summary of the
suggested revisions to the revised MoU are also highlighted below and can be found in further detail in the attached revised MoU.

1. Appendix A, Schedule 1 – it was recommended that this list reflects the development/planning applications that the County will be circulating to the SVCA for review and comment (i.e. Subdivisions, Condominiums, County Official Plans and County Official Plan Amendments). This list has been revised by SVCA as recommended. County staff continues to recommend that Minor Exemptions (clear-cut permits) under the County’s Forest Management By-law be added to this list. The current process for Minor Exemptions requires these to be circulated to conservation authorities for review and comment. A suggested review fee has also been included in Appendix A – Schedule 3(a) which can be discussed with SVCA. Previously it was recommended that infrastructure projects (e.g. major works on County roads/trails located within regulated/screening areas) be included on this list, however these are captured under the current conservation authority regulations and permit review process so there is less of a need to add these to the list.

2. It was previously recommended that additional wording be added to the MoU with respect to making other arrangements to provide the application review and/or technical review services (i.e. peer reviews). There may be times where a matter is beyond the necessary resources or expertise of SVCA staff or where there is a difference in opinion between the conservation authority and the applicant’s consultant which may require a peer review. SVCA has added Section 2(b)(v) which address the comments raised previously.

3. County staff previously recommended that clarification be included in the MoU regarding pre-submission consultation including the importance of involving SVCA staff as part of the pre-submission consultation process. It was also recommended that wording be included to indicate that any pre-submission consultation fees required by SVCA be collected by SVCA directly from the applicant. SVCA has included wording in section 2(c)(ix) to address these comments.

4. The one major change that was recommended in the previous MoA provided by SVCA was to only provide comments on natural hazards within SVCA’s regulated area or within SVCA’s screening area and that they only wanted to be circulated on applications within these areas. This is a major departure from the current process as the County and municipalities are required to circulate conservation authorities on all applications within the conservation authority watershed as per the Planning Act. Conservation authorities, including SVCA, also currently provide natural heritage comments and technical review for planning applications within their respective watersheds. It was recommended that SVCA provide the option for the County and the municipalities to circulate them on all applications regardless of whether it is within the regulated/screening area or not. It was also recommended that SVCA provide the option to the County and the municipalities to have SVCA provide comments on natural heritage matters as well.

At the meeting with SVCA and local municipal staff, it was recommended that in order to maintain consistency with the level of services provided by the other conservation authorities and to avoid confusion over which agency provides these services, it was recommended that SVCA continue to provide both natural hazard and natural heritage review for all applications and to review this in the context of not only the Provincial...
Policy Statement but County/local municipal planning documents as well. The revised MoU circulated by SVCA did not include language about providing natural heritage review and technical services nor did it indicate that the review of natural hazards would also be for all applications. SVCA staff did indicate that if the County or municipalities want SVCA to continue to provide these services that a motion be passed by Council clearly indicating this.

The County currently relies on the conservation authorities to provide technical review on both natural hazards and natural heritage matters. Should SVCA no longer provide this service, the County and/or municipalities would need to hire environmental experts/staff to provide this technical review as the County and municipalities currently do not have the expertise to review these matters. This could also lead to an increase in peer reviews being required for technical reports which could increase costs for applicants and could cause delays in the application process.

County staff recommend that for the reasons noted above as well as from a consistency standpoint that SVCA continue to provide both natural hazard and natural heritage review for all planning applications within the SVCA watershed. There are a number of suggested revisions identified in the attached revised MoU which reflects this recommendation (i.e. clarifying that the review and technical services are for all applications and for both natural hazards and natural heritage matters). County staff have also included some proposed wording with respect to reviewing these matters in the context of the PPS as well as County/local municipal planning documents.

5. It was recommended that a section be included indicating that the SVCA provide the County and local municipalities with mapping related to natural hazards including natural hazard mapping, regulated area mapping and screening area mapping. County staff have suggested revised wording in Section 2(c)(vii) to reflect this.

6. It was also recommended that wording be added to indicate that SVCA will conduct site visits to subject properties as required. County staff have suggested revised wording in Section 2(c)(iii).

7. It was recommended that the MoU include a communications and issue resolution protocol. SVCA has included this in Appendix A – Schedule 4.

8. It was recommended that a schedule be included in the MoU which identifies the role of SVCA in various matters as it relates to regulatory authority, watershed resource management, Planning Act commenting agency and delegated provincial responsibilities. A similar schedule has been included by the NVCA in their MoU’s with municipalities and the intent is to assist with clarifying roles and responsibilities. County staff have added a suggested chart which clarifies the various roles and responsibilities and have included this in Appendix A – Schedule 5 of the attached revised agreement.

County staff continues to see merit in entering into MoU’s with conservation authorities as it will help to clarify roles and responsibilities and will provide a consistent review process for both natural hazards and natural heritage matters throughout Grey County.

County staff reached out to Bruce County and Wellington County to discuss the revised SVCA MoU and to determine what approach is being taken. For Bruce County, their Council has asked staff to explore options for hiring environmental experts to provide the technical review and comments on natural heritage matters for all planning applications. Last update was that
staff were preparing a request for proposal to determine the costs for this service and report back to Bruce County Council. Wellington County has 5 conservation authorities within their area. They have recently entered into updated MoU’s with 4 out of the 5 conservation authorities save and except for SVCA. The updated MoU’s with the other 4 conservation authorities continue to provide natural hazard and natural heritage review for all planning applications.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

Conservation Authority Act and applicable regulations
Planning Act
County Official Plan and Local Official Plans

Financial and Resource Implications

The County currently relies on the conservation authorities to provide technical review and comments on both natural hazards and natural heritage matters for all planning applications. Should SVCA no longer provide this service, the County and/or municipalities would need to hire environmental experts/staff to provide this technical review as the County and municipalities currently do not have the expertise to review these matters. This could also lead to an increase in peer reviews being required for technical reports which could increase costs for applicants and could cause delays in the application process. SVCA staff have indicated that SVCA could continue to provide these services subject to the County and local municipalities passing a motion requesting as such. SVCA has indicated that this will increase the review costs slightly which typically range in an increase of $100 to $200 per application. The cost for the County to hire environmental expert(s)/staff is anticipated to be considerably more than the slight fee increases being put forward by SVCA should they continue to provide these services.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal – Planning Staff, CAO
☒ External – SVCA staff, member municipalities within the SVCA watershed, Bruce County, Wellington County

Appendices and Attachments

For an accessible version of the below agreement, please contact the Clerk’s Department.

Revised Memorandum of Agreement with Recommended Revisions
The Grey County Federation of Agriculture (GCFA), on behalf of its 1500 members, is deeply disappointed by Grey County Committee of the Whole adopting the recommendation to set 2018 Farm land property tax at 25% of the residential rate.

After a 22% increase to farm land tax bills in 2017 the GCFA had asked council to slow the increase in farm taxes from an 11% increase in 2018, to a more manageable 3.1% increase as farm tax increases by setting the farm property tax class at 22% of the residential rate.

Prior to this increase studies have shown agriculture land receives 38-50 cents of services for every dollar raised in taxes; as brought to your attention by the Grey Bruce Christian farmers letter attached to March 22nd COW agenda package, (in a study of Cavan Monaghan Township in the US) and the OFA's own study of Bayham Ontario services.

Grey County farmers are not asking to pay less tax, we are asking for county to pass a measure to ensure the financial health of its rural economy. No other tax class would stand for an average of a 60% -75% tax increase in addition to any increase needed to supplement increased spending or inflation.

Staffs report to council on the issue highlighted that many farm properties are blended with residential assessments and increases to individual properties appeared small in this report. This hides the fact that many farm businesses rent more property than they own. Therefore, farm business will be responsible for bearing the increase to farmland taxes through increased rental rates, compounding the increase.

Grey County has stated in Recolour Grey that “Thriving rural areas are critical to both our economy and quality of life.” Keeping the ratio at 25 percent of the residential tax rate limits our Grey County farmers abilities to expand and invest. Dropping the Farmland Tax Rate has a massive impact to the individual farm business, yet it effects the county only by 1/2 the cost of Councillors remuneration.

We continue to urge Grey County Council to be a leader in the province and join the 5 other counties that have lowered their agricultural tax rate and reject the recommendation of committee of the whole.

It's time we recognized charging the legal maximum is not a way to stimulate growth and healthy in rural economies.
### Scenario 1: Adjusting Farm Tax Ratio to maintain 2017 share of levy (3.5%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farm taxes paid</th>
<th>Farm Increase ($)</th>
<th>Farm Increase (%)</th>
<th>Residential taxes paid</th>
<th>Residential Increase ($)</th>
<th>Residential Increase (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,535,038</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$43,745,819</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,875,500</td>
<td>$340,462</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>$45,457,800</td>
<td>$1,711,981</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,933,992</td>
<td>$58,492</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>$45,602,502</td>
<td>$144,702</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under this scenario 2016-2018:
- Farm taxes increase by 26%
- Residential taxes increase by 4.2%
- Approximate tax ratio to maintain farm portion of tax levy at 3.5% in 2018 is 0.2265

### Scenario 2: Not Adjusting Farm Tax Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farm taxes paid</th>
<th>Farm Increase ($)</th>
<th>Farm Increase (%)</th>
<th>Residential taxes paid</th>
<th>Residential Increase/Decrease ($)</th>
<th>Residential Increase/Decrease (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,535,038</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$43,745,819</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,875,500</td>
<td>$340,462</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>$45,457,800</td>
<td>$1,711,981</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$2,110,000</td>
<td>$234,500</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>$45,254,100</td>
<td>($203,700)</td>
<td>-0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under this scenario from 2016-2018:
- Farm taxes increase by 37.5%
- Residential taxes increase by 3.4%
Recommendation

1. That Report FR-CW-13-18 regarding the quarterly purchasing report for Quarter 1 of 2018 be received for information.

Executive Summary

Grey County’s purchasing policy A-FIN-001, as endorsed by County Council on March 4, 2014, gives Directors the authority to award items and services up to $250,000. This policy requires Directors to provide a summary of all purchases between $25,000 and $250,000 on a quarterly basis.

Background and Discussion

The attached chart summarizes all purchases made between $25,000 and $250,000 by Departments between January 1, 2018 and March 31, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Bids</th>
<th>Awarded Bid</th>
<th>Approved Amount</th>
<th>Awarded Amount (excl. HST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP-TS-09-18</td>
<td>Structure Replacement Design</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greer Galloway Group Inc.</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$63,345.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFT-TS-12-18</td>
<td>Hot Box</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amaco Construction Equipment Inc.</td>
<td>$38,000.00</td>
<td>$35,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Housing Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Bids</th>
<th>Awarded Bid</th>
<th>Approved Amount</th>
<th>Awarded Amount (excl. HST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFT-HOU-02-18</td>
<td>Door Replacement at Meaford and Holstein</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Talbot Enterprises</td>
<td>$82,000.00</td>
<td>$57,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFT-HOU-03-18</td>
<td>Twin Pines (Owen Sound) Ceiling and Lighting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wayne’s Electric</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$26,930.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Bids</th>
<th>Awarded Bid</th>
<th>Anticipated Revenue</th>
<th>Awarded Amount (excl. HST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFT-PCD-02-18</td>
<td>Forest 6, Collingwood 19 Harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mark Dinsmore</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
<td>$38,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFT-PCD-03-18</td>
<td>Forest 43, Sullivan Klondyke Harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mark Dinsmore</td>
<td>$28,500.00</td>
<td>$16,100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Long Term Care Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Bids</th>
<th>Awarded Bid</th>
<th>Approved Amount</th>
<th>Awarded Amount (excl. HST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFT-LTC-01-18</td>
<td>Auditorium Renovation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allen Hastings Ltd.</td>
<td>$137,500.00*</td>
<td>$122,493.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$160,000.00 is the total approved amount from Home and Community Support Services to complete the renovation and includes $22,500.00 in consulting fees.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Services Contract</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Bids</th>
<th>Awarded Bid</th>
<th>Approved Amount</th>
<th>Awarded Amount (excl. HST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFT-SS-01-18</td>
<td>Roof at EarlyON in Hanover</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>T. Hamilton &amp; Son Roofing Inc.</td>
<td>$131,000.00</td>
<td>$76,355.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legal and Legislated Requirements
None

Financial and Resource Implications

Relevant Consultation
☒ Internal
☐ External

Appendices and Attachments
None
Committee Report

To: Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council

Committee Date: April 12, 2018

Subject / Report No: TR-CW-19-18

Title: Setback Exemption Request for 504569 Grey Road 1

Prepared by: Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation Services

Reviewed by: Kim Wingrove, CAO

Lower Tier(s) Affected: Township of Georgian Bluffs

Status: Recommendation

1. That Report TR-CW-19-18 be received and that the request for a setback exemption of 52.49 feet (16 metres) from the centreline at 504569 Grey Road 1 in the Township of Georgian Bluffs to accommodate a garage separate from the existing residential house be approved.

Executive Summary

The owner of the property located at 504569 Grey Road 1 is requesting to construct a garage with a 52.49 feet (16 metres) setback from the centerline of Grey Road 1.

An exemption to the Grey County Transportation Services’ erection of buildings and structures on lands abutting Grey County Roads policy was sent the Director of Transportation Services by the property owners.

Background and Discussion

Grey County Transportation Services' policy on the erection of buildings and structures on lands abutting Grey County Roads specifies that no building or structure shall be erected within 75 feet (22.9 metres) from the centreline of any County road unless approved by the Director of Transportation Services and County Council.
Due to the slope on this property and the natural hazard area recognized by Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, the property owner is proposing to build a garage with a setback of 16 metres.

Staff completed a survey to measure the setback of structures from the centerline of the road for various properties in this area. It was determined that most of the structures were between 16 metres and 19 metres from the centerline.

Transportation Services recommends approving this setback exemption request.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

None

Financial and Resource Implications

None

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal (list)

☐ External (list)

Appendices and Attachments

Location of Proposed Garage Map
March 28, 2018

Kathleen Wynne, Premier
Legislative Building
Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Wynne:

Re:  Funding for Local Libraries

Please be advised that the Council of the Town of Hanover, at its regular meeting held on March 19, 2018, endorsed the following resolution:

Moved by COUNCILLOR FITZSIMMONS | Seconded by COUNCILLOR KING
WHEREAS public libraries provide safe, inclusive, and vibrant community spaces where everyone is welcome to learn, work, connect, and have fun; and,

WHEREAS the Hanover Public Library engages with the community and contributes to a culture of social good by sharing knowledge and resources; and,

WHEREAS the Hanover Public Library continues to seek funding opportunities through donor development and sponsorships to increase services and expand programming outside of their core funding; and,

WHEREAS the Hanover Public Library continues to manage public resources with the utmost care and are committed to the sustainability of their services;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Town of Hanover urges the Province of Ontario to recognize the contribution of local libraries within their communities and to cease the 20 year budget freeze to local libraries in an acknowledgement to the services they offer to all residents; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town of Hanover urges the Province of Ontario to reinstate adequate and appropriate funding for local libraries, increasing each year going forward in line with the consumer price index; and,

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Tourism, Culture, and Sport; to the Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs; to the local MPPs; to the Association of Municipalities Ontario; to the Ontario Library Association; to the Federation of Ontario Public Libraries; and to the County of Grey and local area municipalities.  CARRIED
We thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Respectfully,

Brian Tocheri
CAO/Clerk

c.c. D. Ford, Ontario PC Party  
A. Horwath, Ontario NDP Party  
B. Mauro, Minister of Municipal Affairs  
D. Vernile, Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport & MPP – Kitchener Centre  
I. Naidoo-Harris, Minister of Education & MPP  
B. Walker, MPP Grey-Bruce-Owen Sound  
M. Turner, Association of Municipalities Ontario  
S. Paterson, Ontario Library Association  
S. Abram, Federation of Ontario Public Libraries  
Grey County Municipalities  
A. Rivers-Moore, CEO/Chief Librarian – Hanover Public Library
March 22, 2018

Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority
1078 Bruce Road 12, PO Box 150
Formosa ON N0G 1W0
Attention: Wayne Brohman, General Manager

Dear Mr. Brohman:

The Township of Chatsworth Council passed the following resolution at their regular Council Meeting on Wednesday February 21, 2018.

Resolution 2018-07-09

That CAO/Clerk’s Report 2018-07 dated February 21, 2018 regarding a revised Memorandum of Understanding between the Township of Chatsworth and the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority be hereby received for information;

AND FURTHER THAT Council requests the SVCA to continue to provide natural heritage comments for the Township of Chatsworth as part of its review of planning applicants;

AND FURTHER THAT in order to maintain consistency with other municipalities in Grey County, the SVCA continue to provide comments on County and Local Official Plan policies for all Planning Act applications;

AND FURTHER THAT Council directs staff to forward a copy of this resolution to Grey County and the five member Municipalities of the watershed within Grey County.

If you have any questions please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Best Regards,

Carolyn Vlielander-Marx, Dipl.M.A.
Deputy Clerk

cc  County of Grey
Municipality of Grey Highlands
Municipality of West Grey
Township of Southgate
Town of Hanover
March 13, 2018

County of Grey
Att: Ms. Kim Wingrove and Warden Stewart Halliday
595 9th Ave East
Owen Sound, ON N4K3E3

Dear Ms. Wingrove and Warden Halliday:

RE: March 7, 2018 Council Presentation

On behalf of myself and Council, thank you for your presentation at the March 7, 2018 meeting of Council.

Your knowledge and dedication to maintaining communication with the Township and lower tier municipalities of Grey County is greatly appreciated. We look forward to continuing this relationship and to future meetings with you both and the dedicated staff of Grey County.

Sincerely,

Mayor Alan Barfoot
Township of Georgian Bluffs
519 376 2729 x. 238
abarfoot@georgianbluffs.on.ca
Accessibility Advisory Committee
March 23, 2018 – 2:00 PM

The Accessibility Advisory Committee met on the above date at the County Administration Building with the following members in attendance:

Present: Dwight Burley, Tara Turnbull, Christina Schnell, Andrew Edgcumbe, David Mollison

Regrets: Catherine Scholtz

Staff
Present: Rob Hatten, Communications Manager; Heather Morrison, Clerk; Tara Warder, Deputy Clerk/Legislative Coordinator; Jody MacEachern, Acting Director of Information Technology;

Municipal Representatives: Debbie Yip, Municipality of Grey Highlands; Wendi Hunter, Township of Georgian Bluffs; Kaitlin McArthur, Town of the Blue Mountains

Call to Order

Heather Morrison called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

New Member Introduction

Each Committee member introduced themselves to the group.

Election of the Chair and Vice Chair

Heather Morrison called for nominations for Chair of the Committee for 2018.

AAC01-18 Moved by: Christina Schnell Seconded by: Tara Turnbull

That Councillor Dwight Burley be nominated as Chair of the Accessibility Advisory Committee for 2018.

On motion by David Mollison, nominations closed.

Councillor Burley accepted the nomination and was acclaimed Chair of the Accessibility
Advisory Committee for 2018.

Heather Morrison then called for nominations for Vice Chair of the Committee.

AAC02-18 Moved by: Councillor Burley Seconded by: David Mollison

That Christina Schnell be nominated as Vice Chair of the Accessibility Advisory Committee for 2018.

On motion by Councillor Burley, nominations closed.

Christina Schnell accepted the nomination and was acclaimed Vice Chair of the Committee for 2018.

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Information Technology Accessibility Practices

Jody MacEachern provided an overview of accessible documents and the Information Technology department’s role in training and ensuring the accessibility of documents.

Mr. MacEachern then outlined the tools on the Grey County website for accessibility, including the Browse Aloud function.

GIS and interactive mapping software were outlined as well.

Durham Heritage Bridge

Rob Hatten noted that the Lion’s Club in Durham would like to extend an existing park near the entry way to the Heritage Bridge. They would like to fund raise for the project and in the meantime, they have asked the Accessibility Advisory Committee to provide feedback on the drawing provided. Mr. Hatten requested members look at the plan and provide input.

The Committee commented on the difficulty with manual wheelchairs on a gravel surface and the presence of stairs. Further, the importance of ensuring signage has the appropriate sized font was noted and that any signage be visible and free from tree branches and foliage. The Committee also discussed the width of the pathway.

Mr. Hatten will forward the feedback and note that the Committee can review the more detailed plans if requested.

Discussion occurred on the requirements of a recreational trail.
Draft Multi Year Accessibility Plan

Rob Hatten read the draft multiyear accessibility plan. The County is required to have such a plan which outlines the County’s direction on accessibility over the next five years.

Comments were provided on accessible internal documents and accessibility in Moreston Village at Grey Roots. There was a suggestion to have a portable aluminum ramp to enter some of the buildings at Moreston.

Discussion occurred on transit services in the area and the cost to access. The Committee inquired whether there is another way to help the people of Grey County to have improved access to affordable transit and user share opportunities. The Committee noted that Grey County could play a larger role in assisting with affordable transit.

The recent addition and renovations to the Administration Building were discussed. It was noted that there is little contrast in the upstairs bathroom and it can be difficult for people walking around the corner to access. Mr. Hatten noted that the Committee should tour the new building now that it is nearing completion.

Support was given for the mapping system which shows accessible features of municipal facilities across Grey County.

Discussion occurred on the structures of joint Accessibility Advisory Committees in other counties and regions and the role of the Committees in site plan review. It was noted that there will have to be a process outlining how to facilitate this.

Mr. Hatten will bring an updated version of the draft plan to the next committee meeting.

Other Business

Mr. Hatten noted he will bring forward an update in the spring on the progress of the St. Vincent trail work.

Next Meeting Dates

To be determined

On motion by Christina Schnell, the meeting adjourned at 3:35 PM.

Dwight Burley, Chair
Joint Public Meeting – OPA 141

Wednesday, March 28, 2018 – 1:00 p.m.

A joint Grey County/Township of Southgate public meeting was held at the Township of Southgate Council Chambers, Dundalk, Ontario with the following members in attendance:

Municipal Council Members Present: Councillors Jim Frew, Barbara Dobreen, John Woodbury and Anna-Marie Fosbrooke

Municipal Staff Present: Clint Stredwick, Joanne Hyde and Lindsey Green

County Staff Present: Stephanie Lacey-Avon, Planner and Monica Scribner, Recording Secretary

Also present: Doug Woods, Applicant

Proposed County Official Plan Amendment, Local Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment on lands described as Part Lot 8, Concession 5, known municipally as 043836 Southgate Road 4 in the Township of Southgate (Geographic Township of Egremont) County file number 42-07-060-OPA-141.

Call to Order

Chair Fosbrooke called the public meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the Joint Public meeting on behalf of the Township.

Chair Fosbrooke welcomed everyone on behalf of the County. Introductions then followed.

Stephanie Lacey-Avon read the regulations.

The proposed County Official Plan Amendment, Local Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment affect those lands described as Part of Lot 8, Concession 5, 043836 Southgate Road 4 in the geographic Township of Egremont now in the Township of Southgate.
This development requires three applications; a County of Grey Official Plan Amendment, Local Official Plan Amendment as well as a Township of Southgate Zoning By-law Amendment application. In order for the development to move forward, approvals are needed on all of these applications. The County makes the decision on the County Official Plan Amendment application and the Municipality makes the decision on the Local Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications. The County will make the final decision on the Local Official Plan Amendment following adoption by the Township.

The lands are designated as ‘Agricultural’, ‘Rural’ and ‘Hazard Lands’ in the County Official Plan and as ‘Agriculture’, ‘Rural’ and ‘Hazard Lands’ in the Township of Southgate Official Plan. The proposed County and Township Official Plan Amendments would consider exceptions to the minimum lot area and lot creation policies to allow the lot addition.

The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment will reduce the ‘minimum lot area’ requirement of the ‘A1’ Agricultural zone to 6.1 hectares and also lower the ‘minimum lot frontage’ requirement to 176.9 meters. The effect of the proposed Consent application would be to retain a 6.1 hectare parcel and sever a 4.8 hectare parcel to add to the abutting 13 hectare property. Both parcels will continue to be used for cash-crop purposes.

As required by Section 17 and 34 of the Planning Act RSO 1990, as amended, Council shall ensure that at least one public meeting is held, notice of which shall be given in the manner and to the persons and public bodies containing the prescribed information.

In accordance with the Planning Act and the implementing Regulation being Ontario Regulation 543/06 and 545/06, the County of Grey gave notice of this Public Meeting on behalf of the County and the Township, by individual prepaid first class mail to persons within 120 metres based on the most recent assessment information provided by MPAC (Municipal Property Assessment Corporation), and to an extensive list of agencies as set out in the regulations. The public meeting notice is located on the County web site at www.grey.ca.

It is imperative to note that:

Any person or public body may attend the Public Meeting and make written and/or verbal representation either in support of or in opposition to this proposal. If a person or public body that files an appeal of the decision of the County of Grey in respect to the proposed Official Plan Amendment, or of the Township of Southgate in respect to the Local Official Plan Amendment or Zoning By-law Amendment, and does not make oral submissions at the Public Meeting or make written submissions to the County or
Township before the proposal is approved or refused, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal may dismiss the appeal.

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at the public meeting or make written submissions to the County of Grey in respect to the proposed Official Plan Amendment or to the Township of Southgate in respect to the Local Official Plan Amendment or Zoning By-law Amendment before the Councils give or refuse to give approval to the Official Plan Amendments and Zoning Amendment, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Board, there is reasonable grounds to do so.

If you wish to be notified of the decision of the proposed Official Plan Amendment you must make a written request to the County of Grey at 595 9th Ave. East, Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 3E3. This can be mailed to the County or deposited with the Administrative Assistant, Monica Scribner this afternoon. We have business cards here today if you need the contact information.

If you wish to be notified on the decision of the Local Official Plan Amendment or Zoning By-law Amendment, please make a similar request to the Township.

If there are any comments, questions or concerns for those in attendance this evening please address the Chair and give your name and Lot and Concession, or civic address, for the record.

Comments received from the following:

**Historic Saugeen Metis, dated January 12, 2018**

“The Historic Saugeen Metis (HSM) Lands, Resources, and Consultation Department have reviewed the relevant documents and have no objection or opposition to the proposed development, land re-designation, rezoning, land severance, Official Plan and/or Zoning By-law Amendments.”
Saugeen Conservation Authority (SVCA), dated January 23, 2018

“All of the plan review functions listed in the Agreement have been assessed with respect to the applications. The proposed County of Grey official plan amendment; proposed Township of Southgate official plan amendment; and proposed Township of Southgate zoning by-law amendment are acceptable to SVCA staff.”

Comments received from the following:

COMMENTS FROM THE MUNICIPAL STAFF/COUNCIL
Chair Fosbrooke was concerned that when she drove by the property earlier she did not see any signage near the driveway to the property.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC
There were none.

COMMENTS FROM THE MUNICIPAL PLANNER
Mr. Stredwick stated he had only received one call from the public for clarification purposes and no one else showed concerns with the proposal.

COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANT
Mr. Woods stated he drove past the property today and the sign is still posted on the property. It is located on the North West corner near the survey stake, specifically on the lands to be severed.

Chair Fosbrooke was grateful for his clarification regarding the signage.

Chair Fosbrooke thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the public meeting at 1:11 p.m.

Planning Chair Anna Marie Fosbrooke
Committee Minutes
Grey County – The Blue Mountains Task Force
November 28, 2017 – 1:00 PM

The Task Force met on the above date at the County Administration Building with the following members in attendance:

Present: Grey County Warden Alan Barfoot; Blue Mountain Councillors Michael Martin, Joe Halos and John McGee; and Grey County Councillors Ian Boddy, Selwyn Hicks and Kevin Eccles;

Staff Present: Kim Wingrove, Grey County Chief Administrative Officer; Shawn Everitt, Town of the Blue Mountains Chief Administrative Officer; Heather Morrison, Deputy Clerk/Records Manager; Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning and Tara Warder, Committee Coordinator

Call to Order

Warden Barfoot called the meeting to order at 1:09 PM.

Adoption of the Agenda

_TBM03-17_ Moved by: Councillor Martin Seconded by: Councillor Eccles

That the Grey County – The Blue Mountains Task Force agenda dated June 28, 2017 be adopted as presented.

Carried

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Items for Discussion
Approve Minutes of June 28, 2017 and August 22, 2017

*TB M04-17* Moved by: Councillor Halos Seconded by: Councillor Hicks

That the Grey County – Blue Mountains Task Force minutes dated June 28, 2017 and August 22, 2017 be adopted as presented.

Carried

Revised Terms of Reference

Kim Wingrove noted that there was a request to have the final version of the Terms of Reference circulated to the Task Force. The Terms of Reference were then outlined. The purpose of the group is to act as an informal task force to discuss issues and share information between the two municipalities. Minutes will be posted following the adoption of each of the respective councils.

Clarification was made regarding who chairs each of the meetings. It was noted that the Chair and Vice Chair will rotate depending on which municipality hosts the meeting. Staff will make this change in the Terms of Reference.

Development Charges Discussion

Randy Scherzer noted that if there were any outstanding questions or concerns on Development Charges, he is available to answer them.

A question arose whether development charges that originated from the Blue Mountains are allocated back to the Blue Mountains.

Mr. Scherzer noted that development charges are distributed throughout the County according to the development charges background study. Development charges are intended for growth related projects. The reserve fund is just a general reserve fund and not to be allocated to any singular area.

Councillor Martin noted that the primary objective in these discussions is to make sure the allocations are within some proportion of the amount of tax the Blue Mountains contributes.

Discussion occurred on the phasing in of development charges.

Staff indicated that Grey County only collects development charges on residential properties and not commercial/industrial.

Staff will send an update to members to confirm whether Grey County is at the maximum value as recommended by Hemson Consulting.
Staff confirmed that developers pay both local and county development charges if both tiers have development charges. The local municipality collects on behalf of the County. The majority of Grey County development charges go towards county roads which supports transportation throughout the county. There has to be growth related projects identified as well.

**Subdivision Control Memo**

Randy Scherzer noted that staff prepared the above noted memo to address questions from the Task Force, noting that many of the delegated items are actually delegated through the Planning Act.

There are joint applications between the County and the lower tier and the County works with the municipalities as much as possible to ensure the best process is achieved. County staff attend the subdivision/condominium public meetings, and the two tiers work on notices together as well.

Randy Scherzer spoke to the condominium exemption process and redline revision process.

It was noted that the exemption process typically involves an ownership change and is more a legal process. The County has developed criteria to guide this process in consultation with the local municipalities, however staff can look at the criteria again to make sure it still fits. Further, the County makes sure letters of support are received from the local municipalities before proceeding with approval.

With respect to the Redline Revision process, after a plan of subdivision has been draft approved, a change may be needed to the plan. Sometimes many changes are proposed and this can trigger the need for a new plan. Staff noted that many plans were approved by the Province and do not have a lapse date. Staff have started reviewing the older draft plans and recommend including a lapse date and also looking at some of the conditions as well.

Staff spoke to concerns regarding increased workload for Town of the Blue Mountains staff if they took on the role of approving plans of subdivision and condominium. The Blue Mountains had previously suggested that the municipality look at taking over this role. Staff noted that they are always looking for ways to improve processes to ensure they are working as efficiently as possible. Staff are recommending this process stay the way it currently is and continue to look at process improvements.

Councillor Martin noted that after looking at subdivision approvals further, that status quo is the best option at this time.
Discussion occurred on planning notices and notice signage. It was noted that any Official Plan or subdivision going forward will have larger signage so it’s visible to people and contains clear contact information.

Discussion occurred on licensed gravel pits as well.

The Task Force noted the need to have conversations with owners of these developments to understand their plans as municipal infrastructure is impacted.

**Coordination of County Approvals and Works**

It was noted that the Blue Mountains was not aware of the work occurring on Bruce Street in Thornbury and wondered about ways to improve the communication on these works.

It was noted that having meetings on upcoming projects is beneficial. It is possible to have joint meeting with residents for county projects.

Kim Wingrove indicated that if municipalities submitted their projects plans, the County could map the upcoming projects for people’s reference and access.

**Social Services Funding**

Inquiry was made as to what the budget allocations are for social services.

Staff noted that social services funding is allocated based on the need within the area. As far as the amount of tax dollars allocated towards social services, it is a relatively small amount of funds.

The Blue Mountains would like to have a better understanding of what kinds of operations the municipality funds and where the services are allocated throughout the County.

The programming related to where funds flow is highly regulated. Children’s Services is an area that has had more movement recently. The County is looking to provide support and work with operators and providers to ensure they have space, wages and funding for purchasing equipment.

Further discussion occurred on Events for Life. Staff will look at this further and communicate about the programs available.
Economic Development

_Housing Report – HDR-CW-12-17 Transition and Transformation of the Grey County Housing System_

The Town of the Blue Mountains councillors noted that most of the County social housing is in Owen Sound and Hanover. The Blue Mountains needs affordable housing and assisted housing as well and they want to explore what can be done to assist the municipality with its housing requirements.

Discussion occurred on whether there should be affordable housing within every new development and whether municipalities need to look at mandating developers to implement attainable housing. Staff want to further explore the incentives that can be given to developers to achieve this, as well as proposed processes to get the conversation going. The difficulty of keeping attainable housing at an attainable price was noted.

Clarification was given between affordable housing and attainable housing.

Discussion occurred on Grey County’s policy on waiving development charges. Randy Scherzer noted that there is no ability to waive development charges for affordable housing. We don’t have the approval authority to have our own Community Improvement Plan (CIP), but the County can request it. The ability to partner with local municipalities to provide incentives through CIPs for affordable housing were highlighted and this will be explored further in consultation with local municipalities in 2018.

_Transit_

The benefits of a County wide transit authority were discussed.

The need to explore different options for providing transit such as partnerships with Uber, car sharing and carpooling lots were noted as well.

Other Business

There was no other business.

Next Meeting Dates

_To Be Determined_

On motion by Councillor Eccles, the meeting adjourned at 2:54 PM.
Committee Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Warden Halliday and Members of County Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Date:</td>
<td>April 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject / Report No:</td>
<td>HDR-CW-07-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Acquisition of Twin Pines Apartments Limited Property – PIN 37318-0094 (LT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Anne Marie Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by:</td>
<td>Kim Wingrove, CAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Tier(s) Affected:</td>
<td>Municipality of West Grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

1. That Report HDR-CW-07-18 be received and that the properties identified as Part of Park Lot 8 North Side of Chester Street West Plan 500 Durham as in GS38555 except R443637; Geographic Township of Bentinck, Municipality of West Grey, County of Grey be acquired from Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario as represented by The Minister of Infrastructure; and

2. That the Warden and Clerk be authorized to sign the transfer agreement to transfer ownership from Her Majesty the Queen to Grey County; and

3. That the County proceed with option two and issue a Request for Proposal for interested parties to build affordable housing; and

4. That once the transfer of land is finalized, staff proceed with a notice of intent to declare the land surplus.

**Executive Summary**

PIN 37318-0094 is a parcel of vacant land adjacent to Grey County Housings Twin Pines Building located at 315 Bruce Street in Durham. Grey County is completing the following report to acquire PIN 37318-0094 from Her Majesty the Queen under the Forfeited Corporate Property Act., 2015.

**Background and Discussion**

The property adjacent to Grey County Housing's Twin Pines Building located at 315 Bruce Street in Durham was thought to have been included in the download of properties from the
Province at devolution. Grey County has maintained and paid property taxes on this vacant land since December 14, 2001.

Interest in the land from a private party led to the discovery that the land was not transferred to Grey County at devolution. The registered owner of the land is Twin Pines Apartments Limited pursuant to a transfer registered on December 22, 1961. The corporation was incorporated on September 1, 1960 and was voluntarily dissolved December 1, 1971.

Upon the dissolution of the corporation, the property became forfeited corporate property and forfeited to the crown, the Province of Ontario.

Through the Forfeited Corporate Property Act, 2015 the County made application for relief from forfeiture. The Ministry contacted the County February 7, 2018 to inquire about the intended use of the property. The Ministry asked if the land would be used to build affordable housing. The County responded that its intention is to see the future use of the property to include new affordable housing units.

There are two options to provide affordable housing:

1. Grey County builds affordable housing on the site, or
2. A request for proposal is issued to seek interested parties to build affordable housing.

Grey County received an agreement March 13, 2018 from the province to purchase the land for $2 on an “as is where is” basis. A copy of the agreement for the transfer of the property to Grey County is attached to this report.

Affordable Housing Options on Site:

Option One: Grey County Builds on Site
Grey County would build affordable and market rent units on site. Funds from the Investment in Affordable Housing Program and a mortgage would be required to build. The land is about the same size as the Twin Pines apartments adjacent to this parcel of land. The site currently holds 11 apartments and parking.

An architect would need to be consulted to determine how many units and parking spaces would work with the size of the lot and what combination of units would be suitable to ensure the rental income covered the costs of the operations and maintenance of the building.

It is recommended that the building consist of market rent units and affordable units. The market rent units would be around the $800 to $900 monthly rent range and the affordable units would be $576 as allowable with the Investment in Affordable Housing Program. There could be some operating and capital expenses for the on-going or future maintenance of the property.

**Option Two: Request for Proposal for Development**

Grey County would issue a Request for Proposal to seek interested parties in building affordable housing. The land and funding from the Investment in Affordable Housing Program would be given to the successful proponent in return for a certain percentage of the units being affordable housing. Through the IAH program the units would only be required to remain affordable for 20 years. There would be no on-going funding required for this option.

If council would like to proceed with a Request for Proposal for sale and development of the land once the transfer of land is finalized a notice of intent to declare the land surplus is needed. Public notice is required for 21 days prior to declaring the land surplus to the Counties needs.

**Financial and Resource Implications**

We have currently invested $1,376.34 being the Administration fee for the Application for Relief from Forfeiture payable to Minister of Finance.

A sub-search of title was done to determine ownership of the land which cost $100.00. The legal cost to finalize the transfer is estimated to be under $500.00.

Assessment of land

Possible on-going operating or capital costs for option one

**Relevant Consultation**

☒ Internal:

**Appendices and Attachments**

[Transfer Agreement Twin Pines Property Durham](#)
To: Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council
From: Anne Marie Shaw, Director of Housing
Meeting Date: April 12, 2018
Subject: Social Housing Apartment Improvement Program Additional Funding and Business Plan for 2018-19 funding.

Status:

Recommendation

1. That report HDR-CW-06-18 regarding additional funding through the Social Housing Apartment Improvement Program be received; and

2. That Council endorses the business plan for the additional year one funding from the Province of $111,547 and the 2018-2021 business plan and that the plans be submitted to the Province.

Background

On October 6, 2017, Grey County received notice the Province is providing new funding under the Social Housing Apartment Improvement Program (SHAIP) for repairs and retrofits to social housing. The investment is part of the Province’s Climate Change Action Plan funded by proceeds from the province’s carbon market. The funding applies only to highrise apartments with 150 or more units. Grey County has one such building located at 350 14th Street West, Owen Sound, known as Parkway Apartments.

Additional Funds 2017-18

Pending carbon market proceeds, Grey County received a conditional allocation up to $829,876 for 2017-2018 and $736,054 for 2018 to 2021. The Province has now confirmed the funding of $829,876. The plans for this funding were provided Council in report HDR-CW-01-18. Grey County received notice February 23, 2018 of additional funds of $111,547.
Grey County housing is proposing to use the additional funds as follows:

Replacement of remaining roof area: $105,970
Administration Cost 5% $ 5,577
Total $111,547

One tower of the roof was replaced as part of the repair to the damaged brick and building envelope in 2015. The current funds will be used for replacement of the remaining roof areas. Funds from year 2018-2021 will also be required to fund the total amount of the roof project.

**Funds for Phase Two of Program (2018-2021)**

The business case for year 2 to 4 of this funding is due April 28, 2018.

Eligible building retrofits include:

- Replacing building heating and or cooling systems and related sub components
- Upgrading exterior and interior building insulation
- Solar walls
- Upgrading windows and/or exterior doors
- Upgrading lighting systems, LED lighting, lighting controls
- Re cladding or upgrading building envelope
- Cost required of required building energy audit reports

For the three-year period following completion of the funded retrofit work, the Service Manager will collect monthly data related to the ongoing energy use of the building. This data is tracking gas and electrical consumption. A pre retrofit Energy Audit and post retrofit energy audit must be performed. Administration fees of up to 5% of the funding are available to assist with administrative costs.

Phase two projects include:

- LED Lighting: Changing the interior lighting to LED, changing existing exterior lighting to LED and adding more lighting to the parking lot and building to increase safety and security.
- Solar Energy: Installation of a solar Photovoltaic 30KW system to generate electricity. Net metering allows electricity generation from a renewable energy source to the electricity grid for a credit on energy costs.
- Wooden Doors: Replacement of wooden exterior doors, many building built between 1969-1973 have wooded doors that are in need of replacement due to
drafts, warping, not closing properly. A clause in the guidelines allows buildings under 150 units to use funding if there is funding remaining after the retrofit of the overall envelope of buildings over 150 units.

Financial / Staffing / Legal / Information Technology Considerations

Projects for Year 2-4 Funding include:

- Administration Fees $36,802
- Replace Exterior Lights-$158,000
- Replace Interior Lights $89,250
- 30KW Solar PV System $170,000
- Remaining roof cost $50,000
- Various Door replacements $232,002

Total $736,054

Link to Strategic Goals / Priorities

Program will assist in the sustainability of affordable housing units.

Attachments

SHAIP Additional Funds Letter February 23, 2018

Respectfully submitted by,

Anne Marie Shaw
Director of Housing
February 23, 2018

Ms. Anne Marie Shaw
Director of Housing
County of Grey
595 Ninth Avenue East
Owen Sound, Ontario
N4K 3E3

Dear Ms. Shaw:

Re: Social Housing Apartment Improvement Program – Confirmed Funding Allocation 2017-18

Further to my letter dated December 8, 2017, I am happy to inform you that, due to a repurposing of carbon market proceeds, the new total conditional allocation for the County of Grey has been increased from $829,876 to $941,423 under the Social Housing Apartment Improvement Program (SHAIP) in 2017-18. This is an increase of $111,547. I would ask that you let ministry staff know by March 9, 2018, if you will be unable to use this additional funding in 2017-18.

Based on a recent carbon market auction, your additional confirmed allocation for SHAIP in February 2018 is $337,114. This brings your total confirmed allocation under SHAIP to $897,280 in 2017-18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHAIP Y1 (2017-18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Total Conditional Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$941,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As you know, SHAIP is funded by proceeds from the province's carbon market, which, by law, must be put towards programs that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

Any further confirmed allocation for 2017-18 will be based on proceeds from the next carbon market auction. You will receive an additional confirmed allocation only after this last carbon market auction for 2017-18 and provincial approvals. Please be advised that ministry staff anticipate being able to send your next confirmed funding allocation letter in late March 2018.

We look forward to working with you in committing the funds in a timely manner and implementing the program efficiently. Please do not hesitate to contact Erich Freiler, by email or by phone at erich.freiler@ontario.ca or (416) 585-6193, if you have any follow-up questions.

Sincerely,

Janet Hope
Assistant Deputy Minister

c: Cynthia Cabral, Team Lead, Regional Housing Services, West
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Date:</td>
<td>April 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject / Report No:</td>
<td>TR-CW-20-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Award of RFT-TS-03-18 Grey Road 32 Pulverizing and Hot Mix Paving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Matt Marck, Engineering Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon Melville, Buyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by:</td>
<td>Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Tier(s) Affected:</td>
<td>Grey Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

1. That Report TR-CW-20-18 regarding tender award recommendations for RFT-TS-03-18 be received and that the tender be awarded to E.C. King Contracting for $1,947,652.43 excluding taxes; and

2. That a 5% construction contingency be added to the tender price resulting in a revised estimated project cost of $2,081,027.67 net HST; and

3. That the project deficit of $81,027.67 will be funded from any surplus realized from within the 2018 capital construction budget or, if a surplus is not available, from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve.

**Executive Summary**

The tender for the reconstruction, pulverizing and hot mix paving of Grey Road 32 was posted on the Grey County website from February 26, 2018 until March 20, 2018.

It is recommended to award RFT-TS-03-18 to E.C. King Contracting for the bid amount of $1,947,652.43, excluding taxes.
Background and Discussion

The project design includes a cross section consisting of 3.25 m lanes and 0.75 m paved shoulders.

The parameters for the tender are as follows:

- pulverizing and paving of a 8.2 km section of Grey Road 32 from Highway 10 northerly to Grey Road 30
- minor vertical correction at 2 locations
- guiderail installation and upgrades
- culvert replacements

Grey Road 32 was posted at 60 km/h in 2017. There is no expectation to raise the speed limit back to 80 km/h as it is not warranted by the parameters of the construction.

Bids received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of Bidder</th>
<th>Bid Amount (excl. taxes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>E.C. King Contracting</td>
<td>$1,947,652.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Harold Sutherland Construction Ltd</td>
<td>$2,137,641.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Cox Construction Limited</td>
<td>$2,028,306.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Arnill Construction Limited o/a Seeley and Arnill Construction</td>
<td>$2,058,079.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legal and Legislated Requirements

None.

Financial and Resource Implications

The funding chart below identifies the total tender costs.

Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excluding HST</th>
<th>Net HST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Project Budget (Grey Road 32)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded Tender Amount</td>
<td>$1,947,652.43</td>
<td>$1,981,931.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$99,096.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tender Projected Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,081,027.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 5% construction contingency is deemed reasonable and is slated to compensate for any unforeseen quantity overruns and possible fluctuations in the Asphalt Cement Price Index.

The project deficit can be attributed to:

- Increase in asphalt costs for 2018
- Increase in granular material costs for 2018

Staff recommends that the shortfall for this project be funded from any surplus realized from within the 2018 Capital construction budget, or if a surplus is not available, from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve.

**Relevant Consultation**

- Internal (list)
  Committee of the Whole for Grey County by way of this report
- External (list)

**Appendices and Attachments**

- Project Limits Map
Project Limits Map
Committee Report

Recommendation

1. That Report TR-CW-21-18 regarding the Engineering Technologist position be received and that Grey County proceed with hiring an Engineering Technologist; and

2. That the position be funded from the Transportation General Reserve in 2018 and included in the 2019 budget.

Executive Summary

The Engineering Technologist position in Transportation Services is currently vacant. That staff member was assigned to the Asset Management/Maintenance Technologist position in October 2017 to meet operational requirements. It was anticipated that the engineering work could be completed with a combination of consulting services and remaining staff resources.

The Engineering Division is proposing to fill the Engineering Technologist position at this time as a more cost effective way of completing the large number of capital projects that are scheduled for 2018-2022 and beyond. The position will be funded from the Transportation General Reserve for the remainder of 2018 and included in the 2019 budget.

Background and Discussion

Transportation Services would like to fill the Engineering Technologist position with a full time employee (rather than a contract) in 2018 for the following reasons:
• Filling the Engineering Technologist position in 2018 will allow a significant volume of work to be completed in a timely fashion, at a level of quality required by the County and enable the preparation of budgets further in advance of construction.
• Multiple office staff members are within two to five years of potential retirement and having an employee well in advance lessens the impact of retirements.
• Based on the past two years of experience, the Maintenance/Asset Management Technologist position should be retained. Asset management is becoming increasingly important. As well, the position has worked well as a temporary assignment to familiarize engineering staff with maintenance.

Grey County’s Engineering Division continues to complete the majority of the road project surveying, tendering and contract administration (bridge projects continue to be completed by consultants). The road construction portion of the capital budget for 2018 is just over $17 million. Further to the attached organizational chart, at full complement four technologists are responsible for surveying, engineering design and contract drawings, tendering and administering contracts. Technologists employed by Grey County have an internal cost (including benefits) of roughly 40% cheaper than the most recent equivalent consultant technologist charge out rate.

Legal and Legislated Requirements
None

Financial and Resource Implications
For 2018, Grey County would fund the Engineering Technologist position at a cost of approximately $49,100 for the remainder of 2018 from the Transportation General Reserve. The position would be included in the budget for 2019, resulting in a levy increase of $88,918.

Due to the size of the 2019-2020 capital projects list, Grey County will require a consultant to complete the work if the position is not filled. The estimated cost of a contract engineering technologist for the remainder of 2018 is $100,000.
Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal (list)
Committee of the Whole for Grey County by way of this report
☐ External (list)

Appendices and Attachments
Organization Chart
Organization Chart
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Committee Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Date:</td>
<td>April 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject / Report No:</td>
<td>PDR-CW-14-18 Information Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Sunvale Homes Plan of Subdivision 42T-2018-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Scott Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by:</td>
<td>Randy Scherzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Tier(s) Affected:</td>
<td>Municipality of West Grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation

1. That Report PDR-CW-14-18 regarding an overview of proposed application 42T-2018-05, to establish a plan of subdivision consisting of two hundred and forty-seven (247) lots on lands described as Part of Lot 24, Division 2, Concession 1 EGR, (geographic Township of Glenelg) in the Municipality of West Grey, be received for information.

Executive Summary

The County has received a plan of subdivision application (County file number 42T-2018-05) to create a total of 247 lots within the settlement area of Durham. The subdivision will be comprised of 123 single detached lots, 60 semi-detached lots, and 64 townhouse units. Servicing to the proposed subdivision will be via municipal water and sewer services. Various technical reports have been submitted with the proposed subdivision application, as well as a zoning by-law amendment to the Municipality of West Grey. The applications and supporting studies will be circulated to prescribed agencies and the public for review and comment. The Municipality of West Grey will be holding a public meeting for the applications in the near future. Following the public process, and agency review process, a thorough analysis and staff recommendation will be provided.

Background and Discussion

The County has received a plan of subdivision application that proposes to create 247 lots, as well as buffers to the woodlands, and stormwater management blocks in the settlement area of Durham. The subject lands are located at Part of Lot 24, Division 2, Concession 1 EGR, (geographic Township of Glenelg) in the Municipality of West Grey. The subject lands are approximately 17.8 hectares in size and are located on the north side of Durham Road East and
east of Garafraxa Street North (Highway 6) (see Map 1 – Airphoto of Subject Lands). The proposal is to service the new lots with municipal water and sewer.

The proposed lots would front onto a series of internal roads which have connections to Durham Road East and Garafraxa Street North via Jackson Street East. The proposed subdivision would also allow for future connections to the east and north.

The subject lands currently contain a former horse barn, shed, and track. These lands were added to the settlement area in 2012 via Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 80 to the County Plan.

Map 1: Airphoto of Subject Lands

Surrounding the proposed development is residential, industrial, farm, and forested lands.

The proposed development also requires an amendment to the Municipality of West Grey Zoning By-law.
Map 2: Proposed Plan of Subdivision (Courtesy of Cobide Engineering)

Pre-submission consultation between the proponent, the Municipality of West Grey and the County identified the submission requirements for the proposed plan of subdivision. The following reports have been submitted with the subdivision application;

1. Planning Justification Report,
2. Environmental Impact Study,
3. Functional Servicing Report,
4. Stormwater Management Report,
5. Traffic Impact Study, and
6. Stage 1 – 4 Archaeological Assessment.

Copies of all background reports and plans can be found at this link
Analysis of Planning Issues

When rendering a land use planning decision, planning authorities must have regard to matters of Provincial Interest under the Planning Act, be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2014, and conform to any Provincial Plans or Municipal Official Plans that govern the subject lands. In this case, the County of Grey Official Plan and the Municipality of West Grey Official Plan all have jurisdiction over the subject property. There are no Provincial Plans in place for West Grey.

Provincial Policy and Legislation

Both the Planning Act and the PPS speak to the efficient use of land within settlement areas, where services are readily available. The proposed plan of subdivision is within a settlement area that is serviced by municipal water and sewer services. The PPS indicates that the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas is full municipal services.

The supply of an adequate range of residential housing types is required in both Provincial documents. In this case, the proposed plan of subdivision is providing a mixture of single detached, semi-detached, and townhouse units.

Other policies in the PPS speak to connected, walkable communities, with provisions for public parkland, and open space. The proposed subdivision is not proposing parkland at this time, and is proposing cash-in-lieu of instead. Connections to Durham Road East, Garafraxa Road North, and Jackson Street East are proposed through this subdivision, as well as future connections to the north and east. A Traffic Impact Study has been prepared for this development.

The protection of significant environmental features and cultural heritage features are also required by the PPS. A portion of the subject lands have been identified as Significant Woodlands, which are proposed to be preserved on-site with a 15 metre buffer. Archaeological Assessments (Stages 1 – 4) have been completed for this property. Under the Stage 4 Assessment, excavation was completed and 1,094 artifacts were recovered. Through the detailed agency review of the associated background studies, Municipal and County staff will be seeking further comments on these matters.

Following the public and agency review periods, staff will provide a more fulsome analysis of the Provincial legislation and policy.

County Official Plan

The proposed plan of subdivision is designated as ‘Primary Settlement Area’ within the County Official Plan. Parts of the subject lands are also identified as Significant Woodlands.

Primary Settlement Areas are identified as principal centres in which to focus new residential growth in the County. The County Plan sets an average residential development density of 20 units per net hectare within this designation, but generally defers to the detailed Municipal Official Plan policies and development standards.

Section 2.8 of the County Plan provides policies on the Significant Woodlands. As noted above an Environmental Impact Study was completed for the subject property.
Section 5.3 of the County Plan provides a similar servicing hierarchy to that found in the PPS, which has been noted above. Elsewhere in section 5 of the Plan are policies which govern roads and transportation. These policies will be further assessed following agency review and the public process.

**West Grey Official Plan**

The West Grey Official Plan designates the subject property as ‘Residential’, and maps the Significant Woodlands on the property similar to the County Plan.

**Legal and Legislated Requirements**

The application will be 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**: Municipality of West Grey, required agencies under the *Planning Act*, and the public.

**Appendices and Attachments**

*None*
### Grey County Planning Active Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Appeals File List – March 29, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>File Number / Name</th>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>Status / Links to Documents</th>
<th>Consultants / Groups Involved</th>
<th>Appellants / Participants</th>
<th>County Involvement or Party Status</th>
<th>County Staff Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Township of Chatsworth      | 42-04-36-OPA-123 Bumstead Pit | Official Plan Amendment | The Applicant has submitted an appeal based on the County not making a decision within 180 days of receiving the County Official Plan Amendment application. A similar appeal has also been filed with the Township of Chatsworth for the Zoning By-law Amendment. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry's License application has also been referred to the Ontario Municipal Board. A link to the appeal letter has been provided below:  
  Bumstead Appeal Letter
  Based on the direction from Report PDR-CW-01-18, a letter was sent to the Board and all people on our mailing list advising them of the County’s position. | Cuesta Planning Consultants | Pearl and Brian Bumstead are the applicants and the appellants. Further parties and participants would be determined at a pre-hearing.                                                                 | As per Report PDR-CW-01-18 the County will not be involved in the OMB proceedings for this file.                                                                 | Scott                        |
| Municipality of Grey Highlands | Municipality of Grey Highlands Official Plan | New Official Plan | The County has received two appeals on the Municipality of Grey Highlands Official Plan. Links to the two appeal letters have been provided below. County staff will work with Grey Highlands staff to determine exactly which sections are under appeal and therefore which sections of the Plan are in force and effect. County staff will work with Grey Highlands to see if any issues under appeal can be resolved.  
  Hawkins Appeal Letter
  Cuesta Appeal Letter | Cuesta Planning Consultants | Cuesta Planning Consultants and Michael Hawkins | As per Addendum to Report PDR-CW-40-17 the County will be involved in the OMB proceedings for this matter.                                                                 | Scott                        |
| Town of The Blue Mountains  | 42T-2012-01 – Eden Oak/Trailshead | Plan of Subdivision | The Applicant has submitted an appeal based on the County not making a decision within 180 days of receiving the Plan of Subdivision application. The Applicant has also appealed the non-decision from the Town regarding the zoning by-law amendment and the local official plan amendment. The Applicant, the Town, the County and the other parties reached a settlement and presented that to the Board on April 3, 2018.  
  Eden Oak Trailshead Inc. Consulting | DC Slade Consulting | Eden Oak Trailshead Inc. Consulting based on the OMB Attendance guidelines, the County would be a Party at any future hearings.                                                                 | Randy                          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>File Number / Name</th>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>Status / Links to Documents</th>
<th>Consultants / Groups Involved</th>
<th>Appellants / Participants</th>
<th>County Involvement or Party Status *</th>
<th>County Staff Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Town of The Blue Mountains   | 2016 Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan          | New Official Plan          | The Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan was approved by the County on June 21, 2016. The Plan was subsequently appealed by six parties. Addendum to Report PDR-PCD-22-16 Blue Mountains Official Plan was presented at the August 11, 2016 Planning and Community Development Committee meeting as a summary of the appeals and to determine the County’s future role in the appeals. A letter has been issued by Town staff noting that the majority of the Official Plan is in force and effect, with only certain sections remaining under appeal. Town/County staff will work with the appellants to explore any potential settlement opportunities. A pre-hearing with the OMB was held on March 21, 2017. Signed minutes of settlement that resolve the Ivi Xhelili, Tomson Xhelili, Elisabeth Ecker Vanderploeg and Dinaz Dadyburjor appeals were accepted by the Board at the pre-hearing. A four day hearing for the other two appeals (Eden Oak and MacPherson Builders) was scheduled for September 12 – 15th 2017, but has now been adjourned to see if the parties can work out any remaining issues. A meeting in January 2018 has been scheduled with MacPherson Builders to discuss the issues. The Eden Oak appeal should be resolved by the conditional Board order dated September 6, 2017, subject to a bonusing agreement between the Town and the Developer. | N/A                           | 1. Ivi Xhelili  
2. Tomson Xhelili  
3. Elisabeth Ecker Vanderploeg  
4. Dinaz Dadyburjor  
5. Gerard Borean, Parente Borean LLP, on behalf of Eden Oak (Trailshead) Inc.  
6. Quinto M. Annibale, Loopstra Nixon LLP, on behalf of MacPherson Builders (Blue Mountains) Limited | As per Addendum to Report PDR-PCD-22-16 the County will be a party to the proceedings. | Scott                          |
<p>| Town of The Blue Mountains   | 42T-2015-03 – Home Farm                               | Plan of Subdivision        | The Applicant has submitted an appeal based on the County not making a decision within 180 days of receiving the Plan of Subdivision application. The Applicant has also appealed the non-decision from the Glenn Wellings, Wellings Planning                                                                                                                                          | Glenn Wellings, Wellings Planning | Home Farm – MacPherson Builders                                                                                   | Based on the OMB Attendance guidelines, the County would be a party to the proceedings. | Scott                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>File Number / Name</th>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>Status / Links to Documents</th>
<th>Consultants / Groups Involved</th>
<th>Appellants / Participants</th>
<th>County Involvement or Party Status *</th>
<th>County Staff Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township of Southgate</td>
<td>42-07-060-OPA-16 Peyton Pit</td>
<td>Local Official Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Town regarding the zoning by-law amendment and the local official plan amendment. &lt;br&gt;Home Farm Appeal Letter &lt;br&gt;The Peyton Pit LOPA was approved by the County on July 10, 2017. It was appealed by two separate parties that are neighbours to the pit. A pre-hearing has been scheduled for March 1, 2018.</td>
<td>Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>Stovel and Associates (Rob Stovel) 1. Jo-Anne Chisholm 2. Douglas Karrow</td>
<td>Party at any future hearings.</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality of West Grey</td>
<td>42-05-280-OPA-137 Spaleta</td>
<td>County Official Plan Amendment</td>
<td>The Spaleta OPA was refused by the County on January 11, 2018. An associated zoning amendment was also refused by the Municipality of West Grey. This zoning amendment has also been appealed to the OMB. &lt;br&gt;Cuesta Appeal Letter on Spaleta</td>
<td>Cuesta Planning Consultants</td>
<td>Cuesta Planning Consultants</td>
<td>Based on the OMB Attendance guidelines, the County will be a party at the hearing since the County refused the OPA application.</td>
<td>Scott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*County involvement and party status will generally be in accordance with the guidelines established in Report PDR-PCD-08-13 – see link below:

PDR-PCD-08-13 Ontario Municipal Board Attendance