Committee of the Whole
September 13, 2018 – Following Council
Barn, Grey Roots Museum and Archives

1. Call to Order
2. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest
3. Determination of Items Requiring Separate Discussion
4. 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. Oxford County Correspondence dated August 9, 2018

That Grey County Council supports Oxford County’s SouthwestLynx proposal for the development of an Integrated High-Performance Public Transportation Solution for Southwestern Ontario.

b. Owen Sound Regional Hospital Foundation Correspondence dated August 13, 2018

That the Owen Sound Regional Hospital Foundation Correspondence dated August 13, 2018 regarding the purchase of the new Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) be received for information.

c. Grey Bruce Health Unit Correspondence dated August 24, 2018

That the Grey Bruce Health Unit Correspondence dated August 24, 2018 regarding Ontario’s Basic Income Pilot be supported by Grey County Council.

5. Items For Direction and Discussion

a. SSR-CW-13-18 Further Extension of Movin’ GB Service

That Report SSR-CW-13-18 be received; and

That Council provides direction regarding continued operation of the twice weekly Highway 10 corridor route from Owen Sound to Shelburne given the absence of confirmed provincial transportation funding.
b. HDR-CW-17-18 Grant in Lieu of Development Charges

That report HDR-CW-17-18 be received and the affordable housing projects through Community Living Owen Sound and District and Owen Sound Housing Company be approved for a grant in lieu of development charges; and

That the $52,272 in funding required for the grant in lieu be funded from One Time Funding.

c. HDR-CW-18-18 National Housing Co-investment Fund

That report HDR-CW-18-18 on the Co-investment Fund through the National Housing Strategy be received for information.

d. PDR-CW-27-18 Power Transmission Line and Crossing Agreement on the CP Rail Trail – Chatsworth

That Report PDR-CW-27-18 be supported to develop an agreement with Egerton Solar Power LP and MPI GM Solar 1 LP for the purposes of allowing a portion of the County’s CP Rail Trail to be utilized for a power transmission line and driveway crossing, to support the neighbouring solar power facility; and

That a by-law to adopt the Agreement be prepared for consideration by County Council.

e. Addendum to PDR-CW-09-17 Parkbridge Craigleith Subdivision – Town of the Blue Mountains

That Addendum to Report PDR-CW-09-17 be received; and

That all written and oral submissions received on plan of subdivision 42T-2016-10 known as Parkbridge Craigleith were considered; the effect of which helped to make an informed recommendation and decision; and

That in consideration of the draft plan of subdivision application 42T-2016-10, on lands described as Part of Lot 21, Concession 2 being Part Lot 161, East Part of Lot 169, Lot 172, and Part Lot 173, Plan 529 (geographic Township of Collingwood) in the Town of The Blue Mountains, the Grey County Committee of the Whole approves this plan of subdivision to create a total of four (4) blocks part of which would contain a total of two hundred and eleven (211) residential units consisting of forty (45) single detached dwellings and one hundred and sixty six (166) townhouses, subject to the conditions set out in the Notice of Decision.

f. PDR-CW-28-18 Servicing Allocation Options Report
That Report PDR-CW-28-18 Servicing Allocation Options be received.

That for new plans of subdivision or condominium being considered for draft approval by the County of Grey after September 13, 2018, save and except those in the City of Owen Sound, Hybrid Approach Option C allowing, servicing allocation at the discretion of the municipality, at the draft approval stage for plans of subdivision and condominium, or at the time of registration, or through separate by-law prior to registration, be endorsed.

That staff be directed to include policy language in Recolour Grey that sets criteria for allocating capacity through approvals of plans of subdivision or condominium, and criteria for draft plan approval extensions where servicing is being allocated.

That staff be directed to consult with municipal staff and the development community on options for servicing allocation and existing draft plan approvals.

That a review of all draft plan approvals granted on or prior to September 13, 2018, save and except those in the City of Owen Sound, be brought forward in a future staff report. This report shall consider a process for revisions to older draft approvals, which may include implementing lapse dates for draft approval and servicing allocation, or withdrawal of draft approval;

That Report PDR-CW-28-18 be circulated to member municipalities along with an explanation of the chosen option.

g. Addendum to PDR-CW-22-18 Stonebrook Phase II of Plan of Subdivision – Grey Highlands

That Addendum to Report PDR-CW-22-18 be received; and

That all written and oral submissions received on plan of subdivision 42T-2018-02 known as Stonebrook Phase II were considered; the effect of which helped to make an informed recommendation and decision; and

That in consideration of the draft plan of subdivision application 42T-2018-02, for lands described as Part of Lot 98, Concession 1, (geographic Township of Artemesia) in the Municipality of Grey Highlands, the Grey County Committee of the Whole approves this plan of subdivision to create 10 (10) blocks for the purpose of constructing a total of twenty-four (24) townhouse units, subject to the conditions set out in the Notice of Decision.

h. PDR-CW-29-18 Stonebrook Phase III Plan of Subdivision – Grey Highlands

That Report PDR-CW-29-18 regarding an overview of proposed plan of subdivision application 42T-2018-07, consisting of fifty-four (54) townhouse units on lands described as Part of Lots 98 and 99, Concession 1 NETSR, Part
1 of 17R181 (geographic Village of Markdale) in the Municipality of Grey Highlands, be received for information.

i. PDR-CW-30-18 Villages at Peaks Bay – Town of the Blue Mountains

That Report PDR-CW-30-18 be received; and

That in consideration of the request to combine two draft plans of condominium known as 42-CDM-2013-01 (Delphi Court) and 42-CDM-2007-15 (Neighbourhoods at Delphi Point) on lands described as Part of Lot 26, Concession 5 and 6, Parts 5 to 10, Plan 16R-9532 and Block 7, RP 16M-37, geographic Township of Collingwood, in the Town of The Blue Mountains, the Grey County Committee of the Whole approves this redline revision by adding the draft approved units from draft approved plan of condominium 42-CDM-2013-01 to 42-CDM-2007-15 resulting in a revised plan of condominium consisting of a total of 149 vacant land condominium units (57 single detached units, 2 semi-detached units, and 90 townhouse units), subject to the conditions set out in the Notice of Decision.

j. PDR-CW-31-18 – Meaford Winery Official Plan Amendment Merit Report - Meaford

That Report PDR-CW-31-18 regarding a proposed County Official Plan Amendment be received; and

That the proposal proceeds to a Public Meeting to consider an amendment to the County of Grey Official Plan on lands designated ‘Rural’ and ‘Hazard Lands’, to consider exceptions to the small scale commercial and industrial use definition to allow for a larger winery facility that includes agricultural related uses and on-farm diversified uses, for the lands described as 357038 The Blue Mountains-Meaford Townline (Concession 1, Part Lot 1 & Part Lot 2, 16R-7631, Part 1 and 16R-8386 Part 1), Municipality of Meaford, geographic Township of St. Vincent provided the Municipality is prepared to hold a joint public meeting in consideration of the necessary local amendment requirements.

6. Tour of Grey Roots Museum and Archives - 11:30 a.m.

7. Other Business

8. Notice of Motion

9. Adjournment
August 9, 2018

Warden Halliday and Members of Grey Council
595 9th Ave. E, County Building
Owen Sound, ON N4K 3E3

Dear Warden Halliday and Members of Grey Council:

At its meeting on June 27, 2018, County Council adopted Report CAO 2018-18 entitled "SouthwestLynx: Integrated High Performance Public Transportation for Southwestern Ontario (attached). The SouthwestLynx plan is the fourth of a Southwestern Ontario transportation series the County of Oxford commissioned Greg Gormick, On Track Strategies to prepare. By demonstrating the potential passenger rail capacity within the existing rail corridors through Southwestern Ontario, SouthwestLynx presents the unquestionable viability of high performance rail (HPR) complemented by a fully integrated intercommunity transportation system as a logical, practical, affordable and deliverable public transportation solution for Southwestern Ontario.

In addition, I have attached an electronic copy of our brochure, Connecting Southwestern Ontario. This brochure summarizes the SouthwestLynx plan and the prior reports Oxford County commissioned; "New Directions", "Empowering Ontario's Short Line Railways" and "Steel Corridors of Opportunity".

All four of the reports are available through our home page at www.oxfordcounty.ca. As well, your Chief Administrative Officer has a hardcopy of the full SouthwestLynx document.

With the adoption of Report CAO 2018-18, Oxford County Council seeks Grey County Council support in advancing the SouthwestLynx plan through the adoption of the following proposed resolution:

That Grey County Council supports Oxford County’s SouthwestLynx proposal for the development of an Integrated High-Performance Public Transportation Solution for Southwestern Ontario.
Our intent is to also seek the support of the Western Ontario Wardens Caucus at their August 2018 meeting.

Our thanks in advance for your support.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Peter M. Crockett, P.Eng.
Chief Administrative Officer

Encl.

Cc: Kim Wingrove, Chief Administrative Officer, Grey
To: Warden and Members of County Council
From: Chief Administrative Officer

SouthwestLynx: Integrated High-Performance Public Transportation for Southwestern Ontario

RECOMMENDATIONS


2. And further, that staff submit Report CAO 2018-18 and its attachments to the High Speed Rail Program Office in support of Oxford’s prior position that Southwestern Ontario requires a fully integrated public transportation solution and that the HSR EA Terms of Reference must include the full and comparative assessment of alternatives to the proposed HSR corridor including the optimization of existing rail corridors;

3. And further, that funding in the amount of $175,000, to be financed from General Reserves be approved for the establishment of a High Speed Rail EA Peer Review Team in coordination with the Corridor Impacted Municipalities group and to develop and undertake a Southwestern Ontario Transportation Dialogue and Relationship program as described in Report CAO 2018-18;

4. And further, that Report CAO 2018-18 and its attachments be forwarded to Oxford’s Area Municipalities, the South Central Ontario Region Economic Development Corporation (SCOR), the Western Ontario Wardens Caucus (WOWC), the Mayors of Southwestern Ontario (MOSO), the Member of Parliament (Oxford), Member of Provincial Parliament (Oxford), the Ontario Federation of Agriculture and interested community stakeholders for their information and support.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- The purpose of this report is to seek Council support for, and authorization to advance, the SouthwestLynx proposal for an integrated high performance public transportation system for Southwestern Ontario.

- Further, this report seeks Council authority to submit the SouthwestLynx proposal to the Provincial High Speed Rail office in support Oxford County’s position that Southwestern Ontario requires a fully integrated public transportation solution and that there is a viable alternative that must be given full and comparative consideration in the Province of Ontario’s
Terms of Reference and the subsequent Individual Environmental Assessment for the Kitchener to London leg of the proposed High Speed Rail project.

Implementation Points

Upon adoption of this report staff will initiate all actions related thereto and in doing so begin a comprehensive program to address Oxford’s concerns with the High Speed Rail proposal and to stimulate advancement of the dialogue and cooperation necessary amongst key stakeholders and partners critical to advancing a transportation solution for Southwestern Ontario.

Financial Impact

The adoption of Report CAO 2018-18 approves $175,000, to be financed by the General Reserve, for initiatives outlined in this report and not included within the approved 2018 Budget and Business Plan. The Treasurer has reviewed this report and agrees with the financial impact information.

Risks/Implications

There are no risks inherent with the adoption of this report.

Strategic Plan (2015-2018)

County Council adopted the County of Oxford Strategic Plan (2015-2018) at its regular meeting held May 27, 2015. The initiative contained within this report supports the Values and Strategic Directions as set out in the Strategic Plan as it pertains to the following Strategic Directions:

2. ii. A County that is Well Connected – Advocate for appropriate federal and provincial support, programming and financial initiatives to strengthen the movement of people and goods to, from and through the County

3. i. A County that Thinks Ahead and Wisely Shapes the Future – Influence federal and provincial policy with implications for the County by:
   - Advocating for federal and provincial initiatives that are appropriate to our county

DISCUSSION

Background

In 2015, County Council demonstrated significant municipal leadership through the adoption of the Future Oxford Community Sustainability Plan and committed to achieving 100% Renewable Energy by 2050, Zero Waste and Zero Poverty. With these commitments Council has also recognized the need to influence public policy well beyond our borders including advocacy for Southwestern Ontario.
This is the fourth in a series of transportation reports Oxford County commissioned Greg Gormick, On Track Strategies, to prepare. This series of reports outline the key issues facing transportation and freight mobility and efficiency across Southwestern Ontario.

Previous support for the development of an Integrated Public Transportation Master Plan, as outlined in the New Directions package (2016) and for freight policy reform as outlined in the Empowering Ontario’s Short Line Railways (2017) report is a demonstration of Council understanding that a vibrant economy requires the efficient movement of both people and goods. Most recently, at its June 13, 2018 meeting Council endorsed Steel Corridors of Opportunity which outlines the role and freight rail in Southwestern Ontario and suggested actions related thereto.

Finally, as Council is aware, the Province of Ontario is proposing a High Speed Rail project ultimately connecting Toronto to Windsor. The proposal includes a new rail corridor west of Kitchener to London. For this section of new rail corridor, the Province of Ontario has issued a commencement notice for the development of an Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference for a proposed High Speed Rail project. To this point it appears the intent is to exclude from consideration any options to optimize the existing rail corridors. At its March 14, 2018 meeting Council adopted the following resolution upon receipt of the Notice of Commencement:

“That the Ministry of Transportation correspondence dated February 27, 2018 regarding the High Speed Rail (HSR) Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference – Notice of Commencement be received;

And further, that the County of Oxford respectfully and unequivocally expects, as is required under the Environmental Assessment Act, the proposed HSR EA Terms of Reference to explicitly include a full and comparative assessment of the High Performance Rail alternative as outlined in Warden Mayberry’s January 18, 2018 letter to Premier Wynne, Minister Del Duca (then Minister of Transportation) and Minister Ballard (Minister of the Environment and Climate Change);

And further, that the Premier of Ontario, the Minister of Transportation, the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change, the Leader of the PC Party of Ontario, the Leader of the Ontario New Democratic Party, the Leader of the Green Party of Ontario, Ernie Hardeman (MPP Oxford), and the Executive Director of High Speed Rail be so advised.”

The Warden and staff continue to pursue Council’s requirement for a Southwestern Ontario fully integrated public transportation solution and a full and comparative assessment of alternatives to High Speed Rail, to no specific avail at this point.

Comments

Context

It is Oxford’s position that the Province of Ontario has prematurely concluded that High Speed Rail (HSR) is the only possible solution for enhancing public transportation connections between Toronto and Southwestern Ontario. Public transportation ridership, impact and value is not dictated by speed alone. Rather more critical is service frequency, reliability, convenience, quality, cost and extensive service integration amongst other public transportation modes.
Since 2016, Oxford County has advocated for an Integrated Public Transportation Master Plan that would consider a range of public transportation options to connect the larger urban centres of Southwestern Ontario with key points east to Toronto, while at the same time connect the small urban/rural communities of Southwestern Ontario to each other and key urban centres.

With this in mind, and prior to the aforementioned issuance of the Notice of Commencement, staff had commissioned the development of a feasibility assessment to understand the potential for improving the existing rail corridors through Southwestern Ontario.

The result is a proposed public transportation strategy for Southwestern Ontario that illustrates a viable option to provide a high quality transportation connection to Toronto that focuses on the optimization of the existing rail corridors, referenced as High Performance Rail (HPR). This report demonstrates that a HPR solution, when coupled with critical intercommunity transportation services and properly leveraging other intended rail investments, can achieve dramatic transportation connectivity enhancements across Southwestern Ontario in comparable travel times, markedly earlier and at substantially lower costs than High Speed Rail.

SouthwestLynx – Practical and Implementable

We have called the proposal SouthwestLynx. Our premise is a Southwestern Ontario centric transportation solution that connects to Toronto, rather than forcing a Toronto centric solution to fit the transportation needs specific to Southwestern Ontario as currently envisioned by the Province’s HSR proposal. The difference between the two approaches is transformational.

SouthwestLynx is a practical, affordable plan that can be rapidly deployed to address the public transportation access and mobility deficiencies that are threatening Southwestern Ontario’s economic, community and environmental destiny.

SouthwestLynx is based on several successful High Performance Rail (HPR) based services now being offered or emerging in the U.S., which are in turn based on similar examples from around the world. Many of the international HPR based systems laid the groundwork for the subsequent addition of HSR services to further augment the base HPR services. All of these successful global precedents have included major intercommunity transportation components, which have not only acted as feeders to the HPR core routes, but also to provide stand-alone service between the points they serve.

While the proponents are making much of the proposed HSR’s Toronto-Kitchener-London unverified 73 minute travel time, optimizing the existing Toronto-Woodstock-London south rail corridor can result in a very competitive 100 minutes travel time. The longer Toronto-Kitchener-London north rail corridor can be optimized to achieve as low as 140 minute travel times. All at a fraction of the cost and impacts associated with any HSR proposal, currently estimated to cost at least $21 billion.

Moreover while an optimistic first HSR train date is likely well beyond 2025, the HPR based SouthwestLynx proposal to optimize the existing corridors can create passenger rail capacity within the first year. It is expected that within a single year, the existing corridors could accommodate 5 additional two-way daily Toronto – London trains (from 7 to 12). Further strategic optimization investment in existing rail corridors can create the track capacity for as
many as 30 two-way daily Toronto – London passenger rail trips (from 7 to 30) within the first 5 years. Within the SouthwestLynx plan, daily two-way passenger trains Toronto-Windsor and Toronto-Sarnia can double from 4 to 8 and 2 to 4 respectively in the same time period. Quicker, better, faster is SouthwestLynx!

Simply put, SouthwestLynx can begin improving the region’s public transportation system within one year because its focus is within the two existing rail corridors. It is scalable and incremental, and it can be completed at a substantially lower and more readily verifiable cost than the initial $21 billion, 14 years required for the proposed Toronto-London-Windsor HSR project. The HSR proposal costs and implementation time are best case initial estimates only.

SouthwestLynx proposes a HPR core system to significantly improve the current Southwestern Ontario rail passenger services, augmented by an extensive and coordinated network of connecting intercommunity transportation services all of which would be linked to intermodal mobility hubs (Attachment 1). SouthwestLynx requires only minor land acquisition, severs no agricultural properties, includes rail freight benefits and provides a broader range of transportation improvements offering better value, compared with HSR.

In order of priority, the initial 5 year projects within the two existing rail corridors include:

1. **Aldershot-Bayview Junction Capacity Expansion**

   The key obstacle to any thought of passenger rail service improvements using the CN South Main Line (Toronto-Brantford-Woodstock-London) is the capacity constraints on the CN portion of the Oakville Subdivision between Aldershot Station and Bayview Junction in Hamilton’s west end. This 2-km section of track is one of the most heavily used in Canada that often suffers severe conflicts between the passenger and freight trains.

   Proposed track improvements are a vital first step to improving passenger and freight rail capacity through west Hamilton to Southwestern Ontario. The improvements are also key to VIA Rail services, absolutely essential to any thought of GO Transit Rail services to Brantford, Hamilton (all day) and beyond to Niagara.

   The proposed track improvement in this area will cost a minimum of $500 million.

2. **CN Guelph Subdivision Upgrading**

   The CN-owned portion of the Guelph Subdivision extends 91 km from the western end of the Kitchener to a junction at London East with CN’s Bayview-London Dundas Subdivision, which is used for VIA’s South Main Line passenger service. For passenger service, this section is in only fair condition and unable to sustain a higher-speed service.

   To bring back up to an appropriate condition for the SouthwestLynx passenger service, major track infrastructure rehabilitation is required throughout the corridor along with a number of short railway sidings that are in need of extensions and/or additions as the train frequency incrementally increases. The line has a modern centralized traffic control (CTC) signaling system which with the SouthwestLynx optimization plan will yield major benefits.
It is estimated that the upgrading of the CN Guelph Subdivision to provide more frequent service at the maximum 160-km/hour passenger speed CN allows on its track will cost approximately $500 million.

3. **CN Halton Subdivision (Bramalea-Georgetown) Capacity Expansion**

The CN Halton Subdivision forms a central and critical part of the North Main Line used by VIA and GO's Kitchener Line trains. It is a heavily-used main component of CN's Montreal-Toronto-Chicago freight main line. Along with extensive freight, the Bramalea-Georgetown section is shared with VIA's two daily North Main Line roundtrips and, on weekdays, with 29 GO commuter trains that originate or terminate at Mount Pleasant, Georgetown or Kitchener, as well as three non-revenue GO train movements.

To implement the high-frequency GO RER and proposed HSR services, the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) proposes to build a new freight bypass CN (Bramalea to Milton) requiring eight years of construction at an estimated cost of $8 billion.

The SouthwestLynx alternative approach would avoid the public cost of this line and eliminate conflicts between the passenger and freight trains by constructing a fly-under between the Mount Pleasant to Georgetown stations to service the Southwestlynx and GO Transit and undertaking some station platform improvements. Within the SouthwestLynx proposal, all passenger trains would stay on the south side of the triple-track line and keep the north track open for exclusive CN freight use until the fly-under. At that point, the CN traffic would be largely confined to the south track and the passenger trains to the north.

By substituting SouthwestLynx proposed Toronto-Kitchener-London HPR service for the proposed HSR service, and using it to provide some of the proposed GO RER frequencies, the capacity demands on this line segment would be reduced to an extent that a fully triple-tracked line from Bramalea to Georgetown could accommodate both the passenger and CN freight services.

The SouthwestLynx approach of triple-tracking this line segment and building the fly-under to minimize freight/passenger conflicts is a vital requirement of the Southwestlynx North Main Line service and can be delivered at an estimated cost of $1.5 billion. It could be completed within five years or less.

4. **CN Dundas Subdivision Capacity Expansion**

A major point of freight and passenger conflicts on the double-track CN Dundas Subdivision portion of the South Main Line is at Paris Junction, at the top of the grade out of Brantford. At various times, a combination of four passenger and freight trains will routinely pass through this point in both directions within a few minutes of each other. Sidings exist on both the north and south sides of the line, but both are approximately 2,200 metres long and are inadequate for use by today’s freight trains of 3,000 metres or more.

To eliminate this choke point, the Southwestlynx plan requires the extension of these short sidings to Princeton to create a 13 km, highly-useful, section of four-track main line. This will not only allow for “meets” between trains operating in opposing directions, but for smooth
overtakes of the CN freight trains, which are limited to 96 km/hour, by the passenger trains, which are now allowed a maximum permissible speed of 130 km/hour.

The ability to use this four-track section for planned overtakes under CN’s “precision scheduled railroad” freight operating concept will become even more important as the passenger speed is increased to the 160-km/hour CN allows on shared-use main line trackage.

The SouthwestLynx proposed capacity expansion from Paris Junction to Princeton will cost approximately $100 million.

5. **CN-CP Woodstock-Komoka Line Consolidation**

An opportunity to address several intercity and urban transportation challenges is available in what would be the largest capital project in the first phase of Southwestlynx. It would not only yield major rail passenger and freight benefits, it would resolve significant rail crossing issues in London.

Leveraging CN and CP proximity in Woodstock and again on the west side of Komoka, the SouthwestLynx proposal identifies the opportunity to adjust existing rail operations to consolidate freight rail separate from passenger rail over a 60 km section. All within the existing rail corridors a 60 km dedicated 200 km/h passenger rail section can be created while still allowing CP and CN freight operations to efficiently continue through Windsor and Sarnia and to US markets as they do today while ensuring local area agricultural and industrial shippers maintain services.

Through London, both the all-passenger CN line and the all-freight CP line would be grade separated from all the streets that now cross them, resulting in improved automotive and pedestrian flow on those streets. A minimum of five grade-separated crossings on the CP line and seven on the CN line would require construction.

An order-of-magnitude cost estimate is $2 billion. Notwithstanding the construction implications this significant investment would significantly benefit the citizens of London, rail passengers, as well as CN/CP freight operations.

6. **Continuous Corridor Enhancements**

There are other infrastructure projects that can be undertaken to increase the speed and the reliability of the Southwestlynx rail passenger services, although none would produce the dramatic benefits that can be derived from the projects described above. However, in concert with these larger projects, they can assist in incrementally reduced schedule times and further enhanced by minimizing conflicts between the passenger and freight trains. The SouthwestLynx plan has identified a number of station, crossovers and switching locations where safety, speed and capacity can be significantly enhanced incrementally.

Costing this aspect of the first phase of the Southwestlynx project will be difficult until the situation is analyzed by both the freight and passenger operators, and the number of replacements determined. Nonetheless, it should be a component of the project on the basis that every minute of time that can be incrementally bled from the running times translates into greater passenger attraction and revenue. At a high level, significant station improvements at
the locations identified may well cost upwards of $20 million, crossing and switching improvements perhaps $2 million for each location.

A SouthwestLynx Demonstration

A two-part demonstration project has been outlined in the report to provide opportunity for early improvements and to establish a template for the roll out of the full SouthwestLynx program:

- A joint VIA-GO “pool agreement” to blend their operations on the Toronto-Kitchener-London North Main Line route to provide faster, more frequent service at lower passenger cost; and
- Development of a multi-county network of intercommunity transportation connections between major points on the two VIA Rail routes and numerous off-line Oxford County points, which can act as a template for other county, regional and municipal governments.

Combined, these demonstration project options could be used to validate the approach proposed in SouthwestLynx.

The SouthwestLynx Advantage

Southwestern Ontario’s public transportation access and mobility require timely and strategic action now. The provincial government is contemplating the construction of a high-cost HSR that will not be fully operational for at least a decade. Further, there is no indication of how the Province proposes to substantially address intercommunity transportation requirements in concert with their HSR proposal. Southwestern Ontario’s need for an alternative that will deliver more effective, more affordable mobility quicker is urgent. SouthwestLynx is that fulsome alternative.

By considering key improvements within both rail corridors SouthwestLynx can be the catalyst to accelerate GO Transit Rail service improvements not only to Kitchener along the north rail corridor but to Hamilton, Brantford and Niagara as well through the south rail which is given no consideration in the Province’s HSR proposal. This is possible because the very obstacles to those long awaited service improvement are leveraged by the SouthwestLynx plan strategically. The result is a public transportation investment that will serve Kitchener and Southwestern Ontario while also enhancing service opportunity to over 1 million more people than the Province of Ontario’s HSR proposal. All while also solving key freight movement issues across the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area as well as across Southwestern Ontario.

Moreover, by investing in partnership with the Canada’s Class 1 Railways (CN/CP) every dollar invested enhances the freight rail capacity through these key corridors as well as the passenger rail capacity.

Partnerships and Cooperation

There are three prerequisites for the implementation of SouthwestLynx:
- Complete replacement of the Southwestern Ontario rail passenger fleet with new, proven high-performance diesel-electric locomotives, rolling stock, and rail infrastructure improvements;
- Coordination and cooperation among the Government of Canada, federally-owned VIA Rail, the Government of Ontario and provincially-owned Metrolinx/GO Transit; and
- A new governance and service delivery strategy based on the successful concepts employed on three integrated California high-performance rail corridors and Southwestern Ontario’s SWIFT ultra-high-speed broadband project.

Multiple infrastructure upgrading projects must be undertaken on the two passenger rail routes linking Southwestern Ontario with the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area. These projects may be spaced over a number of years, dependent on available public funding. These include the easing of several speed-restricting curves, grade separating numerous road crossings, station improvements and track additions to minimize or eliminate conflicts between passenger and freight trains.

Each project will incrementally and progressively contribute to reducing current rail journey times, increasing rail frequency, reducing operating costs, reducing government operating subsidies and reducing passenger fares. All would work hand-in-glove with new, high-performance locomotives and rolling stock to offer benefits equal to or greater than those promised under the controversial Ontario HSR proposal.

Successful integrated public transportation services, as SouthwestLynx proposes, are highly complex in nature. Multiple levels of jurisdiction, varied stakeholders interests, complex funding and operating partnerships will be crucial to success. SouthwestLynx incents cooperation because its plan offers the potential to significantly advance rail freight and rail passenger transportation across Southwestern Ontario and to Hamilton, Brantford and the Niagara Peninsula.

Further, by including strong intercommunity transportation services serving both as passenger rail feeder routes and community connection services, Southwestern Ontario can have the broader high quality transportation service it needs and deserves. These intercommunity services need not be solely traditional municipally operated systems. In fact, a system of complementary municipal and contracted services in partnership with the existing motor coach industry has considerable potential.

SouthwestLynx Governance

SouthwestLynx is premised on a Southwestern Ontario centric transportation solution that connects to Toronto, not a Toronto centric solution as envisioned by the province’s HSR proposal. We believe it must be governed as such.

Like Ontario Northland serves Northern Ontario and Metrolinx serves the Greater Golden Horseshoe, SouthwestLynx must be a Southwestern Ontario based entity premised on serving the needs of Southwestern Ontario. As a distinct entity, its Board would comprise key funding partners and stakeholders including the Government of Canada, Government of Ontario, Western Ontario Wardens Caucus, the Mayors of Southwest Ontario, Indigenous Communities
and appropriate business representatives. Similar successful governance models indicate this approach is not only viable, it is essential to the successful planning, implementation and operations that will be SouthwestLynx.

Moving Forward

A new Provincial government does not resolve the HSR issues, nor does it ensure firm action and cooperation necessary to addresses the Southwestern Ontario transportation issues identified in the Oxford reports.

The SouthwestLynx proposal was developed as a means to demonstrate that viable alternatives to the Province’s proposed HSR do exist. SouthwestLynx is a practical, affordable plan that can be rapidly deployed to provide the public transportation access and mobility vital to Southwestern Ontario’s economic vitality, community wellbeing and environmental health.

To ensure consideration of the SouthwestLynx proposal and the related freight opportunities raised in this report, and the prior Steel Corridors of Opportunity, Empowering Ontario’s Short Line Railways and New Directions, two avenues for action include:

- active pursuit of the HSR EA Terms of Reference expansion to include all viable comparative route alternatives; and
- active pursuit of the required coordination and cooperation necessary between all stakeholders necessary to address the transportation system issues raised in Oxford’s transportation compendium.

High Speed Rail Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference

The Corridor Impacted Municipalities group comprising the Municipality of Thames Centre and the Townships of Zorra, East Zorra-Tavistock, and Wilmot is being coordinated by Zorra Township. The Region of Waterloo, along with the counties of Oxford and Middlesex will be working with the group to ensure a common voice. On behalf of the group, Zorra Township has approached the Ministry of Transportation to seek funding assistance to provide the technical support and capacity to peer review any and all work, as appropriate, emanating from the High Speed Rail Program Office on this file. While receptive, the Ministry has not provided any indication of funding at this time.

Given the potential for a lame duck Council situation in late July, and the complete uncertainty of any provincial funding, it is proposed that Oxford County work with Zorra Township to fund the formation of an appropriate expert Peer Review Team. Upset cost exposure to ensure able action through the remainder of 2018 is estimated at a net $100,000. Any further funding requirements would be identified through the 2019 Budget and Business Plan process.

Southwestern Ontario Transportation Dialogue and Relationship Program

A change in provincial government does not resolve the issues raised to date. The advancement of a transportation solution for Southwestern Ontario will not just happen. To encourage, and as appropriate stimulate, the necessary dialogue it will be necessary to seek the advice and support in approaching key industry players along with the Federal and Provincial governments and their agencies (VIA Rail and Metrolinx respectively). Staff believe
this initiative requires a level of sustained action that is not practical without strategic advice and support. It is proposed that Oxford County lead the development and implementation of an effective Southwestern Ontario Transportation Dialogue and Relationship program. To develop a plan and begin implementation an additional $75,000 is proposed. Working with the Corridor Impacted Municipalities group, we will seek municipal partners through the Western Wardens Caucus, the Mayors of Southwest Ontario, the City of Hamilton and the Regions of Waterloo and Niagara. Any further funding would be identified through the 2019 Budget and Business Plan process and take into consideration any partnership funding support available through the aforementioned municipal group.

Conclusions

The complex issues raised in this report are largely the result of years of evolution in the absence of a long term strategy, public policy and public/private investment that ensures:

- A rail network that addresses rail freight needs and opportunities;
- A rail network that concurrently provides effective and integrated passenger rail;
- A fully integrated intercommunity transportation system.

A system that addresses the efficient movement of people and goods across Southwestern Ontario is in the broader public interest, is fundamental to addressing climate change and should be of significant concern at the federal, provincial and municipal levels of government. Such a system should also be of significant interest and concern amongst the freight and passenger transportation system providers (CN, CP, VIA Rail, Metrolinx and the Motor Coach Industry).

There is nothing technologically or legislatively untested in the SouthwestLynx plan. In fact the work undertaken cites three successful U.S. examples that demonstrate all elements are service proven.

This report demonstrates that SouthwestLynx is a viable alternative worthy of consideration within a proper Individual Environmental Assessment of the High Speed Rail proposal. Moreover, it demonstrates strategic solutions that can significantly advance the economic, community and environmental wellbeing of not only Southwestern Ontario residents and businesses but its many service partners, industries, and stakeholders. As such, staff recommend that Oxford County submit this report and its attachments to the High Speed Rail Program Office in support of Oxford’s prior position that Southwestern Ontario requires a fully integrated public transportation solution and that the HSR EA Terms of Reference must include the full and comparative assessment of alternatives to the proposed HSR corridor including the optimization of existing rail corridors.

Staff also recommend Council approval of initial funding in the amount of $175,000 to be used to establish a High Speed Rail EA Peer Review Team in coordination with the Corridor Impacted Municipalities group and to develop and undertake a Southwestern Ontario Transportation Dialogue and Relationship program as described herein.
Finally, staff recommend that Oxford County seek the support of Oxford’s Area Municipalities, the South Central Ontario Region Economic Development Corporation (SCOR), the Western Ontario Wardens Caucus (WOWC), the Mayors of Southwestern Ontario (MOSO), the Region of Waterloo, City of Hamilton, Region of Niagara, the MP (Oxford), the MPP (Oxford), and the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. Staff would also inform and seek the support of interested community stakeholders.

**SIGNATURE**

Approved for submission:

Original signed by: Peter M. Crockett, P.Eng.
Chief Administrative Officer

**ATTACHMENT**

Attachment 1  SouthwestLynx Proposal Map
Attachment 2  SouthwestLynx: Integrated High-Performance Public Transportation for Southwestern Ontario, June 2018
Recognizing the critical role mobility plays in achieving Oxford’s vision of economic, community and environmental sustainability, Oxford County commissioned Greg Gormick, On Track Strategies, to develop a four-part Southwestern Ontario transportation compendium. As a body of work, the compendium outlines the key issues facing public and freight transportation, freight mobility and efficiency across Southwestern Ontario, and poses actions that would set the stage for positive transformation.
Intercommunity Transportation

Community connectivity and mobility is critical to the vitality of small urban/rural Southwestern Ontario. SouthwestLynx recognizes the dramatic reduction to intercommunity busing that has occurred since 2009 and proposes to re-establish intercommunity connections across Southwestern Ontario.

SouthwestLynx: Integrated High-Performance Public Transportation for Southwestern Ontario

As the fourth and final of Greg Gormick’s commissioned reports, “SouthwestLynx: An Integrated High-Performance Public Transportation for Southwestern Ontario” is the anchor report underlying the rationale for Oxford County’s commission of the entire compendium.

Released in June 2018, the SouthwestLynx report presents the unquestionable viability of High Performance Rail (HPR) complemented by a fully integrated intercommunity transportation system as a logical, practical, affordable and deliverable public transportation solution for Southwestern Ontario.

In partnership with municipalities, the Province of Ontario and the motor coach industry, an integrated intercommunity transportation system can provide key transportation links between communities and to the existing passenger rail for residents across Southwestern Ontario. This connects the residents of small urban/rural Southwestern Ontario to the large urban centres, to each other, to work, to healthcare services and to shopping, recreation and entertainment activities.
Passenger Rail

SouthwestLynx proposes a High Performance Rail (HPR) solution that can be accommodated within the existing rail corridors serving Southwestern Ontario.

SouthwestLynx identifies five key constraint areas within the existing North Mainline (Toronto - Brampton - Guelph - Kitchener - Stratford - St. Marys - London) and South Mainline (Toronto - Hamilton - Brantford - Woodstock - Ingersoll - London) rail corridors. SouthwestLynx then identifies specific improvement opportunities within the existing North Mainline and South Mainline, as well as a CN-CP Woodstock-Komoka line consolidation to dramatically improve freight and passenger rail travel in/out and through London.
The SouthwestLynx Plan

Map showing rail corridors and connections in southwestern Ontario, including:
- Toronto-London (Current: 7, Proposed: 30)
- Toronto-Sarnia (Current: 1, Proposed: 4)
- Toronto-Brantford/Woodstock/Ingersoll (Current: 5, Proposed: 15)
- Toronto-London (Current: 2, Proposed: 15)
- Toronto-Kitchener/Stratford/St Marys (Current: 1, Proposed: 4)
- Toronto-Windsor (Current: 4, Proposed: 8)

Key locations:
- Lake Erie
- Lake Huron
- Lake St. Clair
- Detroit
- Windsor
- Michigan
- Ontario's cities and towns

Additional notes:
- Existing Rail Corridors
- Small Urban/Rural SWO Inter-Community Bus Connections
- Canada-USA Border
- Oxford County Boundary

Scales:
- Kilometers

Legend:
- Current
- Proposed
An Integrated Solution for Southwestern Ontario

SouthwestLynx proposes a fully integrated public transportation solution that will serve the people and businesses of Southwestern Ontario. As well, because both existing rail corridors are utilized, the SouthwestLynx proposal enhances the passenger rail opportunities to more than 1 million more people in Hamilton, Brantford and Niagara Region. All of the SouthwestLynx passenger rail improvements have the added benefit of providing much needed freight rail enhancements and capacity improvements that will serve Southwestern Ontario.

Key elements of the SouthwestLynx Plan

- Practical, affordable and implementable alternative to High Speed Rail
- Optimizes existing north and south rail corridors, proposing solutions to key capacity constraint areas including:
  - CN-Halton Subdivision
  - CN-Guelph Subdivision
  - Bayview Junction
  - CN-Dundas Subdivision
  - CN-CP Woodstock-Komoka
- Major passenger rail service improvements
  - Toronto to London: increase from 7 return trips daily to 30 return trips daily
  - Toronto to Windsor: increase from 4 return trips daily to 8 return trips daily
  - Toronto to Sarnia: increase from 1 return trip daily to 4 return trips daily
- Enhances existing rail service to:
  - Toronto to Brantford/Woodstock/Ingersoll: increase from 5 return trips daily to 15 return trips daily
  - Toronto to Kitchener/Stratford/St. Marys: increase from 2 return trips daily to 15 return trips daily
- Southwestern Ontario-centric proposal that maintains passenger rail connections to Woodstock, Ingersoll, Stratford and St. Marys
- Fully integrated intercommunity transportation network connecting people across Southwestern Ontario
- Leverages GTHA planned rail improvements to enhance passenger rail opportunities to over 1 million people in Hamilton, Brantford and Niagara
- Enhances freight rails capacity and negates costly options that delay other planned works
Building a Transportation Strategy for Southwestern Ontario

Additional Reports Supporting SouthwestLynx Proposal

New Directions: Advancing Southwestern Ontario’s Public Transportation Opportunities
Released in June 2016, with an update in August 2017, “New Directions: Advancing Southwestern Ontario’s Public Transportation Opportunities” was timed to inform public policy and funding decisions on the future of our national and provincial transportation systems. The New Directions report proposes the design of a fully integrated public transportation system that contributes to Southwestern Ontario’s competitiveness and long-term sustainability.

Empowering Ontario’s Short Line Railways
Released in February 2017, “Empowering Ontario’s Short Line Railways” tells the story of short line railways in Ontario: understanding their value and understanding their challenges. Short line railways evolved as Class 1 railways exited the business of short rail operations. The report says that now is time for meaningful dialogue on the future of short line rail.

Steel Corridors of Opportunity
“Steel Corridors of Opportunity: Maximizing the Benefits of Southwestern Ontario’s freight railways” was released in June 2018. The report focuses on Southwestern Ontario’s freight railway system, which is a vital component of our economic, community and environmental prosperity.
Oxford County’s advocacy role

Oxford County Council continues to demonstrate municipal leadership through the adoption of, and ongoing financial support to advance, the Future Oxford Community Sustainability Plan and its related commitments to achieving 100% Renewable Energy by 2050, Zero Waste and Zero Poverty. Through these commitments and ongoing support, Council has also recognized the need to influence public policy well beyond its borders, including advocacy for Southwestern Ontario.

Oxford County’s transportation reports are available for download at www.oxfordcounty.ca
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August 13, 2018

County of Grey
Att: Stewart Halliday
599 9th Ave East
Owen Sound, ON N4K 3E3

Dear Mr. Halliday:

Fourteen years ago, you helped bring the first MRI into our community. Since then thousands of patients across Grey and Bruce Counties and beyond have benefited from this important diagnostic tool, with 10,000 scans performed each year.

The MRI in the Owen Sound Regional Hospital is currently one of the oldest operating magnets in Canada and the time has come to replace it. An MRI typically runs for ten years. The team in Owen Sound has extended the life of the equipment as long as they could.

As a key supporter who helped bring the first MRI to our region, I wanted you to be one of the first to know Grey Bruce Health Services (GBHS) is purchasing a new one.

Careful consideration is being put into the selection and purchase of the new MRI, which will be outfitted to meet the needs of our patients and should be installed and operational by early 2019.

The five Foundations of GBHS, including the Owen Sound Regional Hospital Foundation, are working together to raise the $4.7 million needed to bring the next generation in MRI to Owen Sound. We appreciate all you have done in bringing the first MRI to our community. If you have any questions about this project please contact me at 519-372-3925.

Yours Sincerely,

Amy McKinnon
Executive Director
August 24, 2018

Honourable Minister Lisa MacLeod
Minister of Children, Community and Social Services
80 Grosvenor Street, 6th Floor, Hepburn Block
Ministry of Community and Social Services
Toronto, ON M7A 1E9

Dear Minister MacLeod:

On behalf of the Board of Health for the Grey Bruce Health Unit, I am writing to convey our deep disappointment in the recent announcement of your government’s intention to cancel Ontario’s Basic Income Pilot and reverse planned updates to social assistance programs. I urge you to reconsider these decisions.

Social assistance support is already dangerously inadequate. Moreover, the proposed 1.5% rate increase, while similar to those of the recent past, is so wanting that it fails even to keep pace with inflation. The health of more than 900,000 people who currently rely on Ontario Works and the Ontario Disability Support Program will undoubtedly be affected by this unfair decision, which was made without consultation. The Grey Bruce Health Unit strongly encourages the Government of Ontario, at the very least, to maintain a 3% increase in social assistance rates.

The direct link between poverty and illness cannot be understated. The Basic Income Pilot was grounded on a detailed and well-researched proposal authored by Senator Hugh Segal, which was in turn subject to a broad consultation that received input from over 35,000 Ontarians as well as support from each of the provinces’ major political parties. We urge your government to continue this pilot and its planned evaluation, so the results can inform future decisions.

As you embark on your review of social assistance policies in Ontario, please consider the evidence-based and experience-informed recommendations of the Income Security: A Roadmap for Change report to support people in their efforts to participate in the labour market and in their communities. Of note from that report, "Past decisions to create savings through reductions in social assistance have led to worse outcomes for people and exacerbated issues associated with poverty." The best social assistance is that which is evidence-informed and reflects the diverse needs of individuals. Many Grey Bruce children and adults rely on this valuable income to pay rent, buy nutritious food and contribute to our rural economy. Everyone deserves to live with dignity, experience improved physical and mental health and to participate fully in society. You have the power to transform lives for the better.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Alan Barfoot
Chair, Board of Health
Grey Bruce Health Unit

AB:
Cc:
Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Honourable Christine Elliott, Minister of Health and Long-Term Care
Dr. David Williams, Chief Medical Officer of Health
Roselle Martino, Assistant Deputy Minister, Population and Public Health Division
Loretta Ryan, Executive Director, Association of Local Public Health Agencies
Pegeen Walsh, Executive Director, Ontario Public Health Association
Hon. Bill Walker, MPP Grey-Bruce-Owen Sound
Hon. Lisa Thompson, MPP Huron-Bruce
Hon. Jim Wilson, MPP Simcoe-Grey
Mayors and Councils of Grey and Bruce
Committee Report

To: Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council
Committee Date: September 13, 2018
Subject / Report No: SSR-CW-13-18
Title: Further Extension of Movin’ GB Service
Prepared by: Barb Fedy
Reviewed by: Kim Wingrove
Lower Tier(s) Affected:
Status:

Recommendation
1. That Report SSR-CW-13-18 be received; and
2. That Council provides direction regarding continued operation of the twice weekly Highway 10 corridor route from Owen Sound to Shelburne given the absence of confirmed provincial transportation funding.

Executive Summary
Grey County’s transportation pilot funding expired March 31, 2017. Council has subsequently approved two extensions to the Highway 10 twice weekly corridor route from Owen Sound to Shelburne in anticipation of receiving grant funding from the Community Transportation Grant Program that was announced in May 2018. During the recent AMO delegation discussion with the Minister of Transportation, County officials were advised that no decisions regarding the flow of grant funds would be made prior to the completion of the province’s fiscal review anticipated this fall. There are concerns regarding ongoing municipal funding commitments to operate this service without provincial support and Council direction is required at this time.

Background and Discussion
Between April 1, 2016 and March 31, 2018 Grey County explored a variety of transportation options, funded by the province and led through a partnership with service provider Home and Community Support Grey-Bruce. Movin’GB supported riders through Monday and Thursday transit routes between Owen Sound and Shelburne.

Previous reports SSR-CW-07-18 and SSR-CW-09-18 provided information regarding the pilot and included requests for continued service pending the transfer payment agreement for the Local Transit and Intercommunity Bus Projects that Grey County has been approved for.
Movin’GB Outcomes

The intent of the pilot was to improve the lives of Grey County residents who did not have access to adequate and reliable transportation options. Pilot project services targeted seniors, people with disabilities and residents living in low income who were in need of access to affordable transportation. However, the service was available to any adult who wished to access it for any purpose.

| 2018 Highway 10 Ridership (Mondays and Thursdays) |
|------------------|--------|
| February         | 10     |
| March            | 38     |
| April            | 50     |
| May              | 40     |
| June             | 54     |
| July             | 59     |
| August           | 55     |
| Total            | 306    |

Recent survey results for reasons for accessing this transit:

- Medical (8)
- Shop (14)
- Social (6)
- Laundry
- Other (4)
- Work

Some early lessons learned during the short duration of the point to point route are that although ridership numbers are not overwhelming, they are new riders who did not have access to transportation previously and they reported experiencing a positive impact to their quality of life. It takes time to engage community to understand that transportation services are for all, not limited to certain populations. Awareness is necessary to understand that transportation is not just about big city buses; it can be smaller vehicles that address a universal problem in a rural setting.

As well, a limited marketing campaign was intentional to ensure demand could be met. Staff were concerned about managing capacity with the pilot but it is anticipated more days of service, additional shifts and vehicles as well as improved route options will increase ridership and recent rider survey comments reflect this.
Funding Limitations

Council has endorsed the continuation of the twice weekly Highway 10 corridor route as it made sense to maintain the service pending the release of the transfer payment agreement and funding commitment from MTO. In the interim Grey County committed to payment of the route expenditures after the pilot funding ended March 31, 2018. However the delay in awarding the funding due to the transition to a new government is a concern as costs mount, as well as the Community Transportation Grant Program itself; ongoing operations of this route are approximately $5000.00 per month and are not sustainable through 100% municipal funding.

To date rides have been free of charge in order to drive ridership. The operations and expenditure costs previously were funded through the pilot program. Recently, when asked, the riders indicated they could pay the following:

- $5.00 / ride (8)
- $40 / month
- $2.00 / ride (3)
- $0.00 / ride (2)
- Reasonable (2)
- Whatever it takes
- $15.00 / ride
- $20

Adding a fee to ride from Owen Sound to Shelburne would help to support some of the ongoing costs that are unfunded, which since April 1st, 2018 have been 100% municipally funded. There will not be enough to meet expenses however there are relevant studies including a recent rural business case analysis from the United States where missed health care appointments cost their system several times more than providing the transportation. Lack of transit was the reason for missed appointments in most cases. Further non quantifiable costs to low income residents, seniors and persons with disability include isolation and the need to be connected to community; also impacting health care expenditures in a negative way when there is no access to transit. Further, the CT Program funding was intended to expand this limited route for employment and skill development, critical to community as more and more employers are indicating they cannot fill their vacancies.

With the limited rural options, Grey County differs greatly from urban centres as there are no services or choices for public transportation. The investment of the committed CT Program grant funding is vital and a status update from the MTO is critical. Without the guaranteed 1.85 million, this small program cannot be sustained. This will again leave some with no options whatsoever as even if they could afford it, there are no taxis in some communities.

Finally, there has been a strong collaboration to develop this model between Grey County and HCSS-GB; the partnership and success from it has been positive and expanding the program as intended with the approved CT Program grant commitment will only bring better results when the funding is received. However without the promised funding, there will be no alternative but to cancel what has been developed.
Legal and Legislated Requirements

There are none.

Financial and Resource Implications

Journaled expenses April 1st to July 31st total $26,264.85, which works out to be an average monthly cost of $6,566. Report SSR-CW-09-18 estimated monthly expenses to be $4790.11. In review there were additional unexpected TripSpark license costs that were pilot project-related included and after confirmation with MTO, could not be included as pilot expenses as they were received after the ministry reporting deadline.

If Council direction is to continue the service to the end of 2018, funding could be provided from the anticipated 2018 Ontario Works departmental surplus. If however should there not be sufficient surplus to fund these additional costs within the 2018 budget, the unfunded portion could be funded by a transfer from the Ontario Works Caseload Reserve.

Relevant Consultation

Internal - Social Services, Finance

External - Home and Community Support Grey-Bruce

Appendices and Attachments

SSR-CW-07-18
SSR-CW-09-18
Committee Report

To: Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council

Committee Date: September 13, 2018

Subject / Report No: HDR-CW-17-18

Title: Grant in Lieu of Development Charges

Prepared by: Anne Marie Shaw, Director of Housing

Reviewed by: Kim Wingrove

Lower Tier(s) Affected: 

Status: 

Recommendation

1. That report HDR-CW-17-18 be received and the affordable housing projects through Community Living Owen Sound and District and Owen Sound Housing Company be approved for a grant in lieu of development charges; and

2. That the $52,272 in funding required for the grant in lieu be funded from One Time Funding.

Executive Summary

There is a need for affordable housing in Grey County. In 2016, an expression of interest (EOI) was issued to develop affordable housing through the investment in affordable housing program for 2016-2018. Owen Sound Housing Company and Community Living Owen Sound and District were the successful proponents. A grant in lieu of development charges is requested at a cost of $52,272 in total. The grant in lieu would be funded through one time funding.

Background and Discussion

There is a need for affordable housing in Grey County because of the continuing increase in the cost of rents, utilities, and the low vacancy rate. Residents in Grey County with lower income have a hard time finding affordable housing. Grey County’s 10 Year Housing and Homelessness Plan identified a key strategic area of supplying more affordable housing units. In 2016 an expression of interest was released to identify projects for the Investment in Affordable Housing funds for 2016-18.
Owen Sound Community Living and District responded to the expression of interest for affordable housing in 2016. Community Living Owen Sound and District was a successful proponent for funds and approved by council in October 2016.

As with past participants of the Investment in Affordable Housing Program, Grey County offers a grant in lieu for development funds. County development charges for six affordable one bedroom apartments are $4,000 a unit for a total of $24,000. Staff recommends the funding required for the grant in lieu be funded from the one time funding.

Owen Sound Housing Company, another successful proponent of the EOI, has eight more units of affordable housing being built in 2018 at the Odawa Heights location. Six of the units are affordable units and two market units. County development charges for six affordable one bedroom townhomes are $4,712 a unit for a total of $28,272. Staff recommends the funding required for the grant in lieu be funded from one time funding.

Future Affordable Housing Builds

A report detailing a Community Improvement Plan will be presented to Committee of the Whole this fall. One of the components of the plan will look at incentives for building affordable housing such as development charges and application fees. This plan will detail how future successful applicants of affordable housing programs will receive incentives. Until this plan is presented and approved staff is recommending that the development charges be funded through the housing reserve to promote and continue the development of much needed affordable housing.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

The Investment in Affordable Housing Program recommends the waiving or a grant in lieu of development charges for affordable units to assist with the affordability and promotion of affordable housing.

Financial and Resource Implications

$52,272 in funding from one time funding

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal: Finance

☐ External:

Appendices and Attachments

None
Committee Report

To: Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council

Committee Date: September 13, 2018

Subject / Report No: HDR-CW-18-18

Title: National Housing Co-investment Fund

Prepared by: Anne Marie Shaw, Director of Housing

Reviewed by: Kim Wingrove

Lower Tier(s) Affected: 

Status: 

Recommendation

1. That report HDR-CW-18-18 on the Co-investment Fund through the National Housing Strategy be received for information.

Executive Summary

The National Housing Co-investment Fund provides low interest loans for municipalities, non-profits and private sector developers to build affordable housing. There are a number of minimum requirements in order to qualify for a loan including a funding contribution from a government partner in addition to the federal government. The Co-Investment Fund is another option for parties interested in building affordable housing.

Background and Discussion

Canada’s first National Housing Strategy was released in June 2018. The goal of the strategy is to ensure Canadians have access to housing that meets their needs and is affordable. The strategy will focus on the most vulnerable Canadians first. The strategy prioritizes:

- women and children fleeing domestic violence
- seniors
- indigenous peoples
- people experiencing homelessness
- people with disabilities
- veterans
- those dealing with mental health and addiction issues
- veterans
- young adults
In order to be successful, the strategy requires participation of the public, private and non-profit sectors to provide affordable housing. One of the released programs of the strategy is the National Housing Co-Investment Fund (NHCF). The Fund provides capital contributions and low-cost loans for the creation of affordable housing and the repair and renewal of existing community and affordable housing.

The primary funding available through NHCF is a low interest loan. The loan offers a 10 year term (closed to pre-payment) with a fixed interest rate, up to a 50 year amortization period with the ability to borrow up to 95% of project value for non-profits and 75% of project value for municipalities and private sector. The funding is available for the next 10 years or until funding is gone.

There are federal capital contributions available to support projects where loans are not a viable option or as a top up to close the gap with existing financial support.

The maximum loan and capital contribution amounts are determined through a scoring and prioritization process. Federal capital contributions range from 0 to 10% for a private proponent to 0-30% for a non-profit housing provider.

Minimum Requirements of the National Housing Co-Investment Fund

The Co-Investment Fund is open to municipalities, provinces, non-profits, community housing, indigenous organizations and private sector. All projects must have a minimum of five units; be primarily residential; meet minimum requirements for partnerships; and demonstrate financial viability, affordability, energy efficiency and accessibility.

Partnerships: central feature of Co-Investment fund, federal funding must be supplemented by investors from another level of government.

Financial Viability: demonstrate financial ability to carry project, evidence of viability of proposed project, capacity to deal with development risks.

Affordability: rents for a minimum of 30% of units must be maintained at 80% of market rent, with a commitment for a minimum of 20 years.

Accessibility: 20% of all units within the project meet or exceed accessibility standards as prescribed, access to the project and its common areas are barrier free.

Energy Efficiency: required to achieve 25% decrease in energy consumption and GHG emissions relative to the most recent national building and energy codes.

Funding Eligibility

Determining the amount of funding that the project will be eligible for is based on a scoring process that awards points based on the following criteria:

Affordability
Accessibility
Environmental Efficiency
Financial Partnerships
Proximity to local amenities
On-site support (Social inclusion and focus on federal priority groups)

**Eligible Loan and Contribution Amounts**

Eligible loan and contribution amounts as a percentage of project cost are determined by scores generated by the Prioritization Scoring Grid. The percentages are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units</th>
<th>Primary Funding – Loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritization Score Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary Funding – Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritization Score Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more details on the Co-Investment Fund:

[National Housing Co-Investment Fund - New Construction Stream](#)

**Possible Scenarios for Co-Investment Fund**
The Co-investment Fund is another option for proponents interested in building affordable housing. The low interest loan may be of interest to some builders. There is opportunity to use funding through the Provincial Investment in Affordable Housing Program or County funds as the alternate level of government funder. As the Service Manager, Grey County is responsible for assisting potential proponents with the application and process for this fund.

Legal and Legislated Requirements
None at this time

Financial and Resource Implications
Federal Funding requires contribution from another level of government

Relevant Consultation
☐ Internal:
☒ External: Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation

Appendices and Attachments
None
Recommendation

1. That Addendum to Report PDR-CW-09-17 be received; and

2. That all written and oral submissions received on plan of subdivision 42T-2016-10 known as Parkbridge Craigleith were considered; the effect of which helped to make an informed recommendation and decision; and

3. That in consideration of the draft plan of subdivision application 42T-2016-10, on lands described as Part of Lot 21, Concession 2 being Part Lot 161, East Part of Lot 169, Lot 172, and Part Lot 173, Plan 529 (geographic Township of Collingwood) in the Town of The Blue Mountains, the Grey County Committee of the Whole approves this plan of subdivision to create a total of four (4) blocks part of which would contain a total of two hundred and eleven (211) residential units consisting of forty (45) single detached dwellings and one hundred and sixty six (166) townhouses, subject to the conditions set out in the Notice of Decision.

Executive Summary

The County has received a plan of subdivision application (County file number 42T-2016-10) to create four blocks of land. Two blocks (Blocks A and B) would contain the Nipissing Ridge which identifies the lands that would be protected. A public trail will also be constructed within Blocks A and B along the base of the Ridge. The third block (Block D) was added as part of the April 2018 revised submission and includes a triangular shape piece of land that would be used as private open space. The fourth block (Block C) proposes to be developed with a total of 211 residential units consisting of 45 single detached residential units and 166 townhouse units. The residential units are proposed as life lease units with each unit being located on an individual land lease. The units would be owned by the unit purchaser and Parkbridge would lease the land that the unit will sit on. Parkbridge would own and manage the entire development site. Based on agency review and comments received regarding the
proposed plan of subdivision, it is recommended that the proposed plan of subdivision be given draft approval subject to the conditions set out in the attached Notice of Decision.

Background and Discussion

The County has received a plan of subdivision application (County file number 42T-2016-10) on lands described as Part of Lot 21, Concession 2 being Part Lot 161, east part of Lot 169, Lot 172, and Part Lot 173, Plan 529 (geographic Township of Collingwood) in the Town of The Blue Mountains. The proposed plan of subdivision would create a total of four blocks of land (see Figure 1). Two blocks (Blocks A and B) would comprise of the Nipissing Ridge and these lands would be protected given the environmental features that exist within these blocks. It is proposed that these blocks would be owned by Parkbridge, however no development would be permitted within these blocks based on the proposed zoning amendment as well as future restrictions to be applied as part of the site plan. A public trail will be constructed within Blocks A and B along the base of the Ridge. The third block (Block D) was added as part of the April 2018 revised submission and includes a triangular shape piece of land that would be used as private open space. The fourth block (Block C) proposes to be developed with a total of 211 residential units consisting of 45 single detached residential units and 166 townhouse units (see Figure 2).

The residential units are proposed as life lease units with each unit being located on an individual land lease. The units would be owned by the unit purchaser and Parkbridge would lease the land that the unit will sit on. Parkbridge would own and manage the entire development site. The entrance to the Parkbridge development is proposed off of Grey Road 19 at the existing Craigleith Road and Grey Road 19 intersection. There are a number of internal roads proposed within Block C all of which will be owned and maintained by Parkbridge. An emergency access is proposed to come off of Lakeshore Road.

Along with the subdivision application, Parkbridge has also submitted a zoning by-law amendment, a part lot control application and a site plan to the Town of The Blue Mountains. The Zoning By-law Amendment proposes to rezone the subject lands from the Development ‘D’, Hazard ‘H’ and Residential ‘R3’ zone to a Mixed Residential Use (single detached and townhouse dwellings), Hazard ‘H’ and Private Open Space ‘OS2’ zone. It should be noted that the Town of The Blue Mountains passed the zoning by-law amendment which has been appealed by a concerned member of the public. Details regarding the appeal are discussed later on in this Report.

The application for Part Lot Control is seeking approval to create interests in land such as easements and land leases to exceed the maximum 21 year limit under Section 50(7) of the Planning Act. Parkbridge has indicated that they would like to offer lease terms for at least 50 years and possibly as much as 99 years for its future residents.

One of the key applications is the site plan application as this will finalize the details of the development including the development areas within Block C, as well as identify the protected areas and the open space areas. The site plan will also provide details on phasing as well as the technical design and construction requirements. The details of the development will be finalized through the site plan agreement between the Town of The Blue Mountains and Parkbridge.
The applications were deemed complete by the Town and County of Grey in January 2017. Notice of the applications and submitted materials were then circulated to agencies, the general public, and posted to the Town and County websites. The first public meeting was held by the Town on May 15th, 2017. Minutes from that meeting can be found at the following link starting at page 10 - Town Committee of the Whole Minutes - May 15, 2017. A revised submission was submitted by the Applicant in April 2018 which was circulated again to agencies, the public and posted on the websites. A second public meeting was held by the Town on June 4th, 2018. Minutes from this meeting can be found at the following link starting at Page 18 - Town Committee of the Whole Minutes - June 4, 2018.

In support of the proposed plan of subdivision, the proponent has submitted a number of background studies and reports, some of which were updated as part of the 2018 revised submission. Copies of all background reports and plans can be found at this link.
The subject lands are vacant and consist of naturally regenerating former agricultural lands, watercourses and the Nipissing Ridge. The lands contain a human-made pond and also contain areas of historical and cultural significance. The lands are surrounded by existing residential development as well as proposed residential developments. Lakeshore Road, the Georgian Trail, residential uses and Highway 26 are situated to the north of the subject lands. To the east is the proposed Eden Oak development which has been draft approved by the Ontario Municipal Board (now known as the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal). South of the subject lands is the proposed Home Farm development which is currently before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal. West of the subject lands is Grey Road 19 and some further residential development.

Public and Agency Comments Received

There were members of the public that made oral submissions at the two public meetings which were held on May 15, 2017 and June 4, 2018 in the Town of The Blue Mountains, as well as additional written comments received. The minutes from the public meetings can be found at the following links - May 15, 2017 Minutes and June 4, 2018 Minutes. Comments raised by the public can be summarized as follows;

- Concerns about the impacts to traffic onto Lakeshore Road, Grey Road 19 and Highway 26 from the proposed development as well as the cumulative effect of traffic from other proposed developments. Concerns about one main access to the development.
- Concerns about safety for pedestrians and cyclists based on the increase in traffic to be generated
• Concerned about the impacts to the natural environmental features both on the subject lands and surrounding the subject lands, including impacts to a potential deer wintering area near the subject lands.
• Insufficient notices of Town meetings and not enough information.
• This development may provide attainable housing which is required in this area and is close to Blue Mountain Village. Excited that this development may bring people to the area that will live and work here and make a community.
• Increased density should be considered to support more opportunity for affordable/attainable housing.
• Impacts to drainage caused by increased stormwater and the potential to exacerbate existing stormwater issues in the area including further flooding and erosion issues
• Concerns about the proposed density in that the density is too high and is not compatible with the surrounding area and questions about the density calculation
• Recommended a 30 metre setback from the watercourses
• Hazard lands should not be used as trails as they are steep and that additional hazard lands be included and dedicated to the Town
• Concerns about the land lease model and the potential for people to neglect their properties if they are leasing versus owning the property
• Concerns about impacts to surrounding property values should this development proceed and increased noise
• Questions about who would be responsible for waste and recycling collection
• Concerns about the future residents of Parkbridge using a waterfront access located at the end of Fraser Crescent and Blue Mountain Road.
• Recommend that the development not proceed until a roundabout is built at Grey Road 19 and Grey Road 21
• Concern that the lease model will make these units not attainable
• The zoning by-law amendment that was adopted by Town Council has been appealed and the following are the reasons stated in the appeal submission:
  o No notice of approval of the draft plan of subdivision was circulated
    ▪ Staff comment – a decision regarding the draft plan of subdivision has not been made by the County
  o The Town’s Official Plan indicates that any development application must be consistent with the Niagara Escarpment Plan and the review of the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) was not received by the Town when it was discussed at Council
    ▪ Staff comment – comments were received by the NEC and conditions of draft approval have been added based on their comments.
  o Several policies and regulations of the Town Official Plan have not been followed, namely minimum 30 metre hazard land setback, relevant traffic impact study
    ▪ Staff comment – the revised submission now includes a 30 metre setback from all the watercourses. With respect to a relevant traffic impact study, a traffic impact study was completed and reviewed by MTO, County Transportation Services, the Town as well as a third part peer reviewer. Based on the review of the traffic impact study and the revised submission, MTO, County
Transportation Services and the Town have no outstanding concerns from a traffic impact perspective.
  - This has not been before the upper-tier for review and comment which is expected in September
    - Staff comment – this Report is being brought forward to consider the subdivision application that has been submitted to the County.

Agency comments were as follows:

- **Hydro One** – no comments or concerns.
- **Historic Saugeen Metis** – no objections.
- **Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA)** – in comments dated March 30, 2017, GSCA indicates that the majority of the natural features on site are proposed for some form of protection through the open space allowance and the hazard zoning. They note that there will be some disruption due to the road network. GSCA also notes that the majority of the development proposed maintains connectivity to the larger woodland in the area and watercourse corridors leading to Georgian Bay. The open space areas maintain the majority of the significant diversity on the site. GSCA recommends that a minimum setback of 30 metres on all watercourses be provided as a buffer for fish habitat, wildlife and water quality as a Natural Heritage feature. The April 2018 revised submission provides for a 30 metre minimum setback from all watercourses. This will be finalized and implemented as part of the detailed site plan approvals. GSCA also recommends that a vegetation management plan and a natural heritage mitigation plan be developed for the proposal as a draft plan condition. GSCA notes that they require additional information regarding the flood plain and erosion rate within watercourse 9 as this may change the block configuration and/or design layout. Additional information was provided as part of the April 2018 revised submission. In an email dated August 29, 2018, GSCA confirmed that they continue to recommend the following draft plan conditions be included to the satisfaction of the GSCA:
  - That a zoning by-law amendment be passed to include natural hazard areas associated with the Nipissing Ridge, the flood and erosion hazards with watercourses 7, 8, 9 and 10 and other areas identified through technical reports
  - That a slope stability study be prepared for the development of any structures that back on to the Nipissing Ridge slopes
  - That a final stormwater management plan be prepared
  - That a vegetation management plan and natural heritage feature mitigation plan be prepared
  - That the stormwater management plan and vegetation management plan be incorporated in the Subdivision Agreement, Site Plan Agreement and/or Part Lot Control Agreement, and
  - That the subdivision agreement include a clause indicating portions of the lands are subject to Ontario Regulation 151/06 administered by the GSCA and a permit is required from the GSCA prior to site alterations.

- **County Transportation Services** – County Transportation Services identified initial concerns with the potential for traffic to impact the intersection of Grey Road 19 and Lakeshore Road with the original submission. The proposal was revised in April 2018 to only have one access off of Grey
Road 19 and to only use the access to Lakeshore Road as an emergency access. County Transportation Services were initially concerned with the revised submission given the potential traffic impacts onto Grey Road 19 with all the traffic entering and exiting off of Grey Road 19. Based on this concern, a peer review of the Traffic Impact Study was conducted. Through the Traffic Impact analysis it was determined that there would be a need for an eventual left turn lane to be added off of Grey Road 19 for traffic entering from the north on Grey Road 19. The County’s Development Charges Background Study identifies that this section of Grey Road 19 will be improved in the future including adding additional lanes to accommodate the projected traffic resulting from growth and development in this area. As a result, development charges will be collected for each unit within the Parkbridge development and these development charges can be utilized to make any future improvements to Grey Road 19 as identified in the DC Background Study. County Transportation Services has no further concerns with the proposed development.

- Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) – In comments dated March 31, 2017, the NEC requested that as a condition of draft approval, that a Visual Impact Assessment and a Vegetation Preservation Plan be prepared to the satisfaction of the NEC which will be incorporated into the Subdivision/Site Plan Control/development agreement. Further comments were received from the NEC on August 17, 2018 which indicates that their previous comments still stand and that as a condition of draft approval the NEC will want to review the completed Visual Impact Assessment and the Vegetation Preservation Plan. The NEC did have some further comments with respect to maximum height of the units which can be finalized as part of the site plan agreement.

- Ministry of Transportation (MTO) – MTO expressed initial concerns with adding any further traffic to the Lakeshore Road and Highway 26 intersection without finalizing the EA for this area and without making improvements to this intersection. MTO also initially identified stormwater management concerns. Based on the revised proposal which proposes to only utilize access to Lakeshore Road for emergency purposes only, MTO no longer has concerns from a traffic impact perspective onto Highway 26. From a drainage perspective, MTO still requires further information. This further information can be provided as part of the Final Stormwater Management Plan and therefore MTO has been added as a clearance agency to the recommended draft plan condition for the detailed stormwater management plan.

- Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) – The MNRF provided comments on the Butternut Health Assessment and recommended that any healthy Butternut trees on site be protected by identifying a ‘no development’ buffer around the healthy trees. A condition of draft plan approval has been included to ensure that any healthy Butternut trees are protected as part of the detailed site plan approval process.

- Town of The Blue Mountains – In the Town Staff Report PDS.18.73 dated June 25, 2018, Town Staff recommended that Town Council support the proposed plan of subdivision and recommended conditions of draft approval. Town Council supported the Town Staff Report on July 9, 2018 and passed the Zoning By-law Amendment. The conditions of draft approval supported by Town Council have been incorporated into the recommended conditions of draft approval attached to this Report. County staff concurs with the Planning Analysis identified in the Town Staff Report.
Analysis of Planning Issues

Planning decisions in Ontario must have regard for matters of Provincial Interest under the Planning Act, be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2014, and conform to the goals and objectives of any official plans governing the lands. In this case the Niagara Escarpment Plan, the County of Grey Official Plan and the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan are all applicable to the subject lands.

The Planning Act

Section 1.1 of the Planning Act outlines the purposes of the Act. The purposes of the Act promote sustainable economic development in a healthy natural environment within a land use planning system, led by provincial policy and matters of provincial interest. Section 2 of the Planning Act outlines matters of Provincial Interest, which decision makers must be consistent with when carrying out their responsibilities under the Act. The most relevant matters of provincial interest to this application are: (a) the protection of ecological systems, including natural areas, features and functions; (f) the adequate provision and efficient use of communication, transportation, sewage and water services and waste management systems, (h) the orderly development of safe and healthy communities, (j) the adequate provision of housing, including affordable housing, and (p) the appropriate location of growth and development.

(a) Impacts on the natural environment have been minimized through the environmental impact study and the recommended mitigation measures contained therein. GSCA and NEC have reviewed the EIS and have no objections to the development subject to recommended conditions of draft approval. The conditions of draft approval have been incorporated in the attached conditions. GSCA recommended that a 30 metre setback be included around the watercourse and this has been included in the revised submission and will be finalized as part of the detailed site plan approval process.

(f) The subject development will be serviced by municipal water and sewer services. There were initial concerns identified by MTO, the Town, and the County Transportation Services regarding potential traffic impacts. The initial traffic concerns have been addressed based on the revised submission. All traffic will be directed towards a new entrance off of Grey Road 19 with an emergency only access being provided off of Lakeshore Road. Any improvements to Grey Road 19 that are required to support the growth and development in this area will be constructed as identified in the County’s Development Charges Background Study. The future collection of development charges from this development, as well as other developments, will contribute towards the improvements required to Grey Road 19. A public trail will be constructed along the base of the Nipissing Ridge as well as a trail connection to the Georgian Trail. Transit Services do exist along Grey Road 19 and the Town has indicated that they will explore a potential transit stop at the intersection of Grey Road 19 and the future Parkbridge entrance. All waste from the proposed residential units will be handled by Parkbridge. Waste handling/temporary storage facilities will be constructed on site and will be finalized through the site plan approval process.

(j) The proposed development could offer either a recreational or permanent form of housing. The life lease model being offered by Parkbridge will offer an alternative form of housing.
By not having to purchase the land, the initial cost of purchasing a unit is less than owning both the land and the unit. This could offer a more attainable form of housing in The Blue Mountains area.

(p) The subject lands are located within the Recreational Resort Area designation in the County Plan which is considered a designated settlement area. This designation contemplates the type of development that is being proposed.

The subject plan of subdivision application, with the attached conditions of draft approval, would have regard for matters of Provincial Interest under The Planning Act.

**Provincial Policy Statement**

A key goal of the PPS is directing new growth to serviced settlement areas, and promoting the vitality of such settlement areas through re-development and intensification. The subject lands are designated as Recreational Resort Area which contemplates the form of development that is being proposed.

Section 1.6.6.1 of the PPS outlines the servicing hierarchy to be utilized in the Province of Ontario. At the top of the hierarchy are municipal water and sewer services. As noted previously, this development will be serviced by municipal water and sewer services.

Section 2.1 of the PPS speaks to the long-term protection of significant natural heritage features. As noted above there was an EIS completed for this development which has been reviewed by County, Town, GSCA, and NEC staff. The recommendations of the EIS have also been implemented in the draft conditions attached to this Report. With the appropriate conditions and mitigation measures applied to this development, it would appear that the development will be consistent with this section of the PPS.

Section 2.6 of the PPS speaks to the protection of cultural and archaeological resources within the Province. Stage 1 to 4 Archaeological Assessments were completed on this property. Saugeen Ojibway Nation had representatives attend the site when the detailed archaeological assessments were being completed. Areas have been identified for archaeological protection and these will be identified and protected as part of the site plan.

Section 3.1 of the PPS directs development away from areas of natural hazard. Input was received from the GSCA and the GSCA is generally satisfied with the proposed development. The GSCA’s recommended draft conditions have been incorporated into the conditions attached to this Report.

It can be concluded that the proposed plan of subdivision application, with the attached conditions of draft approval, is consistent with the PPS.

**Niagara Escarpment Plan**

The Niagara Escarpment Plan contemplates this development in the Escarpment Recreation designation. The NEC’s recommended draft conditions have been incorporated into the conditions attached to this Report.
County of Grey Official Plan

The subject property is designated as ‘Recreational Resort Area’ in the County Official Plan. As noted above, the County Plan generally defers to the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan within this land use designation, but does contemplate this as a designated growth area. The County Plan maps portions of the subject lands as Significant Woodlands.

In general the County Plan mimics the policy matters covered under the review of the Planning Act and the PPS.

With respect to the Significant Woodlands on the subject lands, an EIS was completed for the property. The majority of the Significant Woodlands exist along the Nipissing Ridge and these areas will be protected. Both GSCA and NEC have reviewed the EIS and are satisfied with the results subject to recommended conditions of draft approval which have been included in the attached notice of decision.

The proposed plan of subdivision application, with the attached conditions of draft approval, conforms to the goals and objectives of the County of Grey Official Plan.

Based on agency review and comments received regarding the proposed plan of subdivision, it is recommended that the proposed plan of subdivision be given draft approval subject to the conditions set out in the attached Notice of Decision.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

The Plan of Subdivision Application has been 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

- [X] Internal (Planning and Transportation Services)
- [X] External (Town of The Blue Mountains, Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, Niagara Escarpment Commission, Saugeen Ojibway Nation, as well as other prescribed agencies and members of the public in accordance with the Planning Act)

Appendices and Attachments

Draft Notice of Decision and Recommended Draft Plan Conditions
NOTICE OF DECISION

On Application for Approval of Draft Plan of Subdivision
under Subsection 51(16) of the Planning Act

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

PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE FILE
All written and oral submissions received on the application were considered; the effect of which helped to make an informed recommendation and decision.

WHEN AND HOW TO FILE A NOTICE OF APPEAL
Notice to appeal the decision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal must be filed with the County of Grey no later than 20 days from the date of this notice, as shown above. The notice of appeal should be sent to the attention of the Director of Planning and Development of the County, at the address shown below and it must,
(1) set out the reasons for the appeal,
(2) be accompanied by the fee required by the Tribunal as prescribed under the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act, and
(3) Include the completed appeal forms from the Tribunal’s website.

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

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

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

HOW TO RECEIVE NOTICE OF CHANGED CONDITIONS
The conditions of an approval of draft plan of subdivision may be changed at any time before the final approval is given.
You will be entitled to receive notice of any changes to the conditions of the approval of draft plan of subdivision if you have made a written request to be notified of changes to the conditions.

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

ADDRESS FOR NOTICE OF APPEAL
County of Grey
595-9th Avenue East
OWEN SOUND, Ontario N4K 3E3
Attention: Mr. Randy Scherzer, MCIP RPP
Director of Planning & Development
Plan of Subdivision File No. 42T-2016-10 has been granted draft approval. The County’s conditions of final approval for registration of this draft plan of subdivision are as follows:

1. That the Final Plan shall conform to Draft Plan of Subdivision File No. 42T-2016-10, as per drawing D-03 prepared by SvN dated May 1, 2018 as revised showing 4 Blocks (A,B,C, and D), Blocks A, B and D as open space blocks and a public trail, and Block C to provide for a maximum of 211 residential units, private open space uses, storm water management facilities and private streets on Part of Lot 21, Concession 2, being Part Lot 161, East Part of Lot 169, Lot 172 and 173, Registered Plan 529, (geographic Township of Collingwood) in the Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey.

2. That a suitable Subdivision Agreement be entered into between the Owner and the Town of The Blue Mountains. The agreement shall contain all matters set out as Conditions of Approval as deemed necessary in this Decision and any other matters as deemed appropriate by the Town of The Blue Mountains, including financial, legal, and engineering matters, including the installation of municipal services, landscaping and other requirements of the Town of The Blue Mountains, Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, Niagara Escarpment Commission and the County of Grey including the payment of all financial obligations.

3. That the Subdivision Agreement shall contain provisions related to the owner providing cash-in-lieu of parkland (5%) in accordance with the Planning Act.

4. That prior to final approval by the County a Traffic Impact Study is completed to the satisfaction of the Town of the Blue Mountains, the County of Grey and the Ministry of Transportation and that the requirements of the Traffic Impact Study be included in the Subdivision Agreement.

5. That prior to final approval by the County a Visual Impact Study is completed to the satisfaction of the Niagara Escarpment Commission and that the requirements of the Visual Impact Study are included in the Subdivision Agreement.

6. That prior to final approval by the County, that appropriate zoning is in effect for this proposed subdivision that conforms to the County of Grey Official Plan and the Town of the Blue Mountains Official Plan and that addresses, inter alia, the following:
   i. An appropriate setback from watercourse 7,9 and 10;
   ii. An appropriate setback from the base of the Nipissing Ridge;
   iii. Any hazardous areas identified by the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority;
   iv. The imposition of a Holding (-h) prefix to be lifted upon identified conditions being met;

7. That prior to final approval by the County a Site Servicing Plan is prepared and the development is fully serviced with sanitary sewer and water to the satisfaction of the Town of The Blue Mountains and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.
8. That the Owner shall grant all necessary easements and/or blocks and/or enter into agreement for drainage, utility and servicing purposes, as may be required, to the appropriate agency or public authority.

9. That the Subdivision Agreement include a clause requiring that the Owner agrees to relocate any existing utilities as a result of the subject development at the sole expense of the Owner.

10. That the Subdivision Agreement include a clause requiring that the Owner provide an easement for an east-west public trail along the Nipissing Ridge and a north-south public trail between Grey Road 19 and the Georgian Trail.

11. That the private streets shall be named to the satisfaction of the Town of The Blue Mountains.

12. That prior to initiation of any site grading or servicing and prior to registration of the Plan, the Owner has prepared a Regional Stormwater Management report by a qualified consultant which describes the stormwater drainage system for the proposed development on the subject lands to the satisfaction of the Town of The Blue Mountains, Ministry of Transportation and the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, and that said report be incorporated into the Subdivision Agreement with the Town. The report shall include:
   
   i. Plans illustrating how the drainage system will tie into the drainage of surrounding properties;
   
   ii. The stormwater management techniques which may be required to control minor and major flows;
   
   iii. How external flows will be accommodated and the design capacity of the receiving system;
   
   iv. Location and description of all outlets and other facilities which may require permits;
   
   v. Proposed methods for controlling or minimizing erosion and siltation onsite and/or in downstream areas during and after construction, and;
   
   vi. The technique to be utilized to ensure that all stormwater overland flow routes shall be restricted within roads or approved outlets only.

13. That prior to final approval by the County, the Owner has prepared a detailed soils investigation by a qualified geotechnical engineer to be submitted to the Town of The Blue Mountains.

14. That the Subdivision Agreement contains a requirement that a secondary emergency access point be provided beyond the 85th unit.

15. That the Subdivision Agreement contain specific clauses related to the required Ontario Building Code / Engineering Standards, as applicable, of the Town including but not limited to the following:
i. The appropriate horizontal and vertical alignments of all roads and underground services including their intersection geometrics;

ii. That suitable construction traffic routes are identified to the satisfaction of the Town;

iii. The street lighting system on all roadways be designed and constructed to the satisfaction of the Town.

16. That the Subdivision Agreement include a requirement that arrangements be made with Canada Post and the Town’s Infrastructure and Public Works department for the provision of suitable mail delivery methods which may include the installation of Canada Post Community Mailboxes and that the locations be included on the appropriate servicing plans.

17. That should Community Mailboxes be required, that the Subdivision Agreement contain further clauses requiring that the Owner install an appropriately sized sidewalk section (concrete pad) per Canada Post specifications, to place the mailbox on, plus any required walkway access and/or curb depressions for wheelchair access and the provision of a temporary Community Mailbox location until curbs, sidewalks and final grading have been completed.

18. That the Subdivision Agreement include the requirement of a Site Plan Agreement prior to building permits being issued.

19. That the Subdivision Agreement include a section for Part Lot Control to permit land lease up to 99 years.

20. That prior to final approval, the Owner prepares a Landscape Analysis, Vegetation/Tree Preservation/Management Plan and Landscape Plan by a qualified consultant to the satisfaction of the Town of The Blue Mountains, the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. The Landscape Plan shall include amongst other matters special provisions to ensure that the existing vegetation on the periphery of the site be maintained and protected during the development process and that said plan be incorporated into the Subdivision Agreement with the Town. The Landscape/Tree Preservation Plan will also need to address the protection of the Butternut trees to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF).

21. That prior to final approval, the Owner prepares a Slope Stability Study for the development of any structures that back on to the Nipissing Ridge slopes by a qualified consultant to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and the Town of The Blue Mountains.

22. That prior to final approval the required Archaeological reports are entered into the registry at the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Support (MTCS).

23. That prior to final approval, a copy of the fully executed Subdivision Agreement between the Owner and the municipality shall be provided to the County of Grey.
Applicant: Parkbridge - Craigleith  
Municipality: Town of The Blue Mountains  
Location: Part of Lot 21, Concession 2 being Part Lot 161, East Part of Lot 169, Lot 172, and Part Lot 173, Plan 529 (geographic Township of Collingwood), Town of The Blue Mountains  
File No.: 42T-2016-10

Date of Decision:  
Last Date of Appeal:  
Date of Notice:  

24. That prior to final approval, a copy of the fully executed Site Plan Agreement between the Owner and the municipality shall be provided to the County of Grey.

25. Prior to the signing of the final plan by the County of Grey, the Town is to be advised that all Draft Plan conditions have been carried out to the Town's satisfaction.

26. That prior to final approval the County is advised in writing from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority how Conditions, 2, 12, 20 and 21 have been satisfied.

27. That prior to final approval the County of Grey is advised in writing from the Ministry of Transportation how Conditions 4 and 12 have been satisfied.

28. That prior to final approval, the County of Grey is advised from the County Transportation Services Department how Condition 4 has been satisfied.

29. That prior to final approval being given, that the County is advised in writing by Canada Post Corporation how Condition 16 and 17 have been satisfied.

30. The prior to final approval the County of Grey is advised in writing from the Niagara Escarpment Commission how Conditions 2, 5 and 20 have been satisfied.

31. That prior to final approval the County of Grey is advised in writing from the Town of The Blue Mountains how Conditions 2 to 25 have been satisfied.

32. If final approval is not given to this plan within five years of the draft approval date, and no extensions have been granted, draft approval shall lapse under Subsection 51(32) of the Planning Act, RSO 1990, as amended. If the owner wishes to request an extension to draft approval, a written explanation together with the applicable application fee and a resolution/letter of support from the local municipality must be submitted to the County of Grey, prior to the lapsing date. Please note that an updated review of the Plan and revisions to the conditions of approval may be necessary if an extension is to be granted.

33. That the owner, submit to the Town of The Blue Mountains and the County of Grey with a digitized copy of the Final Plan in a format acceptable to the County of Grey.

NOTES TO DRAFT APPROVAL

1. It is the applicant's responsibility to fulfill the conditions of draft approval and to ensure that the required clearance letters are forwarded by the appropriate agencies to the County of Grey, quoting the County file number 42T-2018-10.

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

3. Clearances are required from the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of The Blue Mountains</td>
<td>32 Mill Street, Thornbury Ontario, N0H 2P0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Sauble Conservation Authority</td>
<td>237897 Inglis Falls Road, RR#4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornbury Ontario, N0H 2P0</td>
<td>Owen Sound, Ontario, N4K 5N6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Escarpment Commission</td>
<td>99 King Street East, Thornbury Ontario, N0H 2P0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Transportation</td>
<td>659 Exeter Road, London, Ontario, N6E 1L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Post Corporation</td>
<td>Grey County Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Planning Officer</td>
<td>595 9th Avenue East, London, Ontario, N5Y 1A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955 Highbury Avenue</td>
<td>Owen Sound, Ontario, N4K 3E3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. It is suggested you make yourself aware of the following subsections of the Land Titles Act:

a) subsection 144(1) requires all new plans to be registered in a Land Titles system if the land is situated in a land titles division; and

b) subsection 144(2) allows certain exceptions.

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

5. It is suggested that the municipality register the subdivision agreement as provided by subsection 51(26) of the Planning Act against the land to which it applies, as notice to prospective purchasers.

6. Portions of the subject lands are affected by Ontario Regulation 151/06: Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alteration to Shorelines and Watercourses regulation. As such permits are required from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority prior to site alterations and/or construction within the affected area.
7. All measurements in subdivision final plans must be presented in metric units.

8. The final plan approved by the County must be registered within thirty (30) days or the County may withdraw its approval under subsection 51(59) of the Planning Act RSO 1990, as amended.
Committee Report

Recommendation

1. That Report PDR-CW-28-18 Servicing Allocation Options be received.

2. That for new plans of subdivision or condominium being considered for draft approval by the County of Grey after September 13, 2018, save and except those in the City of Owen Sound, Hybrid Approach Option C allowing, servicing allocation at the discretion of the municipality, at the draft approval stage for plans of subdivision and condominium, or at the time of registration, or through separate by-law prior to registration, be endorsed.

3. That staff be directed to include policy language in Recolour Grey that sets criteria for allocating capacity through approvals of plans of subdivision or condominium, and criteria for draft plan approval extensions where servicing is being allocated.

4. That staff be directed to consult with municipal staff and the development community on options for servicing allocation and existing draft plan approvals.

5. That a review of all draft plan approvals granted on or prior to September 13, 2018, save and except those in the City of Owen Sound, be brought forward in a future staff report. This report shall consider a process for revisions to older draft approvals, which may include implementing lapse dates for draft approval and servicing allocation, or withdrawal of draft approval;

6. That Report PDR-CW-28-18 be circulated to member municipalities along with an explanation of the chosen option.

Executive Summary
The County is the approval authority for new plans of subdivision and condominium across the County, with the exception of the City of Owen Sound. Municipalities in Grey County own and operate their own water and wastewater treatment plants. In recent years, Grey County has been experiencing higher levels of residential growth than previously forecast. Some municipalities within the County have received applications for more residential units, than can be supported by current water and wastewater treatment plant capacities. Some developers have asked for additional flexibility in how and when servicing allocation gets assigned to a development. This report explores the current servicing allocation procedures when processing plans of subdivision or condominium, as well as assessing how other municipalities allocate servicing to subdivisions. A series of options are provided for consideration, with staff recommending the hybrid approach, option (c), as the preferred alternative, as well as additional considerations for policies in Recolour Grey.

Background and Draft Approval Process

The County is the approval authority for all plans of subdivision or condominium across the County, with the exception of those in the City of Owen Sound. The City retained the ability to draft approve plans of subdivision or condominium when they rejoined the County in 2000. As such, this report shall primarily apply to draft plan approvals where the County is the approval authority (i.e. all those except Owen Sound).

For the purposes of this report the terms ‘plan of subdivision’ or ‘plan of condominium’ will be used synonymously. From a process and draft approval perspective, the two development types are very similar.

Prior to the occupancy of new residential developments, in serviced settlement areas, clean potable water and sanitary sewage treatment is required. Most new residential developments proceed as either plans of subdivision or condominium. When processing a new plan of subdivision, typically there are three main stages from the time the application gets submitted.

1) Application submitted – staff review the file, agency and public comments are received, a public meeting is held, and a final recommendation is made to the approval authority, who either refuse or grant draft approval. This decision can then be appealed to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT), within 20 days of the notice of decision. County staff do not make a recommendation on the subdivision until the member municipality has provided their input, recommended draft plan conditions, and a commitment that servicing capacity exists to service the development.

2) Draft approval is granted – assuming there are no appeals, the developer has three years to meet the conditions of draft approval, before the subdivision lapses, or else they need to apply for a draft approval extension. During this draft approval period the proponent can start to pre-sell lots/units, they can begin to pre-service the lots/units (with permission from the municipality), and they work to meet the conditions of draft approval. A subdivision agreement, as well as sign-off from the member municipality hosting the subdivision is required, as part of the draft approval conditions. Currently draft approval also represents the municipality’s commitment of servicing allocation to the development.

3) Final approval / registration – Once all the draft approval conditions have been met, an application is submitted to the County for final approval. The Director of Planning
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reviews this application, and if complete, the plans are signed and deposited with the Land Registry Office. It is at this stage that the lots are actually created and can be conveyed separately to other landowners. Those lots that were pre-sold at the draft approval stage, will now ‘close their deals’ and the lands will be conveyed to the new owners. Final approvals often occur in phases, based on logistical, financial, and taxation purposes.

The above process is similar for all subdivisions, except where the non-decision of an application in stage 1 gets appealed, or the decision (either refusal or draft approval) gets appealed. Where appeals are received the LPAT becomes the approval authority. The only other significant deviation to the above process is where a ‘redline revision’ is received. A redline revision seeks to change the draft approval under stage 2, prior to final approval and registration. The redline revision can either change;

- the lot layout on the draft plan,
- the draft plan conditions, or
- both of the above.

Under the current process, water and sewer capacity is allocated at the time of draft approval. Whether the subdivision is developed immediately, or over a long period of time, the municipality needs to ‘hold onto’ this servicing capacity so that it is available for the development. When draft approval extensions are requested to the County, the County does not render a decision on the extension, unless the member municipality consents to the extension, as it is also an extension of the servicing capacity allocation. The County does have the legislative ability to withdraw draft approval, which would release the servicing capacity, but this has typically not been done. Should a subdivision approval lapse, then the committed servicing allocation would also lapse.

Up until the early 1990’s, when the Province was the approval authority for plans of subdivision and condominium, draft approvals did not contain a lapse date. There are a number of these older approvals within the County that do not currently have a lapse date. The County has the ability to amend these approvals to include a lapse date, through a redline revision. If a developer with one of these older approvals comes in for their own redline revision, then a lapse date is added to the revised approval.

Any new draft approval is given a standard lapse date of 3 years from the time of draft approval. Any extensions to draft approval are most typically done on a one year basis, but can be considered on a multi-year basis.

Recently County staff have undertaken a process to detail all existing subdivision and condominium approvals across the County, including those older draft approvals without lapse dates. Note this process was not done for the City of Owen Sound who approve their own subdivisions and condominiums. County staff will soon be sharing this information with member municipalities, to ensure we all have accurate data in this regard. Following this data sharing process, the logical next step will be to examine all existing approvals to assess development timeframes (and work with the developer where possible to move development forward), consider adding lapse dates through redline revisions to those plans that do not have lapse dates, and to determine if there are any older approvals that no longer meet current development standards.
Exceptions to the Current Process

In recent years the County has only made two significant exceptions to allocating servicing capacity at the time of draft approval. A summary of those exceptions has been provided below.

1) Town of The Blue Mountains – in 2009 the County approved a revised approach in the Town of The Blue Mountains for those developments seeking to connect to the Thornbury wastewater treatment plant. The rationale for this exception was that the Ministry of the Environment has already approved an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the plant expansion, the Town had applied for their certificate of approval, and the Town has sufficient reserves to pay for the expansion. Even though committed capacity was approaching 80% of the design capacity, the operation of the existing plant in 2009 was only at 64% of the design capacity. This issue came about because there were so many draft approvals which had committed capacity, but had not yet been built, so they were not actually using their plant capacity. Town staff questioned the need to expand a plant operating at 64% capacity, just because there were so many developers who may / may not choose to develop in the near future.

As a result, because the EA had already been approved by the Province and because the funding was already in place from the Town, the County committed to continuing to draft approve new developments in the Thornbury area. The County did so because there was confidence that they could be serviced appropriately when the development needed the servicing. A link to the 2009 staff report on this topic has been included in the Attachments section of this report.

2) Township of Southgate – in recent years a developer has been buying and developing significant amounts of residential lands in Dundalk. Three major subdivisions known as Flato West, East, and North have been draft approved. Flato West has since been registered and homes are currently being built. Flato East and North abut one another, but Flato East pre-dated the developer buying the Flato North lands. The Township of Southgate is currently installing a new municipal well and upgrading their sewage lagoons. Full approvals and operation of these new facilities and upgrades was not yet complete by the time draft approvals were sought on Flato East and North. Based on phasing and servicing reasons it made sense to combine phases of Flato East and North, even though they were originally two separate applications.

In this particular case, the County draft approved both Flato East and North, with draft conditions noting that servicing allocation was not completely available yet. The draft approval conditions also require the developer to advise any pre-sale buyers that servicing capacity may not yet be available. As such, the developer can register combined phases of Flato East and North as servicing capacity becomes available, in a manner which best accommodates the logical extension of roads, water, and sewers. The County approved this approach based on; the circumstances unique to the layout and timing of this development, specific draft approval conditions clarifying the status of servicing allocations, and the Township’s progress and commitment to improving servicing through the new well and lagoon optimization.
Why Examine the Servicing Allocation Process?

A few municipalities within Grey, most notably the Township of Southgate and the Municipality of Grey Highlands, are facing development pressures which exceed either current water or wastewater treatment plant capacities. Both municipalities are undertaking improvements to their municipal services, but have demands from developers which exceed their current approved plant capacities. The County currently has subdivision applications in both municipalities, which if draft approved, would exceed the municipal ability to service those developments. At present, the County could defer decisions on these applications until servicing capacity is in place, or approve portions of the developments for which capacity is available.

Knowing the County’s current position, developers have asked for additional flexibility when seeking draft approvals, believing that a municipality could have servicing in place by the time they go to build their developments (or build the later phases of their developments). More specifically developers have asked that draft approval be granted without allocating servicing capacity, and that capacity be allocated at the time of final approval and registration (this could be done as a condition of draft approval). The rationale staff have heard from developers can be summarized as follows:

1) Larger plans of subdivision take many years to build out, and get registered and built in phases.
2) Banks want to see that the whole plan of subdivision is approved ‘up front’ in order to lend the money.
3) Home buyers in the early phases also want to know what’s going in beside or behind them, when they consider buying a unit, and having the entire draft approval in place allows them to do so.
4) Although a municipality may not have servicing capacity to service the entire subdivision up front, if a municipality knows that there is demand, they can upgrade their facilities to ensure that the capacity is available for the future phases of development, while allowing the developer to begin constructing the earlier phases.
5) When a developer pre-sells a lot at the draft approval stage, that sale is not completed until final approval and registration. As such, if servicing capacity does not exist, the lots cannot be registered and the sales cannot be completed.
6) Other municipalities across the Province use the approach of allocating at the time of final approval and registration.

Planning staff have previously dealt with item # 4 above through phased draft approvals (i.e. only draft approving those phases that have servicing capacity), rather than phased registrations. However, some developers are citing items # 2 and 3 as rationale for why phased registrations are preferable to phased draft approvals.

County Planning staff had reservations about changing this process without first seeking:

a) input from municipal staff, as municipalities own and operate the water and wastewater treatment plants,
b) advice on what other municipalities are doing across the Province, and
c) approval from County Council.
County staff want to make the subdivision and condominium development approvals process as smooth and efficient as possible. However, we also do not want to ‘back-end’ infrastructure gaps, such that developers are not aware of these issues until much later in the process.

Planning Policy Framework

Planning policy and legislation in Ontario directs the majority of growth to our municipally serviced settlement areas.

Under the Planning Act, section 51(24)(i), when considering a new plan of subdivision or condominium, one must consider “the adequacy of utilities and municipal services”. Section 34(5) of the Act gives municipalities the ability to zone lands to prohibit new development “unless such municipal services as may be set out in the by-law are available to service the land.” Finally, as noted earlier in this report, section 51(44) of the Act permits municipalities the ability to withdraw draft approval or change the conditions of approval for a plan of subdivision.

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), section 1.6.1, requires that planning for infrastructure “shall be coordinated and integrated with land use planning so that they are:

a) financially viable over their life cycle, which may be demonstrated through asset management planning; and
b) available to meet current and projected needs.”

Section 1.6.6.1 of the PPS goes on to note that; “Planning for sewage and water services shall:

a) direct and accommodate expected growth or development in a manner that promotes the efficient use and optimization of existing:
    1. municipal sewage services and municipal water services;”

The PPS also contains a servicing hierarchy, which places municipal sewage services and municipal water services atop the hierarchy.

Section 5.3 of the County Official Plan contains very similar servicing policies to that of the PPS. Section 5.3.2(1) notes that; “Local municipalities shall plan for sewage and water services which direct and accommodate expected growth…” Later in the County Plan a similar servicing hierarchy is outlined.

Section 6.12 of the County Plan requires that the policies of section 5.3 of the Plan be met for new lot creation.

The current County Official Plan does not detail how we allocate servicing capacity, nor does it provide requirements for draft plan approval extension. As such the County can proceed with looking at new approaches here, without the need to amend the County Plan. That said, County staff would recommend including criteria in the Recolour Grey County Plan consistent with how County Council decides to deal with this report (or any addendum reports thereto).

In addition to the legislation, PPS, and Official Plan policies, the Province, through the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP), has guidelines which also address servicing. MECP (formerly MOE) Guideline D-5-1 Calculating and Reporting on Reserve Capacity at Sewage and Water Treatment Plants, dated March 1995 provides further provincial
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direction on servicing and calculating capacity. More information on the Province’s recommended approach can be found in the next section of this report.

The Provincial Approach

County staff reached out to the Province to get their opinion on servicing allocation in the subdivision and condominium approvals process. In response to our questions County staff got the following response from MECP staff:

“Traditionally, years ago, when the Province was the Planning Act Approval Authority for draft plans of subdivision, MOE Southwestern Region would not recommend draft approval for any proposed plan of subdivision or draft plan of condominium to MAH [Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing] unless the above noted calculation (derived from MOE Guideline D-5-1) confirmed that there was sufficient uncommitted reserve capacity available to service the number of lots / units proposed by the draft plan of subdivision application submitted for review and comment. If there was not sufficient uncommitted capacity, MOE’s recommendation to MAH would be that the issuance of draft approval should be considered premature until such time as sufficient uncommitted reserve treatment capacity comes available.

The only exception to this approach was if a Municipality had completed a Class EA to expand the sewage or water treatment works, and tenders had been let and a contract awarded for construction of said water treatment plant or sewage treatment plant. Under that circumstance, MOE SWR [Southwestern Region] felt that there was sufficient lag time after the issuance of Conditional draft approval, and construction of the expanded sewage and water works, that the sewage plant or water treatment plant expansion would either be fully constructed before the homes in the subdivision were built, or at the very least, both the homes and the sewage or water treatment plant expansion would be finished construction at the same time. If the EA was completed, but no tenders let and construction contract awarded for the expansion of the water or sewage treatment plant, MOE would indicate to MAH that issuance of draft approval was premature.

If an EA for expansion of a sewage works or water treatment works had not commenced as yet, or in progress but not yet completed, MOE would still indicate to MAH that issuance of condition of draft approval of the plan of subdivision / plan of condominium should be considered premature.

The traditional approach that the MOE SWR previously used in the past (as noted above) is the approach the MECP SWR would recommend Grey County follow. That said, the choice of which way to proceed is obviously Grey County’s as the Planning Act approval authority. Ultimately, the municipality and/or the County of Grey should not over commit a sewage treatment plant or water treatment plant, as in the case of a sewage treatment works, the municipality must meet their sewage discharge criteria as outlined in their sewage Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) issued by this ministry. If the municipality or Grey County overcommits, they are at risk of exceedances of their ECA(s).”
As per the above, the Province recommends the County stick with the status quo approach, but does give credence to the approach taken by Town of The Blue Mountains for the Thornbury wastewater treatment plant.

Other Municipal Approaches

The County reached out to a number of other municipalities across the province, both upper and lower tier municipal governments, to see how they handle servicing allocation and subdivision approvals. One municipal planner also independently reached out to some developers to get their feedback on the current system, versus the proposed changes to the system. Feedback or cited examples were received from:

- District of Muskoka,
- Prince Edward County,
- Bruce County,
- Simcoe County,
- Wellington County,
- Norfolk County,
- Haldimand County,
- Haliburton County, and
- City of Peterborough.

Approaches varied across the Province to how servicing capacity was allocated in the subdivision and condominium approvals process. Some municipalities used an approach similar to Grey County in that servicing capacity was allocated at the time of draft approval. Other municipalities did not allocate capacity at the draft approval stage, and instead allocated either via separate by-law, or at the time of final approval and registration. The use of holding symbols through a zoning by-law amendment was also recommended where an approval may exceed current servicing capacity.

One of the questions asked by County staff was ‘how capacity was allocated when multiple developers were vying for the remaining plant capacity?’ In most cases municipalities simply responded that capacity was allocated on a ‘first come, first served’ basis, while others preferred to allocate in smaller phases to try to ensure that each developer got a piece of the remaining allocation.

One area, where other municipal approaches were more refined than Grey County’s approach, was in the limitation of indefinite servicing capacity allocation. Many municipalities had a strict ‘use it or lose it’ approach, in that servicing capacity could be repealed, or draft approvals not extended if a developer was not actively taking steps to develop their subdivision. Some municipalities also provided specific criteria for what needed to be considered prior to draft plan approval extension. The District of Muskoka’s criteria has been included below.

“In order to be granted an extension to a subdivision or condo draft approval, the applicant must meet at least 4 of the following 8 criteria:

i. The proposal is within an identified designated growth area (i.e. greenfield) in an urban centre or special policy area as outlined in The District Municipality of Muskoka and/or Area Municipal Official Plan
ii. The proposal meets the minimum density target of the Muskoka Official Plan within Urban Centre designated growth areas

iii. The proposal meets the minimum housing mix target of the Muskoka Official Plan within Urban Centre designated growth areas

iv. The proposal represents infilling, redevelopment of an underutilized property, and/or intensification within or immediately adjacent to a built-up area in an Urban Centre or Special Policy Area

v. The proposal can be serviced with municipal services in accordance with the phasing schedule/policies of the Area Municipal or Muskoka OP

vi. The proposal represents affordable housing as defined in the PPS, by CMHC [Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation], and/or through the District of Muskoka affordable housing programs

vii. The proposal will have a positive or neutral financial impact on the corporation of the District Municipality of Muskoka

viii. Substantial progress towards clearance of conditions of draft approval, including at least one of the following actions have been demonstrated since the date of draft approval or previously granted extension of draft approval:

   1. Registration and/or substantial completion of a phase of the development;
   2. Completion of a supporting study as required by the conditions of draft approval;
   3. Submission and/or acceptance of final servicing drawings;
   4. Drafting and/or execution of a municipal agreement;
   5. Zoning by-law amendment or site plan applications have been submitted and/or completed; or
   6. Clearance letter received from a municipality or agency”

The District also has restrictions on not extending draft approval beyond 10 years from the original date of approval. They further note that they may not grant a request for extension of draft approval where a treatment plant is operating at 85%, or higher, of its design capacity.

Bruce County staff also noted that a use it or lose it policy was beneficial in ensuring that older approvals met modern development standards. They noted that they were happy to work with developers to look at redline revisions to older plans of subdivisions, with the goal of; (a) incenting development in a timely fashion, and (b) promoting development that meets modern standards. Where draft approvals were ultimately revoked it has the effect of; (a) ensuring development is not sited in locations that are not suitable for development, or (b) ‘clearing the path’ for new development applications to come forward, without the ‘baggage’ of a dated approval on the lands.

County staff recommend that regardless of whether or not the County changes our approach to the timing for allocating servicing capacity, we should include criteria in the Official Plan for how and when we consider draft approval extensions. County staff recommend that this criteria could be included in the new Recolour Grey Official Plan. Currently the County only requires a letter from the developer and a letter from the municipality in support of the extension, we do not require any serious justification for why an extension should be granted.
Input from Municipal Staff across the County

County staff polled municipal staff on their recommended approaches towards servicing allocations when processing subdivision or condominium applications. The responses received were varied; from those that supported a more flexible approach including allocating capacity at a registration phase, to those that supported the status quo of allocating at the draft approval stage. There was no clear consensus on which direction the County should proceed with in this regard.

It is also important to keep in mind that circumstances vary greatly across Grey’s member municipalities, from Owen Sound and Hanover that primarily only have serviced development, to Chatsworth who does not have a municipal waste water treatment plant. Furthermore some municipalities have an abundance of servicing capacity still available within their existing plants; therefore it does not matter when capacity is allocated. Other municipalities are nearing capacity on one or both services, and are facing costly upgrades to their servicing infrastructure.

It is further worth noting here that this report generally excludes the City of Owen Sound, who as noted above, approve their own subdivisions and condominiums.

Amongst those that supported a new approach to allocating servicing capacity for subdivisions, reasoning cited was similar to some of the developer’s rationale listed above. In addition, the County heard comments about wanting to ensure that capacity could not be ‘tied up’ for indefinite periods of time by developers who were choosing not to develop, once they had their draft approvals. Municipalities also noted that having developments ‘queued up’ and ready to build, helped them to justify moving forward with costly servicing infrastructure upgrades.

For those that supported the status quo approach, the primary reason was to give certainty to developers that once they had their draft approval, they could expeditiously proceed to final approval and construction, upon meeting the conditions of draft approval. Some municipal staff raised concerns over granting draft approval, when capacity was not guaranteed, in that it could lead to unexpected development delays at a later stage (i.e. one developer used up the remaining capacity that another developer had been counting on using). In this regard they thought that the developers would want to know up front if there was to be a servicing capacity shortage, and not at the time of registration. Others noted that municipalities should plan ahead, to be sure that servicing shortages do not impact a developers’ ability to get draft approval.

Even amongst those that supported the status quo approach, there were some that thought there should be limitations on the length of time someone can ‘hold onto’ allocated capacity, and that a use it or lose it approach was fair.

Options for New Draft Plan Approvals

The recommendation in this report is only recommended to apply to new draft plan approvals after September 13, 2018. This section of the report considers only those future draft plan approvals after that date.

After reviewing other municipal approaches, as well as the feedback received from the Province and member municipalities, County staff have provided three options for consideration by County Council for new draft approvals of plans of subdivision or condominium.
Option A – Status Quo

a. Status quo – continue to draft approve plans of subdivision and condominium only when reserve servicing capacity can be allocated at the time of draft approval, or where a servicing expansion or upgrade has been approved by the Province and funding is in place to construct the expansion or upgrade. Under the status quo approach, it would be clear in the draft approval conditions that servicing capacity is being allocated through draft approval.

Staff Comments – this is the safest approach, in that it’s not only consistent with how the County has been considering draft approvals, but also consistent with the Province’s recommended approach. The downside to this approach is that it could ‘stall’ some larger development applications in municipalities that are running short on available servicing capacity.

Option B – New Approach

b. New Approach – draft approve plans of subdivision and condominium without allocating servicing capacity at the time of draft approval, and instead allocate capacity at the time of registration, or through separate by-law prior to registration, at the discretion of the municipality. Under the new approach, it would be clear in the draft approval conditions that servicing capacity is not being allocated through draft approval.

Staff Comments – this is the most liberal approach, and would allow for the most flexibility to developers across the County. The downside to this approach is that a developer could be ready to register their subdivision (or the next phase of their subdivision) and find out there is no available servicing capacity. This may lead to costly delays, or the need to request an extension of draft plan approval. This approach would not be consistent with the Province’s recommended approach to allocating capacity, and municipalities may risk exceedances of their Environmental Compliance Approvals. A final downside is that it could lead to developers pushing municipalities to support their developments before a municipality is otherwise ready to. Staff do not recommend moving forward with the new approach.

Option C – Hybrid Approach

c. Hybrid Approach – continue to draft approve plans of subdivision and condominium when reserve servicing capacity can be allocated at the time of draft approval, or if a municipality requests an alternate approach, allocate capacity at the time of registration, or through separate by-law prior to registration, at the discretion of the municipality. Under the hybrid approach, it would be clear in the draft approval conditions whether or not servicing capacity is being allocated through draft approval, or at a later date.

Staff Comments – this approach combines options (a) and (b) to let municipalities decide whether or not they wish to allocate servicing capacity at the draft approval or final registration phase. The same pros and cons as discussed above generally apply, except that it is the municipality who is in charge of when they wish to allocate their servicing capacity. In using this hybrid approach it would need to be made very clear in the draft plan conditions who has allocated capacity and who does not. New draft plan approvals could easily clarify this in the
conditions of draft approvals, similar to the recent Flato East and North draft approvals. Staff recommend moving forward with the hybrid approach.

Any change to the recommended servicing allocation approach, would not obviate the need for new subdivisions or condominiums to provide a Functional Servicing Report with their applications, which examines the water and wastewater servicing capacity for the proposed development.

Existing Draft Approvals

Servicing capacity allocated to draft plan approvals on or before September 13, 2018 will not be impacted by this report. Considering how to approach existing draft approvals will require some further thought and consultation before recommending additional options. Staff are recommending that a future report be brought forward to Committee of the Whole, after further discussions with member municipalities and the development community about existing approvals, to explore all options for these prior draft approvals.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

Throughout this report, staff have outlined pertinent planning policy and legislative requirements. Any further steps taken as a result of this report would be done in accordance with the Planning Act. County staff would take direction from municipal staff to ensure that their legislative requirements as the owners and operators of water and wastewater treatment plants are being fulfilled, including remaining compliant with Environmental Compliance Approvals.

Financial and Resource Implications

At this stage there would be no impacts on the County’s finances or staff resources. The future report and consultation will not require any additional staffing or budget resources.

Within the future recommended staff report there could be options which result in appeals to planning applications, depending on the recommendations. Should servicing allocations be withdrawn, or should draft plan approvals be revoked, it may result in a proponent needing to ‘reapply’ for a plan of subdivision or condominium. Depending on the recommendations there also could be a significant amount of planning staff time required. However, additional details, including the number of developments impacted, will be shared in the future staff report.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal: Planning Department, CAO

☒ External: Municipal staff within Grey County, Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, other Municipalities across Ontario

Appendices and Attachments
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Recommendation

1. That Addendum to Report PDR-CW-22-18 be received; and

2. That all written and oral submissions received on plan of subdivision 42T-2018-02 known as Stonebrook Phase II were considered; the effect of which helped to make an informed recommendation and decision; and

3. That in consideration of the draft plan of subdivision application 42T-2018-02, for lands described as Part of Lot 98, Concession 1, (geographic Township of Artemesia) in the Municipality of Grey Highlands, the Grey County Committee of the Whole approves this plan of subdivision to create 10 (10) blocks for the purpose of constructing a total of twenty-four (24) townhouse units, subject to the conditions set out in the Notice of Decision.

Executive Summary

The County has received a plan of subdivision application (County file number 42T-2018-02) to create 10 blocks to facilitate the construction of 24 townhouse units in the Municipality of Grey Highlands. The units will have access off of two new streets which will connect to Grayview Drive, and a new street which was created through the Stonebrook Phase I subdivision. Servicing to the proposed subdivision will be via municipal water and sewer services. Based on agency review and comments received regarding the proposed plan of subdivision, it is recommended that the proposed plan of subdivision be given draft approval subject to the conditions set out in the attached Notice of Decision.
Background and Discussion

The County has received a plan of subdivision application, known as Stonebrook Phase II, that proposes to create 10 blocks, comprised of two new streets and 24 townhouse units. The proposed subdivision is located on Part of Lot 98, Concession 1, geographic Township of Artemesia, in the Municipality of Grey Highlands. The subject lands are approximately 1.2 hectares in size and are located in the northwest end of Markdale abutting the golf course. Map 1 below shows the subject lands and surrounding area, while Map 2 shows the proposed plan of subdivision.

Map 1: Airphoto of Subject Lands

The proposed lots would front onto a series of internal roads (Streets A and B) that will have connections to Grayview Drive and Stonebrook Phase I. The proposal is to service the new lots with municipal water and sewer. Future road connections are also being provided to the neighbouring golf course lands, as well as the farm field to the northwest. The subject lands are currently vacant.

Stonebrook Phase I has been draft approved for 55 townhouse units. A link to the Phase I draft plan of subdivision has been included in the Attachments section of this report.
Map 2: Proposed Plan of Subdivision

(Map 2 Courtesy of Georgian Planning Solutions and Design Plan Services)

Surrounding the proposed development are the golf course lands, residential dwellings, and farmlands (in the settlement area) which are proposed for future development.

The proposed development also requires an amendment to the Municipality of Grey Highlands Zoning By-law.

Copies of all background reports and plans can be found at this link.
Public and Agency Comments Received

There were members of the public that made oral submissions at the public meeting that was held on June 20, 2018 in the Municipality of Grey Highlands. The minutes from the public meeting can be found at this link.

The following people made comments at the public meeting:

- Mel Chamberlain,
- Isabell Donald,
- Sylvia Donald, and
- George Donald

Comments raised at the public meeting are as follows;

- What will block 9 [now referred to as block 10] be used for?
- What is the lot sizes?
- What will the units look like?
- What is the total number of units?
- Questions about the views onto the Golf Course property and possible fencing.
- What is the price point for the units?

Agency comments were as follows:

- **Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA):** In comments dated June 19, 2018 and May 7, 2018, SVCA staff noted that the proposed plan of subdivision and proposed Zoning By-law Amendment are generally acceptable.
- **Enbridge Gas Distribution:** In comments dated June 7, 2018, Enbridge Gas Distribution noted that they do not object to the proposed application(s).
- **Historic Saugeen Metis (HSM):** In comments dated June 11, 2018, HSM noted that they have taken the time to review the recommendations and acknowledge that no further study of the area is warranted.
- **Hydro One Networks Inc.:** In comments dated June 5, 2018, Hydro One noted that they have reviewed the documents concerning the noted plan and have no comments or concerns at this time.
- **Municipality of Grey Highlands Fire and Emergency Services Department:** In comments dated June 1, 2018, Grey Highlands Fire noted that they have no concerns.
- **Municipality of Grey Highlands Planning:** In a report dated July 18, 2018, which was endorsed by Council, the Municipality recommended approval of the plan of subdivision, subject to a series of draft approval conditions.

**Analysis of Planning Issues**

Planning authorities must have regard to matters of Provincial interest under the *Planning Act* and be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) when rendering decisions on planning applications. Within Grey County they must also make decisions that conform to the County of Grey Official Plan, and in this case which also conform to the Municipality of Grey Highlands Official Plan.
The Planning Act

Section 1.1 of the Planning Act outlines the purposes of the Act. The purposes of the Act promote sustainable economic development, in a healthy natural environment, within a land use planning system, led by provincial policy and matters of provincial interest. Section 2 of the Planning Act outlines matters of provincial interest, which decision makers must consider when carrying out their responsibilities under the Act. The most relevant matters of provincial interest to this application are as follows, including staff comments for each subsection below.

(b) the protection of ecological systems, including natural areas, features and functions,

   (b) A scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed for this development, which recommended mitigation measures to ensure that the development would not negatively impact the natural environment in this area. No significant environmental features were found on-site. Although there were some threatened and endangered species findings for the broader area; no suitable habitats for these species were identified on this site.

(f) the adequate provision and efficient use of communication, transportation, sewage and water services and waste management systems,

   (f) The subject development will be serviced by municipal water and municipal sewer services. Grey Highlands has confirmed that servicing capacity is currently available to service these 24 townhouse units. The stormwater management (SWM) is proposed on a neighbouring property, similar to Stonebrook Phase I. An agreement between the adjacent landowner, the Municipality and the developer will address the ongoing management of the SWM as well as responsibilities of each of the parties. All of these items will be addressed through clauses in the Subdivision Agreement as well as through easements and easement agreements in favour of the Municipality. Draft approval conditions have been added to address SWM facilities in this regard. Having a single SWM facility service multiple developments provides for better efficiency, than a series of individually operated smaller facilities.

   The proposed road pattern of the subdivision provides access from Grayview Drive, the new street created through Stonebrook Phase I, as well as leaving connections to the neighbouring golf course lands, and the farm field to the northwest. A sidewalk is also being provided on one side of the street to facilitate pedestrians. The proposed road network is considered efficient and provides good connectivity.

(h) the orderly development of safe and healthy communities,

   (h) The subject development is within the ‘Primary Settlement Area’ designation in the County Official Plan. Within this land use designation the County Plan defers to the detailed land use policies found within the Municipality’s Official Plan. The County Plan recommends an average development density of 20 units per net hectare (or greater) for new residential development in Markdale. The proposed plan of subdivision exceeds this target residential density. This proposed development connects to Stonebrook Phase I in a manner which provides a logical extension to the residential development in this area.

(j) the adequate provision of housing, including affordable housing,
It is not known if any of the housing being proposed will fall within the affordable range for ownership. The developer’s planner has stated that ‘the final price of these units will not be known until they finish their final designs, but noted that there are no specific provisions for affordable housing within this development’.

The subject lands are located in a settlement area and have been designated for residential growth, adjacent to the golf course. The development has been proposed at a density which offers efficient residential growth, that does not conflict with neighbouring land uses (existing and proposed).

The subject plan of subdivision application, with the attached conditions of draft approval, would have regard for matters of Provincial Interest under The Planning Act.

Provincial Policy Statement

A key goal of the PPS is directing new growth to serviced settlement areas, and promoting the vitality of such settlement areas through re-development, infill and intensification. The subject lands have been designated for residential growth and are within a serviced settlement area.

Section 1.6.6.1 of the PPS outlines the servicing hierarchy to be utilized in the Province of Ontario. At the top of the hierarchy are municipal water and sewer services. The proposed development will be serviced by municipal water and sewer services. Although the Municipality is ‘running short’ on servicing capacity, until further optimization is approved, Municipal staff have noted that reserve capacity is available for this development.

Section 1.6.6.7 speaks to stormwater management. This matter has been reviewed under the Planning Act review.

Section 2.1 of the PPS speaks to the long-term protection of significant natural heritage features. This item was addressed under the Planning Act review above.

Section 2.6 of the PPS speaks to the protection of cultural and archaeological resources within the Province. A Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment was completed on this property. This Archaeological Assessment concluded; ‘no archaeological resources were encountered, and therefore no further archaeological assessment of the study area is warranted’.

Section 3.1 of the PPS directs development away from areas of natural hazard. SVCA has reviewed the proposed subdivision and is generally satisfied that the proposed development is outside of areas of natural hazard. The SVCA have provided a couple conditions to enable their review of applicable documents prior to final approval.

The proposed plan of subdivision application, with the attached conditions of draft approval, is consistent with the PPS.

County Official Plan

Many of the policies in the County Plan mimic those discussed above in the review of the Planning Act and the PPS. A further in-depth review of those same policies in the County Plan will not be repeated here.
The proposed plan of subdivision is designated as ‘Primary Settlement Area’ in the County Official Plan. The Official Plan identifies that Primary Settlement Areas shall be the focus of growth within the County. Section 2.6.3(5) of the County Plan requires an overall average development density of 20 units per net hectare within Primary Settlement Areas such as Markdale. The lot density conforms to this recommended density.

Section 5.3 of the County Plan provides a similar servicing hierarchy to that found in the PPS, which has been noted above.

Section 6.12.1 of the County Plan addresses criteria to be considered in any new plan of subdivision or condominium. Specifically section 6.12.1(a)(vi) of this section states:

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

As noted above, the subject lands will have connections to existing streets, proposed streets, leave adequate space for further future connection, and provide sidewalks. The proposed road network generally follows a modified grid pattern which is preferred.

Section 6.12.1(a)(ix) requires the consideration of street lighting that minimizes impact on dark skies. The proponent’s planner has noted that the street lighting will be directed downward and dark-sky compliant.

Section 6.12.1(a)(xi) speaks to the provision of usable parkland and green space. The applicant will be providing cash in lieu of parkland.

Section 6.12.1(b)(c) and (d) of the Plan speak to the provision of a range of housing, including affordable housing. The proposed townhouse units may offer a housing unit type which is less prevalent in Markdale, and as such would help round out the local housing supply. Townhouse units are generally suitable to those looking to enter the housing market, or those seeking to downsize before ultimately exiting the housing market.

The proposed plan of subdivision application, with the attached conditions of draft approval, conforms to the goals and objectives of the County of Grey Official Plan.

Grey Highlands Official Plan

The subject lands are designated ‘Neighbourhood Area’ in the Municipality of Grey Highlands Official Plan (GHOP). This land use designation permits residential development.

In a planning report dated July 18, 2018, by Municipal Planner Kristine Loft, a detailed policy and zoning analysis was undertaken for the Grey Highlands Official Plan and Zoning By-law. County staff would generally concur with Ms. Loft’s analysis and recommendations in that report, and will not duplicate a similar analysis here. The recommended draft approval conditions have been attached to this report.

With the attached recommended draft plan conditions, County staff are of the opinion that the proposed development:
1. has regard for matters of Provincial interest under the *Planning Act*;
2. is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement;
3. conforms to the County of Grey Official Plan; and
4. conforms to the Municipality of Grey Highlands Official Plan.

**Legal and Legislated Requirements**

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

**Financial and Resource Implications**

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

**Relevant Consultation**

- **Internal:** Planning
- **External:** The Public, Municipality of Grey Highlands, Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority and other required agencies under the *Planning Act*.

**Appendices and Attachments**

*Stonebrook Phase I Draft Plan of Subdivision*

*Draft Notice of Decision (conditions of draft approval) - attached*
NOTICE OF DECISION
On Application for Approval of Draft Plan of Subdivision
under Subsection 51(16) of the Planning Act

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

PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE FILE
All written and oral submissions received on the application were considered; the effect of which helped to make an informed recommendation and decision.

WHEN AND HOW TO FILE A NOTICE OF APPEAL
Notice to appeal the decision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal must be filed with the County of Grey no later than 20 days from the date of this notice, as shown above. The notice of appeal should be sent to the attention of the Director of Planning and Development of the County, at the address shown below and it must,
(1) set out the reasons for the appeal,
(2) be accompanied by the fee required by the Tribunal as prescribed under the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act, and
(3) include the completed appeal forms from the Tribunal’s website.

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

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

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

HOW TO RECEIVE NOTICE OF CHANGED CONDITIONS
The conditions of an approval of draft plan of subdivision may be changed at any time before the final approval is given.

You will be entitled to receive notice of any changes to the conditions of the approval of draft plan of subdivision if you have made a written request to be notified of changes to the conditions.
GETTING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Additional information about the application is available for public inspection during regular office hours in the Planning & Development Office at the address noted below or by calling 519-376-2205 or 1-800-567-GREY.

ADDRESS FOR NOTICE OF APPEAL
County of Grey
595-9th Avenue East
OWEN SOUND, Ontario N4K 3E3
Attention: Mr. Randy Scherzer, MCIP RPP
Director of Planning & Development
Plan of Subdivision File No. 42T-2018-02 has been granted draft approval. The County’s conditions of final approval for registration of this draft plan of subdivision are as follows:

1. That this approval applies to the draft Plan of Subdivision as prepared by Design Plan Services (16142-21) dated December 20, 2017 [date may change with new plan from Krystin], showing a total of five residential blocks (Blocks 1 to 5) for twenty four (24) townhouse units, four reserve blocks (Blocks 6 to 9), one future development block (Block 10) and two future road allowances (Street A & B) on Part of Lot 98, Concession 1; PTS 1-7 16R10935 geographic Township of Artemesia, Municipality of Grey Highlands, County of Grey.

2. That Blocks 6 to 9 be deeded to the Municipality of Grey Highlands as Residential Reserve and 0.3 metre blocks.

3. That the road allowance included in this draft plan shall be shown and dedicated to the Municipality of Grey Highlands as public highways.

4. That the proposed roads be named to the satisfaction of the Municipality of Grey Highlands. The road allowance shall be deeded to the Municipality.

5. That the Owner shall convey 5% of the land and/or cash in lieu for parkland dedication purposes to the Municipality for parkland and/or trail purposes to the satisfaction of the Municipality in pursuant to the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O 1990 as amended.

6. That prior to final approval by the County, the County is to be advised by the Municipality that the proposed subdivision is zoned appropriately by a zoning by-law amendment that has come into effect in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act.

7. That prior to final approval, a suitable Subdivision Agreement be entered into between the owner and the Municipality of Grey Highlands. The agreement shall contain matters set out as Conditions of Approval as deemed necessary in this Decision and other matters as deemed appropriate by the Municipality to satisfy all the requirements, financial and otherwise, of the Municipality with regard to the provision of services, landscaping, stormwater management, fencing and payment of all applicable Municipal and County development charges in accordance with their applicable by-laws. The Subdivision Agreement shall be registered against the lands to which it applies prior to registration of the plan of subdivision and shall be completed at the owner’s expense. An executed copy of the Subdivision Agreement shall be provided to the County of Grey prior to final approval being given.

8. That the Subdivision Agreement contain clauses satisfactory to the Municipality and the County recognizing that should human remains or other cultural heritage materials or features be discovered on site that the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act be adhered to.
9. That prior to final approval, that all easements and or agreements for drainage over the adjacent lands owned by the Markdale Country Club be obtained and registered on title, that all associated costs be at the Owner’s expense and completed to the satisfaction of the Municipality and the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority. The easements and or agreements will allow the Developers to initially construct the drainage works and will allow the Municipality to access and maintain the drainage works, including the stormwater management pond.

10. That all easements and or agreements for drainage, gas line or utility purposes shall be dedicated to the appropriate authority or public authority. Should the relocation of any utilities be required as a result of this development, that all associated costs be at the Owner’s expense.

11. That prior to final approval, the Owner shall complete a Final Landscaping Plan identifying two trees per unit, where possible, to be provided to the satisfaction of the Municipality. The Landscape Plan shall be consistent with the Grading and Drainage Plans. The Landscape Plan shall include, among other matters, two trees per unit to be provided where possible and storm water management planting.

12. That prior to any construction or grading on the subject property, and/or prior to final approval of the subdivision by the County, the Owner or its agent shall prepare studies/reports, completed to the satisfaction of the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority, the County of Grey, and to the Municipality of Grey Highlands:

   a) Scoped Environmental Impact Study;
   b) Final Stormwater Management Report;
   c) Final Lot Grading and Drainage Plan;
   d) Sediment and Erosion Control Plan;
   e) Landscaping/Naturalization Plan; and
   f) Final Site Servicing Plan including Road Design.


14. That prior to final approval, the Subdivision Agreement shall include appropriate wording acceptable to the Municipality and Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority to require that, prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed site plan shall be prepared for each lot showing the location of all buildings and structures to be erected, all final grades, the means whereby the storm drainage will be accommodated, and the means whereby erosion and silt transport will be contained and minimized.
15. The Owner agrees to establish Architectural Guidelines and Site Plan Guidelines to the satisfaction of the Municipality of Grey Highlands. The Guidelines shall be incorporated in the Subdivision Agreement and shall be to the satisfaction of the Municipality. The Guidelines shall address, but not be limited to, building and servicing locations, building design and materials, tree preservation and landscaping for the development, or the built form within the subdivision.

16. That the Owner shall complete to the satisfaction of Canada Post the following:
   a) The owner/developer will consult with Canada Post to determine suitable permanent locations for the placement of Community Mailboxes and to indicate these locations on appropriate servicing plans.
   b) The Builder/Owner/Developer will confirm to Canada Post that the final secured permanent locations for the Community Mailboxes will not be in conflict with any other utility; including hydro transformers, bell pedestals, cable pedestals, flush to grade communication vaults, landscaping enhancements (tree planting) and bus pads.
   c) The owner/developer will install concrete pads at each of the Community Mailbox locations as well as any required walkways across the boulevard and any required curb depressions for wheelchair access as per Canada Post’s concrete pad specification drawings.
   d) The owner/developer will agree to prepare and maintain an area of compacted gravel to Canada Post’s specifications to serve as a temporary Community Mailbox location. This location will be in a safe area away from construction activity in order that Community Mailboxes may be installed to service addresses that have occupied prior to the pouring of the permanent mailbox pads. This area will be required to be prepared a minimum of 30 days prior to the date of first occupancy.
   e) The owner/developer will communicate to Canada Post the excavation date for the first foundation (or first phase) as well as the expected date of first occupancy.
   f) The owner/developer agrees, prior to offering any of the residential units for sale, to place a “Display Map” on the wall of the sales office in a place readily available to the public which indicates the location of all Canada Post Community Mailbox site locations, as approved by Canada Post and the City of Owen Sound.
   g) The owner/developer agrees to include in all offers of purchase and sale a statement, which advises the prospective new home purchaser that mail delivery will be from a designated Community Mailbox, and to include the exact locations (list of lot #s) of each of these Community Mailbox locations; and further, advise any affected homeowners of any established easements granted to Canada Post.
h) The owner/developer will be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Community Mailbox locations prior to the closing of any home sales with specific clauses in the purchase offer, on which the homeowners do a sign off.

i) The owner/developer of any condominiums will be required to provide signature for a License to Occupy Land agreement and provide winter snow clearance at the Community Mailbox locations.

j) Enhanced Community Mailbox Sites with roof structures will require additional documentation as per Canada Post Policy.

17. That consistent with the County of Grey’s current provisions for processing and approving plans of subdivision the Owner’s surveyor shall agree to provide to the County a digitized disk of this final plan to be registered in a computerized format which is acceptable to the County of Grey.

18. If final approval is not given to this plan within three years of the draft approval date, and no extensions have been granted, draft approval shall lapse under Subsection 51(32) of the Planning Act, RSO 1990, as amended. If the owner wishes to request an extension to draft approval, a written explanation together with the applicable application fee and a resolution from the Municipality of Grey Highlands must be received by the County of Grey Director of Planning, prior to the lapsing date. Please note that an updated review of the Plan and revisions to the conditions of approval may be necessary if an extension is to be granted.

19. That prior to final approval being given, the County of Grey is advised in writing by the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority how Conditions 9, 12, 13 and 14 have been satisfied.

20. That prior to final approval being given, the County of Grey and Municipality of Grey Highlands are advised in writing by Canada Post how Condition 16 has been satisfied.

21. That prior to final approval being given, the County of Grey is advised in writing by the Municipality of Grey Highlands how Conditions 2 to 20 have been satisfied.

22. That the Owner have prepared by an Ontario Land Surveyor a final plan in accordance with the Surveys Act, and with the Registry Act or the Land Titles Act, as the case may be and have provided that plan to the County of Grey prior to the lapsing date the mylars and white prints necessary for final approvals and registration.

23. That the Owner remit to the County the applicable final approval fee when the final plan is being presented to the County for the County’s consideration for final approval.

NOTES TO DRAFT APPROVAL

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

3. Clearances are required from the following:
   - Municipality of Grey Highlands, 206 Toronto Street North, P.O. Box 409, Markdale, ON, N0C 1H0
   - Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority, 1078 Bruce Road 12, Box 150, Formosa, ON, N0G 1W0
   - Canada Post, 955 Highbury Avenue, London, ON, N5Y 1A3

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

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

5. All measurements in subdivision final plans must be presented in metric units.

6. That the applicant contact Canada Post at the address below for the supply and installation of Community Mailboxes (CMB). The location of these CMB’s will require the approval of the Municipality of Grey Highlands.

   Delivery Planning Officer, Canada Post Corporation, 955 Highbury Ave, London, Ontario, N5Y 1A3

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

| To: | Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council |
| Committee Date: | September 13, 2018 |
| Subject / Report No: | PDR-CW-29-18 Information Report |
| Title: | Stonebrook Phase III Plan of Subdivision 42T-2018-07 |
| Prepared by: | Scott Taylor |
| Reviewed by: | Randy Scherzer |
| Lower Tier(s) Affected: | Municipality of Grey Highlands |
| Status: | |

**Recommendation**

1. That Report PDR-CW-29-18 regarding an overview of proposed plan of subdivision application 42T-2018-07, consisting of fifty-four (54) townhouse units on lands described as Part of Lots 98 and 99, Concession 1 NETSR, Part 1 of 17R181 (geographic Village of Markdale) in the Municipality of Grey Highlands, be received for information.

**Executive Summary**

The County has received a plan of subdivision application known as Stonebrook Phase III (County file number 42T-2018-07) to create 54 new townhouse units on eight blocks within the settlement area of Markdale. The units will connect to a new street joining Margaret Elizabeth Avenue to Grayview Drive. 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 and a consent application to the Municipality of Grey Highlands. The applications and supporting studies will be circulated to prescribed agencies and the public for review and comment. A future public meeting will be held for the subject applications. 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, known as Stonebrook Phase III, that proposes to create eight blocks, with 54 townhouse units on a new street. The proposed subdivision is located on Part of Lots 98 and 99, Concession 1 NETSR, Part 1 of 17R181 (geographic Village of Markdale) in the Municipality of Grey Highlands. The subject lands are approximately 2.75 hectares in size. These lands are located in the northwest end of Markdale.
abutting existing residential development, including some County owned housing units, the police station, and across Grayview Drive from the golf course. Map 1 below shows the subject lands and surrounding area, while Map 2 shows the proposed plan of subdivision.

Map 1: Airphoto of Subject Lands

The proposed lots would front onto a new street connecting Margaret Elizabeth Avenue to Grayview Drive. The proposal is to service the new lots with municipal water and sewer. The subject lands are currently vacant.

Stonebrook Phase I is draft approved for 55 units, and Phase II is being recommended for draft approval of 24 units on September 13, 2018. The Phase I and II lands are located to the northwest of the proposed Phase III lands.
The proposed development also requires an amendment to the Municipality of Grey Highlands Zoning By-law and a consent application.

Pre-submission consultation between the proponent, the Municipality of Grey Highlands and the County identified the submission requirements for the proposed plan of subdivision. 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 Grey Highlands Official Plan have jurisdiction over the subject property. There are no Provincial Plans in place for this section of Grey Highlands.

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. Municipal water
capacity is currently available for the proposed units. Municipal wastewater treatment capacity is currently in ‘short supply’ and there are other developments in the application process that are also vying for this same capacity. The Municipality has undertaken an optimization program of their wastewater treatment that should provide the required capacity. A decision from the Ministry of the Environment Conservation and Parks on the wastewater treatment optimization is expected to come very soon. The Functional Servicing Report has noted that the development may not proceed until the increased capacity has been approved through the wastewater treatment optimization.

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 townhouse units in clusters of 6 and 8 units apiece.

Other policies in the PPS speak to connected, walkable communities, with provisions for public parkland and open space. The proposed subdivision will provide connections to adjacent roads (Grayview Drive and Margaret Elizabeth Avenue). Sidewalks are being proposed in this subdivision. Parkland has not been proposed at this time, as the developer intends to instead offer cash-in-lieu of parkland.

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 on lands designated as ‘Primary Settlement Area’ in the County Official Plan. 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 detailed Municipal Official Plan policies and development standards.

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, transportation, and stormwater management. Similar to Phases I and II, Phase III is proposing to convey stormwater onto off-site lands, where a combined management system is being proposed. County Official Plan policies will be further assessed following agency review and the public process.

**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 Housing

External: The public, Municipality of Grey Highlands, and required agencies under the Planning Act.

Appendices and Attachments
None
Recommendation

1. That Report PDR-CW-30-18 be received; and

2. That in consideration of the request to combine two draft plans of condominium known as 42-CDM-2013-01 (Delphi Court) and 42-CDM-2007-15 (Neighbourhoods at Delphi Point) on lands described as Part of Lot 26, Concession 5 and 6, Parts 5 to 10, Plan 16R-9532 and Block 7, RP 16M-37, geographic Township of Collingwood, in the Town of The Blue Mountains, the Grey County Committee of the Whole approves this redline revision by adding the draft approved units from draft approved plan of condominium 42-CDM-2013-01 to 42-CDM-2007-15 resulting in a revised draft plan of condominium consisting of a total of 149 vacant land condominium units (57 single detached units, 2 semi-detached units, and 90 townhouse units), subject to the conditions set out in the Notice of Decision.

Executive Summary

A request has been received by the owner of properties that contain two draft plans of condominium to combine the two draft plans into one. There are no other revisions being requested to the draft plans. The draft plans of condominium are known as 42-CDM-2013-01 (Delphi Court) and 42-CDM-2007-15 (Neighbourhoods at Delphi Point) on lands described as Part of Lot 26, Concession 5 and 6, Parts 5 to 10, Plan 16R-9532 and Block 7, RP 16M-37, geographic Township of Collingwood, in the Town of The Blue Mountains. Comments have been received from the Town and other agencies and there are no objections to combining the two draft plans. It is recommended that the redline revision be approved subject to the conditions set out in the attached Notice of Decision which would add the draft approved units from Delphi Court to the Neighbourhoods at Delphi Point plan resulting in a total of 149 vacant land condominium units (57 single detached units, 2 semi-detached...
Background and Discussion

A request has been received from the owner of properties that contain two draft plan of condominiums to combine them into one draft plan of condominium. No other changes to the two draft plans are being requested. The two draft plans of condominium are known as Delphi Court (42-CDM-2013-01) and Neighbourhoods at Delphi Point (42-CDM-2007-15). The Delphi Court Condominium was draft approved by the County on October 15, 2013 which contains a total of 11 vacant land condominium lots, two of which contain two single detached units, two lots will contain semi-detached units, and seven lots will contain townhouse units on approximately 0.44 hectares of land. The Neighbourhoods at Delphi Point (42-CDM-2007-15) was draft approved by the County in March 2008 with the latest redline revisions to this plan being draft approved on November 13, 2014. The current draft approved plan for Neighbourhoods at Delphi Point consists of a total of 138 vacant land condominium units (55 single detached units and 83 townhouse units). The combined draft plans would be referred to as Villages at Peaks Bay and would consist of a total of 149 vacant land condominium units (57 single detached units, 2 semi-detached units, and 90 townhouse units) – see Figure 1 below.

The lands are described as Part of Lot 26, Concession 5 and 6, Parts 5 to 10, Plan 16R-9532 and Block 7, RP 16M-37, geographic Township of Collingwood, in the Town of The Blue Mountains. The subject lands are located north of Highway 26. The Georgian Peaks Ski Club is south of the subject lands across Highway 26 (see Figure 2 below).

The Agent for the Applicant notes that the following reasons for requesting that the two draft approved plans be merged:

- both plans are under the same ownership
- both plans have been marketed under the same project name
- both plans are subject to the same pre-servicing agreement with the Town
- both plans are being serviced under one contract,
- both will be subject to the same subdivision development agreement, and
- the developer would also prefer that the developments be implemented under one condominium plan and one condominium corporation.
Comments Received

The following are comments received regarding the proposed combining of the two draft plans:

Town of The Blue Mountains – no concerns.

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority – no objections.

Niagara Escarpment Commission – no objections.
Analysis of Planning Issues

Planning decisions in Ontario must have regard for matters of Provincial Interest under the *Planning Act*, be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2014, and conform to the goals and objectives of any official plans governing the lands. In this case the Niagara Escarpment Plan, the County of Grey Official Plan and the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan are all applicable to the subject lands.

Planning Analysis was previously provided as part of the reports for the original draft plan or revisions to the draft approved plans. Below are links to the latest staff reports regarding these two draft approved plans:

Based on agency review and comments received regarding the proposed combining of the two draft plans of condominium, it is recommended that the draft plans be combined by revising draft plan of condominium 42-CDM-2007-15 by adding the draft approved units from Delphi Court 42-CDM-2013-01 to 42-CDM-2007-15, subject to the combined conditions set out in the attached Notice of Decision.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

The redline revision has been processed in accordance with the Planning Act.

Financial and Resource Implications

There are no anticipated financial, staffing or legal considerations associated with the proposed redline revision. The County has collected the requisite fee.

Relevant Consultation

X Internal (Planning)

X External (Town of The Blue Mountains, Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, Niagara Escarpment Commission and other prescribed agencies)

Appendices and Attachments

Notice of Decision including Revised Draft Plan Conditions
Applicant: Villages at Peaks Bay (formerly known as Delphi Court 42-CDM-2013-01 and Neighbourhoods at Delphi Point)  
File No.: 42-CDM-2007-15 Revised  
Municipality: Town of The Blue Mountains  
Location: Part of Lot 26, Concessions 5 and 6, Parts 5 to 10, Plan 16R-9532 and Block 7, RP 16M-37, (geographic Township of Collingwood), Town of The Blue Mountains  
Date of Decision:  
Date of Notice:  
Last Date of Appeal:

NOTICE OF DECISION
On Application for Approval of Draft Plan of Subdivision under Subsection 51(45) of the Planning Act

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

PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE FILE
All written and oral submissions received on the application were considered; the effect of which helped to make an informed recommendation and decision.

WHEN AND HOW TO FILE A NOTICE OF APPEAL
Notice to appeal the decision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal must be filed with the County of Grey no later than 20 days from the date of this notice, as shown above. The notice of appeal should be sent to the attention of the Director of Planning and Development of the County, at the address shown below and it must,

(1) set out the reasons for the appeal,
(2) be accompanied by the fee required by the Tribunal as prescribed under the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act, and
(3) Include the completed appeal forms from the Tribunal’s website.

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

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

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

HOW TO RECEIVE NOTICE OF CHANGED CONDITIONS
The conditions of an approval of draft plan of subdivision may be changed at any time before the final approval is given.

PDR-CW-30-18 97 Date: September 13, 2018
Applicant: Villages at Peaks Bay (formerly known as Delphi Court)  
42-CDM-2013-01 and Neighbourhoods at Delphi Point)  
Municipality: Town of The Blue Mountains  
Location: Part of Lot 26, Concessions 5 and 6, Parts 5 to 10, Plan 16R-9532 and Block 7, RP 16M-37, (geographic Township of Collingwood), Town of The Blue Mountains  
Date of Decision:  
Date of Notice:  
Last Date of Appeal:  

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

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

ADDRESS FOR NOTICE OF APPEAL
County of Grey  
595-9th Avenue East  
OWEN SOUND, Ontario N4K 3E3  
Attention: Mr. Randy Scherzer, MCIP RPP  
Director of Planning & Development
Plan of Condominium 42-CDM-2007-15 is hereby revised by adding in the draft approved condominium units from 42-CDM-2013-01 (Delphi Court). The County’s conditions of final approval for registration of this revised draft plan of condominium are as follows:

1. That the draft approval given to 42-CDM-2013-01 on October 15, 2013 be rescinded and replaced with the following conditions of draft approval. In addition, the draft approval given on March 15, 2008 and later revised on May 19, 2009, October 15, 2013 and November 13, 2014 for draft plan of condominium 42-CDM-2007-15 are also rescinded and replaced with the following conditions of draft approval.

2. That this approval applies to the revised draft Plan of Condominium File No. 42-CDM-2007-15 which adds the draft approved units from draft Plan of Condominium 42-CDM-2013-01 as shown on the revised plan prepared by Zubek, Emo, Patten & Thomsen Limited dated June 2018 showing a total of one hundred and forty nine (149) residential units consisting of fifty seven (57) single detached units, two (2) semi-detached units and ninety (90) townhouse units, five road allowances shown as Streets “B”, “C”, “D” and “E” and one roadway block to provide access to the units within Delphi Court, on lands described as Part of Lot 26, Concessions 5 and 6, Parts 5 to 10, Plan 16R-9532 and Block 7, RP 16M-37, (geographic Township of Collingwood) in the Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey.

3. That this condominium plan be approved as a Vacant Land Condominium Corporation in accordance with the provisions of the Condominium Act, S.O. 1998.

4. That the common element condominium roads be named to the satisfaction of the Town of The Blue Mountains.

5. In addition to the Conditions of this decision, that Conditions 2, 3, 7, 8 and 11 of draft plan approval listed within Attachment 2, Schedule E-5 affixed to Ontario Municipal Board Decision/Order 2282 issued August 15, 2007 be met prior to final approval of this draft plan. A copy of the OMB Decision/Order has been linked above/attached to this Decision.

6. That the site be fully serviced with municipal water and sewers to the satisfaction of the Town. Development shall be subject to suitable arrangements for the extension of municipal water and sewer services and the availability of adequate water and sewage allocations in accordance with the servicing provisions of the Official Plan and Minutes of Settlement.

7. That the applicant enters into a development agreement and/or condominium agreement with the Town of The Blue Mountains. The agreement shall satisfy all financial, legal and engineering matters, including landscaping and the installation of municipal services, and other requirements of the Town of The Blue Mountains and the County of Grey including the payment of all applicable Town and County development charges in accordance with their applicable
Development Charges By-law.

8. That prior to final approval, a copy of the fully executed Agreement referenced in Condition 7 between the applicant and the Town of The Blue Mountains shall be provided to the County of Grey.

9. The applicant shall support an appropriate amendment to the Zoning By-law to permit the development of these lands in accordance with the Draft Plan of Condominium including the use of the holding ‘-h’ provision under the Planning Act.

10. Prior to registration, the Zoning By-law implementing the subject plan shall be approved under Section 34 and 36 of the Planning Act.

Servicing, Grading and Road Requirements

11. Prior to the initiation of any site grading or servicing and prior to the registration of the plan, submit for the approval of the Town Engineer, Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, and the Ministry of Transportation the following:

   a. A detailed engineering and drainage report which describes the stormwater drainage system for the proposed development on the subject lands. The report should include:

      i. Plans illustrating how the drainage system will tie into the drainage of surrounding properties;

      ii. The stormwater management techniques which may be required to control minor or major flows;

      iii. How external flows will be accommodated and the design capacity of the receiving system;

      iv. Location and description of all outlets and other facilities which may require permits; and,

      v. Proposed methods for controlling or minimizing erosion and siltation on-site and/or in downstream areas during and after construction.

   It is recommended that the developer or the developer’s consultant contact the Town Engineering and Public Works Department and the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority prior to preparing the above report to clarify the specific requirements of this development.

   b. Overall grading plans for the subject lands
c. Agree in the subdivision agreement, in wording acceptable to the Town of The Blue Mountains and the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority:
   i. To carry out, or cause to be carried out, all the works referred to in condition 11(a) above;
   ii. To obtain the necessary permits from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority; and,
   iii. Prior to the initiation of any grading or construction on the site, to erect any silt fence as referred to in condition 11(a)(v) above.

12. Prior to the registration of the Plan, arrangements shall be made to the satisfaction of the Town for any relocation of utilities required by the development of the subject lands, to be undertaken at the developers’ expense.

13. Stormwater overland flow routes shall be kept within roads or approved walkways only.

14. Prior to the initiation of any site grading or servicing and prior to registration of this plan, submit for the approval of the Town Engineer a detailed soils investigation of the site prepared by a qualified geotechnical engineer. A copy of this report shall also be submitted to the Town’s Chief Building Official.

15. Prior to the initiation of any site grading or servicing and prior to the registration of this plan, submit to the Town:
   a. A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment;
   b. A Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment if required as a result of the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment;
   c. A decommissioning report if contaminated material has been identified and is removed, or alternatively, a copy of the risk assessment together with a copy of the written acknowledgement of its acceptance by the Ministry of the Environment; and,
   d. A copy of a Record of Site Condition and confirmation of the filing of the Record of Site Condition in the Environmental Site Registry.

16. Prior to the initiation of any site grading or servicing, the applicant shall provide a report identifying all existing water wells and private sewage disposal systems on the lands. The applicant shall provide verification to the satisfaction of the Town that all wells and septic systems identified have been decommissioned in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

17. The horizontal and vertical alignments of all roads and underground services including their intersection geometrics shall be designed to the Town of The Blue Mountains Engineering
Standards. In this regard, minor revisions to the road pattern and intersection alignments may be required.

18. Prior to the approval of any engineering drawings, arrangements shall be made to the satisfaction of the Town for a suitable construction traffic route.

Park and Open Space Requirements

19. A 10.0 metre block adjacent to Highway 26 save and except for lands required for sight triangle purposes for the Ministry of Transportation shall be conveyed to the Town for open space and trail purposes at no cost to the Town. In this regard, the applicant shall also agree that this 10.0 metre open space block shall not be credited as parkland for the purpose of determining the parkland requirements for the subject plan.

20. The noise wall is to be located off the 10.0 metre open space block and onto private lands.

21. The applicant shall pay cash-in-lieu for parkland required in accordance with the Planning Act.

Landscape, Fencing and Streetscape Requirements

22. Prior to the registration of the Plan, the applicant shall complete a Landscape Analysis and Landscape Plan to the satisfaction of the Town and the Niagara Escarpment Commission and that this plan be incorporated in the Development Agreement. The applicant shall be required to save, replant and/or remove trees and vegetation as required by the above noted Plan.

23. A planting enhancement be provided within the 10.0 metre open space block to adequately screen the proposed noise wall from public view.

Miscellaneous Requirements

24. The applicant shall grant all necessary easements for drainage, utility and servicing purposes, as may be required, to the appropriate agency or public authority.

25. The applicant shall obtain any necessary permits from the Ministry of Transportation prior to the initiation of any site grading or servicing.

26. The applicant shall make satisfactory arrangements with Canada Post and the Town’s Engineering and Public Works department, for the installation of Canada Post Community Mailboxes and shall indicate these locations on the appropriate servicing plans. The applicant shall further provide the following for the Community Mailboxes:

   a. An appropriately sized sidewalk section (concrete pad), per Canada Post standards, to place the mailbox on, plus any required walkway access and/or curb depressions for wheelchair access; and,
b. A suitable temporary Community Mailbox location which may be utilized by Canada Post until the curbs, sidewalks and final grading have been completed at the permanent Community Mailbox Site locations to enable Canada Post to provide mail service to new residences as soon as homes are occupied.

27. That prior to final approval being given that confirmation is received by the County that public road access to the subject property is available.

28. Prior to the signing of the final plan by the County of Grey, the Town is to be advised that all Draft Plan conditions have been carried out to the Town’s satisfaction.

29. That prior to final approval the County is advised in writing from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority how Condition 11 has been satisfied.

30. That prior to final approval the County of Grey is advised in writing from the Ministry of Transportation how Conditions 11, 19 and 25 have been satisfied.

31. That prior to final approval being given, that the County is advised in writing by Canada Post Corporation how Condition 26 has been satisfied.

32. The prior to final approval the County of Grey is advised in writing from the Niagara Escarpment Commission how Condition 22 has been satisfied.

33. That prior to final approval the County of Grey is advised in writing from the Town of The Blue Mountains how Conditions 2 to 28 have been satisfied.

34. If final approval is not given to this plan within the original three years of the draft approval date, and no extensions have been granted, draft approval shall lapse under Subsection 51(32) of the Planning Act, RSO 1990, as amended. If the owner wishes to request an extension to draft approval, a written explanation together with the applicable application fee and a resolution from the local municipality must be received by the County of Grey Director of Planning, prior to the lapsing date. Please note that an updated review of the Plan and revisions to the conditions of approval may be necessary if an extension is to be granted.

35. That the owner, submit to the County of Grey with a computer disk containing a digitised copy of the Final Plan in a format acceptable to the County of Grey.

NOTES TO DRAFT APPROVAL

1. It is the applicant’s responsibility to fulfil the conditions of draft approval and to ensure that the required clearance letters are forwarded by the appropriate agencies to the County of Grey, quoting the County file number 42-CDM-2007-15.
2. An electrical distribution line operating at below 50,000 volts might be located within the area affected by this development or abutting this development. Section 186 - Proximity - of the Regulations for Construction Projects in the Occupational Health and Safety Act, requires that no object be brought closer than 3 metres (10 feet) to the energized conductor. It is proponent’s responsibility to be aware, and to make all personnel on site aware, that all equipment and personnel must come no closer than the distance specified in the Act. They should also be aware that the electrical conductors can raise and lower without warning, depending on the electrical demand placed on the line. Warning signs should be posted on the wood poles supporting the conductors stating “DANGER - Overhead Electrical Wires” in all locations where personnel and construction vehicles might come in close proximity to the conductors.

3. Clearances are required from the following:

   - Town of The Blue Mountains
   - 32 Mill Street
   - Thornbury Ontario, N0H 2P0
   - Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
   - 237897 Inglis Falls Road, RR#4
   - Owen Sound, Ontario, N4K 5N6

   - Niagara Escarpment Commission
   - 99 King Street East
   - Thornbury Ontario, N0H 2P0
   - Ministry of Transportation
   - Engineering Office
   - 659 Exeter Road
   - London, Ontario, N6E 1L3

   - Canada Post Corporation
   - Delivery Planning Officer
   - 955 Highbury Avenue
   - London Ontario, N5Y 1A3

4. It is suggested you make yourself aware of the following subsections of the Land Titles Act:

   a) subsection 144(1) requires all new plans to be registered in a Land Titles system if the land is situated in a land titles division; and

   b) subsection 144(2) allows certain exceptions.

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

5. It is suggested that the municipality register the subdivision agreement as provided by subsection 51(26) of the Planning Act against the land to which it applies, as notice to prospective purchasers.
6. Portions of the subject lands are affected by Ontario Regulation 151/06: Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alteration to Shorelines and Watercourses regulation. As such permits are required from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority prior to site alterations and/or construction within the affected area.

7. All measurements in subdivision final plans must be presented in metric units.

8. The final plan approved by the County must be registered within thirty (30) days or the County may withdraw its approval under subsection 51(59) of the Planning Act RSO 1990, as amended.

9. That permits are required from the Ministry of Transportation Ontario before any grading/construction commences. The owner should contact Corridor Management Officer, Corridor Management Section – Owen Sound (1450 Seventh Avenue, Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 2Z1 – Phone: 519 372-4045) to discuss MTO’s permit requirements and obtain the necessary applications.

10. The owner is to be advised that no further MTO permits will be made available until the terms of the indemnification agreement between MTO and The Neighbourhoods at Delphi Point Inc. signed and dated January 25, 2013 are satisfied.

11. Under the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act, Ministry of Transportation permits are required for all grading/construction located within 800 metres of the Highway 26 property limit. The Ministry of Transportation will require that all new residential structures be setback a minimum of 8.0 metres from the Highway 26 property limit. The Ministry of Transportation will require that all new commercial buildings and structure, both above and below ground, including stormwater management ponds/facilities, be setback a minimum of 14.0 metres from the Highway 26 property limit.
Committee Report

To: Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council
Committee Date: August 30, 2018
Subject / Report No: County Official Plan Amendment 42-07-10-480-OPA-143 / Report PDR-CW-31-18
Title: Meaford Winery Official Plan Amendment Merit Report
Prepared by: Stephanie Lacey-Avon
Reviewed by: Randy Scherzer and Scott Taylor
Lower Tier(s) Affected: Municipality of Meaford
Status: Recommendation

1. That Report PDR-CW-31-18 regarding a proposed County Official Plan Amendment be received; and

2. That the proposal proceeds to a Public Meeting to consider an amendment to the County of Grey Official Plan on lands designated ‘Rural’ and ‘Hazard Lands’, to consider exceptions to the small scale commercial and industrial use definition to allow for a larger winery facility that includes agricultural related uses and on-farm diversified uses, for the lands described as 357038 The Blue Mountains-Meaford Townline (Concession 1, Part Lot 1 & Part Lot 2, 16R-7631, Part 1 and 16R-8386 Part 1), Municipality of Meaford, geographic Township of St. Vincent provided the Municipality is prepared to hold a joint public meeting in consideration of the necessary local amendment requirements.

Executive Summary

A proposed County official plan amendment application (42-07-10-480-OPA-143) has been submitted by the owners located at 357038 The Blue Mountains-Meaford Townline (Concession 1, Part Lot 1 & Part Lot 2, 16R-7631, Part 1 and 16R-8386 Part 1), Municipality of Meaford, geographic Township of St. Vincent, to amend the Rural permitted use policies to allow for a winery, that includes agricultural related uses and on-farm diversified uses which exceed the size limitations for small scale commercial or industrial uses. The agricultural use (growing of grapes) of this operation is permitted as of right. The agricultural related uses (production and storage of wine) and on-farm diversified uses (restaurant, kitchen, and hospitality area) proposed exceed the current size parameters outlined under section 6.19 (definitions) of the Grey County OP. A development of this nature aims to support agri-tourism, and the local food
production and agri-product businesses. This amendment application would also involve applications to the Municipality of Meaford for a municipal official plan amendment, and zoning by-law amendment.

Background and Discussion

The County has received an application from the property owners located at 357038 The Blue Mountains-Meaford Townline (Concession 1, Part Lot 1 & Part Lot 2, 16R-7631, Part 1 and 16R-8386 Part 1), Municipality of Meaford, geographic Township of St. Vincent to amend the Grey County Official Plan. The amendment would allow an exemption from ‘Rural’ permitted use policy 2.3.2(1) to permit a winery that includes an agricultural related and on-farm diversified use component which exceeds the size limitations for small scale commercial or industrial uses. An amendment would also be needed for Section 6.19 (definitions), small scale, of the County Official Plan.

The subject lands are 60.6 hectares in size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Total Square Feet</th>
<th>Total Square Metres m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Uses</td>
<td>6,600 ft²</td>
<td>613 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Related Uses</td>
<td>12,000 ft²</td>
<td>1,114 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-farm Diversified Uses</td>
<td>6,400 ft²</td>
<td>594 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Square Feet</td>
<td>25,000 ft²</td>
<td>2,322 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 6,400 sq. ft. (594 m²) for the on-farm diversified uses and 12,000 ft² (1,114 m²) for the agricultural related uses are needed for the proposed winery facility. In accordance to the small scale definition under policy 6.19, 8,072 ft² (750 m²) is permitted as of right. An additional 10,328 ft² (959 m²) of commercial space is requested by the applicant.

The proposed development also requires an amendment to the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan and a zoning by-law amendment.

The winery buildings, and area associated with the buildings (parking, septic area, landscape area) is approximately 0.48 ha of the property, or 0.08% of the total area of the subject lands.

Map 1 below shows the subject lands and surrounding area.
Map 1: Airphoto of the Subject Lands

The surrounding lands appear to be predominantly used for agricultural operations, with the exception of some non-farm residential lots. Two identified streams run through the middle and southwesterly portion of the subject property. There are identified woodlands and karst on the westerly portion of the subject lands.

Krystin Rennie, a land use planning consultant has submitted a Planning Justification Report in support of the proposal. The applicant did engage the Municipality, County, and Grey Sauble Conservation Authority in pre-submission consultation. A list of reports and studies were requested at this time and the following were included as part of the application submission: a servicing review study, a preliminary stormwater management report, a traffic review, preliminary geotechnical investigation, and the site plan. A copy of the Report and background materials can be found at the below link:

Link to Background Materials

Analysis of Planning Issues

In rendering decisions, planning authorities must have regard to matters of Provincial interest under the Planning Act and be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Decisions within the County must also conform to the County of Grey Official Plan, and in this case the Municipality of Meaford local official plan, and any Provincial plans in force and effect.
A detailed planning analysis has not been undertaken at this stage. Following the public process, and agency comments, a thorough analysis and staff recommendation will be provided. Key Provincial and County policies have been flagged below for consideration.

Provincial Legislation – The Planning Act

Most notable to this proposed official plan amendment are the following clauses from the Planning Act, which will need to be considered.

(a) the protection of ecological systems, including natural areas, features and functions

There are significant woodlands and two streams located on the westerly portion of the subject property. No development is proposed in this area. Preliminary comments have been received from Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.

(b) the protection of agricultural resources of the Province

The subject property is designated ‘Rural’ and ‘Hazard’ lands as per Schedule A of the County Official Plan. Within the ‘Rural’ designation, agricultural, agricultural-related, and on-farm diversified uses are permitted.

Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2014)

Section 1.1.4.1 of the PPS states rural areas should be supported by building upon rural character, and leveraging rural amenities and assets, promoting the economic base and employment opportunities through goods and services, including value-added products and the sustainable management or use of resources, and by providing opportunities for sustainable and diversified tourism, including leveraging historical, cultural, and natural assets. The subject application is to request relief from the small scale definition of commercial and industrial uses in the rural area in order to develop a vineyard and winery.

Policy 1.1.5.4 outlines, development that is compatible with the rural landscape and can be sustained by rural service levels should be promoted. The viability of servicing has been discussed and reviewed through the accompanying servicing study conducted by C.C. Tatham & Associates Ltd.

Policy 1.1.5.8 also states, agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses and normal farm practices should be promoted and protected in accordance with provincial standards and are permitted in the Rural Lands. The subject development includes all three uses (agricultural, agriculture-related, and on-farm diversified), that all complement the overall vineyard and winery operation.

County of Grey Official Plan

Section 2.3.2(1) of the County Official Plan indicates the predominant use of the lands shall be for agriculture and forestry and uses connected with the conservation of water, soil, wildlife and other natural resources. Small scale commercial and industrial uses are permitted. At the time the current County Official Plan (2013) was final approved, the 2005 version of the PPS was used as the Provincial policy guide. That version of the PPS defined on-farm diversified uses as secondary uses. Agriculture-related uses and secondary uses as defined in the 2005 PPS were
required to be small scale. The current County OP includes a definition for small scale that addresses both secondary uses and agriculture-related uses.

The 2014 version of the PPS included the introduction of new terminology and revised definitions. In 2016, the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs released a guiding document on permitted uses to better explain some of the terminology used in the PPS, along with direction on policy implementation and interpretation. One of the major changes from these two provincial level documents included the removal of size restrictions for agriculture-related uses. These uses were no longer required to be small scale.

As part of the Recolour Grey process, revisions are proposed to reflect the changes made by the province with respect to agriculture-related policies. Although, because the current policy does not reflect these changes from the province, the following amendment is required to the small scale definition:

The small scale definition states, on parcels 20 hectares or greater on Agricultural, Special Agricultural, or Rural designation, small scale when used in the context of commercial or industrial uses shall not exceed the following:

- occupies combined building(s) not exceeding 750 square metres;
- outside storage and display is limited to an area not greater than 500 square metres;
- if the building(s) is less than 750 square metres the outside storage/display area may be increased to a maximum combined storage/display area and building area that does not exceed 1250 square metres; and
- the passing of an implementing zoning by-law amendment

The small scale commercial portion of the winery operation is intended to be a total of 18,400 sq. ft. (~1,709 sq. m.). An additional 10,328 sq. ft. (959 sq. m.) of commercial space is requested by the applicant beyond the permitted 750 sq. m. Justification shall be provided to demonstrate the long-term sustainability of this type of development in the rural area, along with adequately addressing servicing requirements, storm water management, traffic flow, and geotechnical concerns.

Section 6.3 of the County Plan contemplates amendments to the Plan, provided the criteria of the relevant sections of the Plan can be addressed.

As noted above, following the public and agency processes, a thorough planning analysis and staff recommendation will be provided.

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 official plan amendment, beyond those normally encountered in processing an amendment. The County has collected the requisite application fee and peer review deposit for this application.
Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal: Planning Staff
☒ External: Municipality of Meaford, required agencies under the Planning Act, and the public

Appendices and Attachments

None