
Committee of the Whole

March 16, 2018

Grey County Council met on the above date at 9:30 AM at the County Administration Building. Warden Stewart Halliday assumed the Chair and called the meeting to order with all members present except Councillors Jack, Greenfield, Boddy, McKean, Ardiel and Bell.

Councillor John Woodbury was also in attendance on behalf of Councillor Norm Jack.

The following staff were also in attendance: Kim Wingrove, Chief Administrative Officer; Heather Morrison, Clerk; Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning; Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation; Scott Taylor, Senior Planner; Stephanie Lacey-Avon, Intermediate Planner; Philly Markowitz, Economic Development Officer; Carolyn Bailey, Planning Technician; Brad Noble, Planning Data Analysis Coordinator; and Tara Warder, Deputy Clerk/Legislative Coordinator

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

Recolour Grey Key Policies, Mapping Changes and Comments

Randy Scherzer outlined the agenda and welcomed those in attendance which included council members and staff from the local municipalities in Grey County.

Scott Taylor spoke to the meetings which have taken place recently with regard to the new Official Plan, including information sessions, stakeholder meetings, open houses, and meetings with the Province and Saugeen Ojibway Nation. The draft Plan has also been circulated to individuals who have requested information on the Plan.

It was noted that the Plan has been divided into 5 sections: Cultivate Grey, Develop Grey, Natural Grey, Live Grey, and Move Grey.

Mr. Taylor then outlined the policy changes surrounding Cultivate Grey which include consideration of such things as smaller lots, clarification of policies around lot additions and split designation properties, consideration of recreational uses and alternative dwelling types and consideration of the entire food system, among others.

Stephanie Lacey-Avon spoke to the policy changes surrounding Develop Grey, noting the combining of tertiary settlement areas with secondary settlement areas and space extensive industrial together with commercial land uses. There are also policies to support healthy

communities and economic development. Further, some policies also support rural employment opportunities and home business opportunities.

It was noted that the Live Grey policies support consultation with First Nations and Metis for all Grey County Official Plan Amendments, Local Official Plan amendments, and secondary plan amendments as well as plans of subdivision or condominiums. Further, policies permit age-friendly options and implement the Healthy Communities Checklist and advance cultural, eco and agri-tourism opportunities in the County.

Scott Taylor spoke to the Natural Grey section, noting that natural heritage setbacks are changing based on the updates to the Province's Natural Heritage Reference Manual 2010. Mr. Taylor spoke to the update of significant woodlands mapping and parks, recreation and tourism policies. There are also updates proposed to parkland dedication policies stemming from updates to the Planning Act.

Randy Scherzer then addressed Council on Move Grey policies. The development of a complete transportation system which supports different modes of travel was noted. There are proposed policies which support active transportation and paved shoulders, connecting links and a required number of vehicle accesses for new developments.

Mr. Scherzer spoke to the mapping changes and the development of an interactive GIS site to compare the current official plan mapping with the proposed.

Planning staff then outlined a summary of the comments received to date.

Councillor McQueen entered the meeting.

Next steps were then outlined. There is a Council meeting which will serve as the statutory public meeting under the Planning Act on March 27th at 6:30 PM in the Council Chambers.

Staff noted that not all comments from the review will be recommended to be incorporated. Some are a large deviation from what is in existence today and could be different than what will be recommended by staff or adopted by Council.

Staff addressed questions from Council regarding significant woodlands, definitions, timelines and process, and historic landfills.

It was noted that it is important to summarize all the comments received even though some may not be able to be addressed in the Official Plan.

Randy Scherzer noted that once the Province makes the decision on the Official Plan, it will not be appealable based on recent changes to the Planning Act. Staff hopes that there will be an opportunity to review any proposed modifications to the adopted Plan prior to the Province making the final decision. The County can still amend the policies in the future if they are not working.

Councillor Wright then left the meeting.

Council and attendees then divided into groups to participate in the breakout sessions on each

of the five areas of the plan. Staff recorded the comments from the groups, which are appended to the minutes.

Other Business

There was no other business.

Adjournment

On motion of Councillors Pringle and Paterson, Committee of the Whole adjourned at 12:05 PM to the call of the Chair.

Stewart Halliday, Warden

Heather Morrison, Clerk

Recolour Grey Council/Local Council Workshop

March 16, 2018

Cultivate Grey

- Rural manufacturing (on-farm diversification) is vital regardless of community, Mennonite, horse & buggy or otherwise
- Both value-add agriculture and manufacturing must be maintained
- Some concerns re: on-farm manufacturing with respect to larger manufacturers clustered along stretch of road, hope that municipal bylaws would create checks and balances
- Allow exceptions for co-operative models (this would exempt much of the horse and buggy community and respect the unique challenges they have)
- Are employee limits a disincentive or a blessing? Some manufacturers are exceeding employee limit recommendations due to lack of enforcement
- Cumulative impacts on infrastructure should always be considered with respect to permitting on-farm manufacturing
- Consider a mechanism to gather development fees for specific on-farm diversification projects (non-agriculture) if there will be known municipal infrastructure impacts
- Consider MDS concerns when siting on-farm manufacturing, especially if it could restrict and “sterilize” common agricultural practices; permitted uses are not clear enough and could lead to problems (check PPS and OMAFRA process diagram for clarification)
- Make sure to re-route rural linkages (Green in Grey) to allay fears that farmland will be taken out of production; fears of “new NEC” in the agricultural community
- Clarify policy around agricultural forestry (ie: Christmas trees, nut trees, other functional forests not intended for timber or tree farms)
- Consider creating a sub-class for agricultural forests - could add “LT” for long-term after the general zone classifications, i.e.: “R1LT”
- Have clarification about short, medium, and long-term plantations with respect to clear-cutting
- Limit creation of more / smaller rural lots especially where there would be MDS problems; pits & quarries etc.
- Support smaller rural plots if it incentivizes on-farm value adds
- Some concern that smaller lots in Rural would easily transition out of specialized / small-scale / value add farming to estate residential
- Some rural 100 / 100+ acre lots might be ideal for severing with small farms in mind, especially if there are clear zones across the property, ie: 20 acres of fields in good condition that could be a small farm, the rest in bush / wetland / hazard etc.
- Considerations of tax balance if more small lots are created – could we stand to gain with higher residential to agriculture / rural taxation?
- Can Specialty Agriculture lots be even smaller?
- Zoning amendment process should be made easier for agricultural land at edges of settlement areas

- Consider municipal drains as part of asset management
- What is the reasoning behind mapping deer yards? Not recommended
- Support and incentivize the creation of windbreak tree plantations along roads
- Curtail the removal of treed fencelines / hedgerows / field barriers to mitigate erosion and retain moisture and wildlife habitat – consider a policy to examine and restrict fenceline removal
- Incentivize erosion control through water and soil retaining plants in rural, ag and settlement areas – “low impact development” re: storm water
- Create incentives for protection and preservation of wetlands; consider impacts of tile drainage and consider restricting in some areas
- Consider the pending ag impact study with respect to pits and quarries – note and review the fill bylaw for alignment
- Realtors and other “welcome wagon” or first contacts should have an understanding of and be much more clear / transparent with respect to aggregate lands
- Why is the onus for setbacks/demonstration of impacts on the new homebuilder next to an existing pit or quarry rather than the other way around? Why can a pit locate anywhere?
- What triggers a development agreement? Process should be outlined clearly (i.e.: something that would create a haul route / necessitate infrastructure change)
- Is there any consideration at the county level about small flocks (i.e.: chickens) in urban / settlement areas? Could the county make recommendations to harmonize municipal bylaws?
- We need the ability for people to more easily re-designate Agricultural lands to Rural or another land use designation.
- Are we going to have an over production of cannabis? Divided opinions on whether it should be produced in a settlement area versus a rural area.

Develop Grey

- Through the Official Plan, have the settlement boundaries changed and can settlement boundaries change in the future?
- Why are natural heritage studies needed when development is proposed within primary and secondary settlement areas?
- Can we introduce specific policies that address campgrounds
- Can we introduce specific policies that address short term accommodation (Airbnb)? Countywide what do we do?
- If policies at the lower tier are more restrictive, how is this dealt with?
- What are the policies that deal with tiny homes and what are provincial policies on tiny homes?
- Need more affordable housing throughout the County, need policies within Develop Grey
- Affordability issues around Chapmans
- Need initiatives that deal with affordability
- With rising land costs and development costs how can Grey County encourage developers to offer affordable housing and still recover costs?

- **Can intensification targets in the OP be amended to increase affordability? The idea here would be to intensify certain areas in order to create smaller units at a more affordable price.**
- **There is a big difference between the development and managing the development**
- **It should be noted that market demand is what is driving development in Grey County**
- **Although the province pushes development to settlements, perhaps Grey County is well suited to support “rural strips” in between communities and condo development in certain areas that are not primary settlements?**
- **Can Agriminiums occur inside settlement areas?**
- **We need friendly boundary expansions for communities and an easier way to expand settlement/municipal boundaries**
- **Campgrounds in Grey need to be properly designed for long term sustainability**
- **Remove natural heritage requirements from within primary settlement areas**
- **Need to tighten up definition and policies on campgrounds in the OP including dealing with servicing issues**
- **Need policies that deal with Community Hubs (social service, health, education, community services)**
- **Need county-wide policies to address Community Improvement Plans (CIP)**
- **Concern on exponential growth in the south and the east of the County. Is there enough available lands and how can we foster expansion with lands. Growth will impact the entire spectrum of services**
- **Concern that growth management study has not adequately forecasted growth in Dundalk**
- **Question regarding the use of the term “Countryside” in 4.2.5. This is a term introduced by the greenbelt plan. This term should be defined and explained in the OP.**
- **Comment that applications to develop lands adjacent to hamlets and communities should be easier**
- **Smaller farm lots should be permitted and more flexible for families and succession**
- **Settlement expansion should be easier**
- **The growth study does not reflect what is actually happening in Dundalk**
- **Growth management study needs further review**
- **There should be an allowance to short circuit the comprehensive review process to relocate industrial lands**
- **It should be easier to re-designate industrial lands to commercial lands**
- **Need to review development charges process because this is a major impact on growth and growth forecasts**
- **Question regarding the difference between secondary dwelling units and tiny homes**
- **Need policies to deal with tiny homes because MPAC is unable to provide a proper tax assessment (no category) and the county tax base does not increase**
- **Need to add more text regarding secondary homes and tiny homes in OP**

- **Comment that there is not enough affordable housing in rural areas of the County. Need to encourage.**
- **Need to permit development like condos in rural areas in order to keep communities viable such as keeping schools open etc.**
- **Losing the residential tax base is a big concern in Grey County**
- **Why is there a limit of 20 years on garden suites?**
- **There is enormous demand for estate lots. Where can we create more of them? We need a policy that allows for the type of development that people actually want (estate lots).**
- **Hanover needs a boundary change to accommodate 40 years of growth not just 20 years. Staff should help justify this expansion and provide strong wording in the Official Plan for a boundary expansion. Hanover is currently being forced to develop in areas where it does not make sense to develop (e.g. it doesn't make sense to have multiple industrial parks). We need to pay attention to what the market is demanding. See Hanover's comments on the revised Growth Management Strategy. Some of these issues are unique to Hanover, which provides 15% of the County's jobs on 0.2% of the County's lands.**

Live Grey

- **Need higher density housing styles in rural areas to offer affordable housing solutions – 4-6 units sharing services.**
- **Encourage secondary suite development.**
- **There are currently larger farming operations with fewer residents to support rural roads/bridges/infrastructure.**
- **Agricultural communities are asking for reduced % tax ratio but are more frequent users of the roads/bridges.**
- **Consider smaller lot severances along major roadways – (eg. 100 acre lot could have 10, 10 acre lots).**
- **Do we need to have secondary unit development go through the zoning by-law amendment process, or permit as of right?**
- **Reconsider hobby farm sized operations, would like to see more of these in Special Ag.**
- **For lands immediately surrounding designated settlement lands, look to make these special policy lands, where smaller lots could be created than otherwise permitted in Rural/Ag lands.**
- **Urban affordable housing is directly impacted through the availability of developable land.**
- **Promote more County owned social housing.**
- **Hanover is currently doing an age-friendly sidewalk assessment, to assess where new benches may need to go, shaded areas, etc.**
- **Reallocating settlement lands if there are natural constraints on the subject property – eg. Excessive flooding.**
- **Pg. 109 – establish a right to a healthy environment. Ensure lower tier municipalities are circulating comments to Grey Bruce Public Health, and there are consistencies in developing healthy community initiatives throughout County and lower tier processes.**

- **Community hubs can serve the needs of local communities.**
- **With reference to public engagement, how will the Local Planning Tribunal process change the ability for a member of the public to provide input? How can we ensure we are capturing everyone's opinions?**
- **Shrinking minimum floor area, Bruce County has a minimum floor area of ~600-650 sq. ft.**
- **Encourage multiple tiny homes on one lot. For example, there could be 2 acres of land, with 4 tiny homes, utilizing 1 septic system.**
- **Encourage apartments over commercial units.**
- **Include policy to recognize AirBNB as a type of rental housing in policy, although allow lower tier municipalities to incorporate their own regulations.**
- **Promote more public private partnerships to enhance affordable housing supply.**
- **Share healthy developer's checklist online, make accessible to the public and lower tier municipalities.**

Natural Grey

- **Concerns with the impact of cores and linkages on agriculture. Can you build on a vacant lot within a core or linkage?**
- **We need to adjust the linkage boundaries now, and not wait for it to be done at the municipal level. Are the boundaries of the cores certain, or can these be changed?**
- **The Beaver River needs to be a linkage.**
- **Landowners are concerned that linkages are the 'thin end of the wedge' and could one day become trails, or be expropriated.**
- **We should be working with stewardship groups and NGO's to establish and protect the linkages.**
- **Does Natural Grey further inhibit severances?**
- **Will conservation authorities be reviewing linkages when making their comments on development applications? If so, they should not be. While conservation authorities have jurisdiction over water, they do not have jurisdiction over land, which falls under the County jurisdiction. Agriculture is already over-regulated and does not need conservation authority input on this topic. We need to 'push back' when negotiating conservation authority memorandum of understandings on this issue.**
- **Other agencies, beyond just conservation authorities, should be able to waive the need for an environmental impact study (EIS).**
- **The Plan needs clear qualifications on who can complete or peer review an EIS. An EIS checklist is needed for simpler applications. When do we recommend or require peer reviews?**
- **Coyotes are a problem for agriculture.**
- **What will the wildfire appendix mapping mean? Should we 'push back' to the province on the need for this mapping in Grey County?**
- **Wind turbines cause fires to spread across fields.**
- **The County needs to take a position on Air B N B's and short term accommodations.**
- **Deer wintering yards should not be added to the Plan. Deer move around and are adaptable. Controlled hunts should also be considered on this topic.**

- **Who determines what is ‘natural’? We need to clarify the significant features policies to distinguish between natural versus planted woodlots. People should not be restricted from developing on, or cutting plantation woodlots. There needs to be flexibility on ‘man-made’ woodlands. At the very least removing a man-made woodlot should be a simplified application process when compared to removing a natural woodlot.**
- **Hazard land boundaries keep changing. We need to make sure we always have the most recent boundaries to ensure we are providing the best information to landowners. Who has the final say on hazard land boundaries?**
- **Are we being proactive to prevent against future Niagara Escarpment Plan or Greenbelt expansions?**
- **What are the changes to the natural heritage setbacks? There should be some exemptions from these setbacks, especially to woodlands.**
- **Will there be new karst mapping? Where does this information come from?**
- **When does a drain become a watercourse? Municipal drains should be included under asset management.**
- **Who is managing drainage? Drainage and wetlands are key to climate change mitigation.**
- **Upper tiers need to take the lead on watershed planning – see new guidance document released February 2, 2018.**
- **Should we be concerned with the Provincial comments? We have to serve our Grey County public, not the Province.**
- **What are the implications of Natural Grey on Primary Settlement Areas? Why apply Natural Grey mapping in Primary Settlement Areas? These designated growth areas should be free from restrictions of valleylands, woodlands, endangered species, etc. The current Plan has a conflict between growth and the preservation of natural features in Primary Settlement Areas (e.g. Kraemer subdivision in Hanover). Maybe consider a no net loss or compensation approach where lands outside of settlement areas can be reforested, or streams rehabilitated, in compensation for features lost within settlements.**

Move Grey

- **Support for complete streets concept in order to support all modes of transportation. Main streets may be difficult to adapt as complete streets based on buildings being close to road, parking, etc.**
- **Support for connecting links (i.e. transferring County roads that go through settlement areas). The agreement between the County and the local municipalities will need to be fair.**
- **County needs a strong position on private and seasonally maintained roads which is consistent across the County.**
- **Need to clarify what is meant by ‘all modes of transportation’ – does this include e-bikes, motorized scooters, etc.**
- **Need to make sure that stormwater management/drainage matters are being dealt with properly (e.g. tile draining fields – what permits are required?, do the ditches have capacity? etc.). It was noted that MTO as well as the County has an interest**

when it comes to stormwater management/drainage matters adjacent to Provincial Highways/County Roads/CP Rail Trail and that in some cases a permit is required.

- Need to further investigate the ability to put in fibre/conduit as well as installing other utilities (i.e. natural gas, hydro) when we are doing road construction. Need SWIFT to develop a consistent model and fibre/conduit specification that municipalities can use.
- Explore using Uber as a transit solution to support the regional transit initiative. Need to address any liability issues. Learn from the Innisfil model – what agreements are required, how did they address liability issues, insurance, etc.?
- Paved shoulders on bridges – how are we going to address this when the bridge platform is too narrow to install paved shoulders? There was mention that Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18 may have some signage examples for these situations.
- Need to further clarify the road widening policies when it comes to obtaining road widening on both the severed and retained parcels
- Too much emphasis being placed on cyclists for the reason to construct paved shoulders. There are other reasons for having paved shoulders including extending the longevity of the paved surface, supporting large farm equipment, supporting horse and buggy community, etc.
- Consider doing weekend traffic counts on County roads
- Need to do further education on sharing the road – not just active transportation but that all road users need to share and be respectful of the other users.
- Concerned about the impact of proposed policy 8.8.3 on new development where the CP Rail Trail goes through settlement areas. Proposed policy 8.8.3 indicates that new developments proposed adjacent to the County CP Rail Trail corridor will be reviewed to ensure that the permitted uses are compatible with the existing use of the rail corridor as a trail as well as the compatibility of the potential re-introduction of rail service assuming it will occur. The concern is that this may impact new development adjacent to the CP Rail Trail even though rail may never return to the area.
- Need to be prepared for autonomous cars/vehicles. Do we have the infrastructure to support autonomous vehicles? What kind of road maintenance will be required to support autonomous vehicles? Need to think beyond cars/vehicles – e.g. autonomous wheelchairs – should these be permitted on roads or sidewalks?
- Need to support electric vehicles – permitting/encouraging charging stations, etc.
- Need to do further research on maintenance of paved shoulders. Has this been studied yet?
- There was mention that the Province may be interested in uploading County roads?
- Is there an opportunity for heated roads (using solar power) or road surfaces that have lighting installed within the surface?
- Support the Grey Road 40 extension between Highway 6 and 10.
- Support the Grey Road 14 potential County Road Corridor to directly connect to Highway 89.

- **Support the Dundalk Industrial Park by-pass and the proposal that this could be a potential County road. Can there be a roundabout/turning circle at Grey Road 9 and the proposed Dundalk Industrial Park by-pass?**
- **Recommended that Concession 5 between Grey Road 18 and Grey Road 40 be identified as a potential County Road Corridor on Appendix D**
- **Should look for a potential by-pass around Markdale to alleviate truck traffic in the downtown area. Could the CP Rail Trail be used as the location of a by-pass or West Back Line?**
- **Look for opportunities for live snow fencing (e.g. west side of Grey Road 124).**
- **Should there be a roundabout/turning circle at Grey Road 9 and Grey Road 14?**
- **Should Grey Road 9 be identified as an Arterial Road in the functional classification?**