Committee of Adjustment

Chair: Deborah Young
Committee: Gerry Murphy (Vice-Chair)
H. Edward Ormsby
Linda van Aalst
Lynn Whitbeck

Agenda

Date: Thursday, September 27, 2018
Time: 4:00 PM
Location: Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

2. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

3. Adoption of Previous Minutes

   3.1 Accept the minutes of the August 23rd, 2018 meeting.
   
   Committee of Adjustment - 23 Aug 2018 - Minutes - Pdf

4. Business Arising From Previous Minutes

5. Public Meetings

   5.1 Consider Minor Variance A11/18
   Staff Report: DES2018-57
   Applicant: Steenhof/Olynyk
   Legal: Concession 6 Part Lot 22, Plan 284 Part Lot 52,
   Registered Plan 16R-7806 Parts 23 to 26, known municipally
   as 138 Georgian Beach Lane, in the former Township of St.
Vincent, now in the Municipality of Meaford.

Notice of Application A11-18
Staff Report - DES2018-57
A11-18 Agency Comments

5.2 Consider Consent Application B09/18 and Minor Variance Application A10/18
Staff Report: DES2018-56
Applicant: Meaford Golf Course
Legal: Plan 390 Part Lots 1654 to 1659 and 1695, and Registered Plan 16R-1810 Part of Part 1, and Registered Plan 16R-3593 Part 1, known municipally as 408 Ridge Road, in the former Town of Meaford, now in the Municipality of Meaford.

Notice of Application B09-2018
Staff Report - DES2018-56
B09-18 Agency Comments

6. Other

7. Next Meeting
   7.1 Tentatively October 25, 2018.

8. Adjournment
Minutes

A Committee of Adjustment meeting of the Municipality of Meaford was held at 4:00 PM at the Council Chambers on August 23, 2018.

Present: Deborah Young (Chair)  
Gerry Murphy (Vice-Chair)  
H. Edward Ormsby  
Linda van Aalst  
Lynn Whitbeck

Staff: Kara Rogers, Planner/GIS Coordinator  
Liz Buckton, Senior Planner

1. Call to Order

2. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

3. Adoption of Previous Minutes

3.1 Accept the minutes of the July 26, 2018 meeting.

That the Committee of Adjustment of the Municipality of Meaford accepts the minutes of the meeting on the 26th of July, 2018.

Moved by: Gerry Murphy  
Seconded by: Linda van Aalst  
That the Committee of Adjustment of the Municipality of Meaford accepts the minutes of the meeting on the 26th of July, 2018.

Carried

4. Business Arising From Previous Minutes

5. Public Meetings
5.1 Consider Minor Variance Application A08-18
Staff Report: DES2018-52
Applicant: 2200397 Ontario Inc
Legal: Plan 309 Lot 1042, known municipally as 46 Trowbridge Street West, in the former Town of Meaford, now in the Municipality of Meaford.

The proposed application (A08-2018) requests a variance to facilitate construction of a new commercial building. The application requests relief from Provision 5.5(a) of Zoning By-law 60-2009, which requires parking areas and driveways to be located no closer than 1 metre from any lot line. **Application A08-2018 requests a reduced west interior yard setback for the driveway and parking from 1.0m to 0.4m.**

The Chair opened the Public Meeting.

The Secretary-Treasurer advised the Committee about the original circulation and explained the re-circulation of the application due to the incorrect description of the variance referring to the East side lot line instead of the appropriate West side lot line, but indicated that the sketch that had been attached to the original notice was correct. The Committee agreed that sufficient notice had been given to proceed with the meeting.

The Secretary-Treasurer advised the Committee of the comments received from the Municipality’s Development Services (DES2018-52), Municipal Transportation Services, County of Grey Development, Transportation and Housing Services, and the Historic Saugeen Metis.

The Committee discussed the general nature of the application.

Senior Planner Liz Buckton clarified plans for the development of the property based on her conversation with the owner; Additionally she explained that she had talked with a neighbour about concerns regarding fencing and lot boundaries but that no written submission had been received.

Committee Member Lynn Whitbeck inquired about the trees on...
the lot line. Senior Planner Liz Buckton explained which trees would likely need to be removed.

Committee Member Gerry Murphy inquired if the applicant could reduce the width of the driveway to maintain the size of the building and still meet the required setbacks to lot lines. Senior Planner Liz Buckton explained that the proposed driveway is the minimum width as per the Zoning By-law and indicated that Transportation had commented that the driveway should not be reduced in width due to pick-up trucks typically being 2.5m between the edge of each mirror.

Allan Reid (of 90 Collingwood West) explained that he has an interest in property in terms of wanting to preserve the historic character of the downtown area. He indicated that he was curious about the design of the development. Senior Planner Liz Buckton indicated that the current application is only dealing with side yard setback and that heritage matters are not within the purview of this Committee. She further explained that a heritage permit would be required with this development. She noted that the developer would likely wait to know the applicable setbacks before finalizing the design. Mr. Reid also commented on trees on the property and his desire to preserve large trees in the core area.

Having considered the content of all submissions, the Staff Report and oral submissions, the Committee voted on Minor Variance Application A08-18, the application was APPROVED, the decision reading as follows:

Moved by: Linda van Aalst
Seconded by: Lynn Whitbeck

Being that the four tests have been satisfied, the Committee hereby approves a variance to Zoning By-law 60-2009, as amended, to provide relief from the provision 5.5 a) to permit the driveway and parking spaces/area to be located not nearer than 0.4m.

Conditions: None

Reasons for Decision: The Committee is satisfied that the application meets the four tests of a minor variance, as noted in Development Services Staff Report DES2018-52. Carried
5.2 Consider Minor Variance Application A09-18

Staff Report: DES2018-53
Applicant: Rogers
Legal: Concession 9, East Part of Lot 16, known municipally as 138052 Grey Rd 112, in the former Township of St. Vincent, now in the Municipality of Meaford.

The proposed application (A09-2018) requests a variance to facilitate construction of a permitted detached ‘accessory apartment dwelling unit’ on the property. The application requests relief from the Provisions of 4.2.1 of Zoning By-law 60-2009, which by-definition, exclude below-grade floor area of the main dwelling from being counted in the calculation of the 50% maximum floor area permitted for the detached unit. **Application A09-2018 would allow for the finished basement living area of the existing main dwelling to be counted towards the calculation of total permitted floor area for the accessory unit, facilitating a basement below the proposed new accessory dwelling. In accordance with the Zoning By-law, the new accessory dwelling will be located within 50m of the existing dwelling on the lands.**

The Chair opened the Public Meeting.

The Secretary-Treasurer advised the Committee of the comments received from the Municipality’s Development Services (DES2018-53), Municipal Transportation Services, County of Grey Development and Transportation Services, and the Historic Saugeen Metis.

The Committee discussed the general nature of the application.

Senior Planner Liz Buckton explained the history of how these as-of-right permissions for accessory units were developed and the intention with the floor area calculation was to ensure that the accessory unit remains subordinate/accessory relative to main unit. She explained that no sketch was included because it is not a location or setback based variance, and further that the exact location of the proposed structure is not yet decided as the applicant still has some additional works to do. Liz indicated that the detached accessory structure does need to be located within 50 meters of the main dwelling, and that due to MDSI setback...
from a livestock facility to the north, the detached unit will have to be placed on the South side of the main dwelling.

Committee Chair Deborah Young inquired about how the unit would be serviced. Senior Planner Liz Buckton explained that the applicant can choose to install a new well or share the existing one, but that in most cases a new septic is required.

Applicant, Beverly Rogers, explained that her family's plans and the purpose of the accessory unit.

Having considered the content of all submissions, the Staff Report and oral submissions, the Committee voted on Minor Variance Application A09-18, the application was APPROVED, the decision reading as follows:

Moved by: Lynn Whitbeck
Seconded by: Gerry Murphy

Being that the four tests have been satisfied, the Committee hereby approves a variance to Zoning By-law 60-2009, as amended, to provide relief from the Provisions of 4.2.1 which, by definition, exclude below-grade floor area of the main dwelling from being counted in the calculation of the 50% maximum floor area permitted for the detached unit.

Notwithstanding 4.2.1.2 b) to the contrary, the maximum floor area of the accessory apartment dwelling unit (excluding floor area where the distance between finished ceiling and finished floor is 1.2 meters or less) shall not be greater than 50% of the floor area of the main dwelling unit, said calculation of main unit floor area to include its finished basement floor area.

Conditions: Above-grade floor area of the detached accessory apartment dwelling unit be limited to a maximum of 83m2 (893ft2).

Reasons for Decision: The Committee is satisfied that the application meets the four tests of a minor variance, as noted in Development Services Staff Report DES2018-53.

Carried

5.3 Consider Consent Application B08-18
Applicant: Loft/Henry
Legal: Concession C Part Lot 27, known municipally as 439281 Sydenham-Lakeshore Drive, in the former Township of Sydenham, now in the Municipality of Meaford.

Application B08/18 requests municipal consent to sever a parcel of land, with existing dwelling and accessory structures, with an area of approximately 2.391 hectares (5.9 acres) and with approximately 57m (187 ft) of frontage on Sydenham-Lakeshore Drive for the purpose of lot creation. The retained parcel would maintain an area of approximately 37.109 hectares (91.7 acres) with approximately 356m (1167.98 ft) of frontage on Sydenham-Lakeshore Drive.

The Chair opened the Public Meeting.

The Secretary-Treasurer advised the Committee of the comments received from the Municipality’s Development Services (DES2018-51), Municipal Transportation Services, County of Grey Development Services, Gray Sauble Conservation Authority, Hydro One, Union Gas, and the Historic Saugeen Metis. The Committee was also advised of the comments received from Douglas and Janice Reid, and from Lou Donofrio.

The Committee discussed the general nature of the application.

Committee Member Gerry Murphy suggested that the proposed condition for servicing would likely satisfy the servicing concerns raised in the letter from the neighbour owners The Reids. Senior Planner Liz Buckton agreed. He inquired about the lot creation policy in regards to the concerns in the letter from Mr. Donofrio. Senior Planner Liz Buckton explained that the Rural designation policies allow for lot creation and that the proposed severance met the provisions for lot creation as outlined in her Staff Report and in the Report submitted by Kristine Loft. She also explained the history of retirement lots and that there are no longer specific permissions for retirement lots, just for general lot creation.

Committee Member Ed Ormsby explained his hesitation with the application. He commented that he did not feel as though this
application represents good planning. He explained that a larger, more regular-shaped lot would be preferable in his opinion and further he felt that the proposed lot would not be created as proposed if the house and buildings were not there.

Committee Chair Deborah Young inquired about what is done to prevent complaints between residential and agricultural uses. Senior Planner Liz Buckton explained that historically development agreements were registered on title to ensure that any new land owners were aware that the lot was in an agricultural area and the practices that they might experience. She explained that these are no longer used. She explained that the Province introduced Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) policies to ensure adequate distances are maintained between Agricultural and other land uses, to minimize potential complaints.

Kristine Loft, Planner for the file, stated that she agreed with Senior Planner Liz Buckton in terms of how the application met the applicable policies. She explained that no further lots would be allowed to be created. Kristine explained that the current farmer is a cash crop farmer and that the house and buildings are surplus to his operational needs. She explained that MDS would be met. Kristine stated that she agreed with Ed’s point of view about the lot layout, however she explained that to determine whether or not that application represents good planning that she analyzes whether or not that planning policies and tests can be met. She continued, nothing that although the lot layout may not be pretty, the farmer needs to meet the policy requiring him to not remove good agricultural land for production and that being a cash crop farmer that he would want to maximize the agricultural potential of his lands. She indicated that the applicant has no intentions to build on the lot. She indicated that they have determined that a minor variance will be required to recognize the setback between the proposed out building and the interior side lot line. She noted that the applicant and herself were agreeable to the proposed conditions in the Staff Report.

Committee Member Ed Ormsby commented that the applicant may not be able to find a sufficient water source on the proposed lot to install a new well on-site. Senior Planner Liz Buckton explained that if they cannot establish a water source on the new lot, that an application for easement would be require; at such
time that the lot is to be transferred out of common ownership with the farm parcel. Generally it would be expected that a water supply would be available given the existing well in close proximity to the lands.

Having considered the content of all submissions, the Staff Report and oral submissions, the Committee voted on Consent Application B08-18, the application was APPROVED, the decision reading as follows:

Moved by: Linda van Aalst
Seconded by: Gerry Murphy

DECISION – B08-2018

The Committee, in reviewing the subject application, determined it to be compatible with the area, consistent with the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement, and the Meaford Official Plan. Thus, the application is APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

1. Payment of cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication for the severed lands;
2. That a survey be provided confirming the location of the existing well & septic system on the lands and demonstrating that the minimum required setbacks under the Ontario Building Code are provided to the new lot lines for the septic system; and,
3. That the applicant:
   a. Demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Municipality, that the accessory buildings and structures on the severed parcel will meet the applicable provisions and standards of the Zoning By-law, or
   b. Obtain a Minor Variance or Zoning Amendment to address/remedy any non-compliance with the applicable Zoning.

Carried

6. Other

7. Next Meeting

7.1 Tentatively, Thursday, September 27, 2018 at 4PM.
8. Adjournment

Chair

Secretary-Treasurer
Notice of Public Meeting – Committee of Adjustment

Purpose and Effect: The proposed application (A11-2018) requests a variance to facilitate construction of a new dwelling on the property. The application requests relief from Table 6.2.1 of Zoning By-law 60-2009, which requires a minimum interior side yard setback of 2.0m; and relief from Provision 4.1.1.5 of Zoning By-law 60-2009, which allows for a maximum lot coverage applicable to detached accessory structures to 5%. Application A11/18 requests that the interior side yard setback be reduced from 2.0m to 1.2m for the main dwelling, and for the lot coverage applicable to the detached accessory structure to be increased from 5% to 6.5%. These variances will facilitate the construction of a new dwelling and accessory structure on a shoreline parcel.

Related Applications: None.

Location: Concession 6 Part Lot 22, Plan 284 Part Lot 52, Registered Plan 16R-7806 Parts 23 to 26, known municipally as 138 Georgian Beach Lane, in the former Township of St. Vincent, now in the Municipality of Meaford.

Meeting Date and Time: Thursday, September 27th, 2018 at 4:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: 157859 7th Line, Meaford, Ontario (Council Chambers)

You are entitled to attend the meeting in person or to be represented by an agent to express your views on the merits of this application or you may forward correspondence indicating your views. Please note that if you or your agent do not attend the hearing, the Committee may proceed in your absence, and you are not entitled to any further notice of proceedings except as provided by the Planning Act.

If you wish to be notified of the decision of the Municipality of Meaford Committee of Adjustment in respect of the proposed variance, you must make a written request to the Municipality of Meaford Committee of Adjustment.

Additional information and material regarding this application are available at the Municipal Administration Office during regular business hours.

Municipality of Meaford Administration Office
21 Trowbridge Street West
Meaford, Ontario N4L 1A1

Kara Rogers
Planner/GIS Coordinator
krogers@meaford.ca
519-538-1060 ext. 1119

Liz Buckton
Senior Planner
lbuckton@meaford.ca
519-538-1060 ext. 1120
If your property contains 7 or more residential units, please post in a location that is visible to all residents.

Proposal Sketch

How can I contribute my opinion?
Any person or agency may attend the Public Meeting and/or make verbal or written comments regarding the proposal

How do I submit my comments?
Submit written comments prior to the meeting or sign-up to be notified of a decision by contacting or mailing the Secretary-Treasurer:

Kara Rogers
Secretary-Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment
21 Trowbridge Street West
Meaford, Ontario N4L 1A1
krogers@meaford.ca
519-538-1060 ext. 1119

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario’s Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), all information provided for, or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record, including resident deputations. This information may be posted on the Municipality’s website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable upon request.
Recommendation

That Committee of Adjustment of the Municipality of Meaford APPROVE Minor Variance A11-2018 providing relief from Table 6.2.1 and Section 4.1.1.5 of the Zoning By-law 60-2009 to:

a) Reduce the required interior side yard setbacks from 2m to 1.2m to allow for the single detached dwelling to be constructed at a setback of not less than 1.2m from the interior lot lines; and,
b) To increase the maximum permitted lot coverage for detached accessory buildings/structures on the lot from 5% to 6.5%.

Background

The subject lands are located at 138 Georgian Beach Lane and fall within the Shoreline Designation of the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan and within the Residential Limited Service (RLS) zone of Meaford’s Comprehensive Zoning By-law 60-2009, as amended.

Surrounding land uses include;

- Georgian Bay to the northeast
- Vacant, treed residential and environmentally protected lands to the south;
- Shoreline residential dwellings on lots to the north and south.

Application A11-2018 requests relief from Table 6.2.1 of the Zoning By-law to allow for construction of a new dwelling on the lands at a setback of not less than 1.2m from the interior side lot lines. The application also requests
relief from Section 4.1.1.5, to facilitate the construction of a detached accessory structure having a maximum lot coverage of 6.5%.

The construction intended to be facilitated by the above noted variances is shown on the Site Plan & drawings affixed as Appendix 1 to this report.

Staff note that the proposed variances could be considered for alternate placement of the dwelling and/or accessory structure on the lands and would not require that the construction be completed specifically in conformity with the Site Plan provided. In particular, Staff note that the applicant may wish to consider alternate placement of the detached accessory structure on the lands as it is presently proposed immediately behind Lot 53, Plan 284 which could limit future flexibility/options to provide Lot 53 with access from Georgian Beach Lane, should the access along Georgian Beach Road South be discontinued (as is being explored by the local resident’s association).

Analysis

An application for a variance to the Zoning By-law must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, County and Local Official Plans and must satisfy Section 45(1) of the Planning Act.

Section 45(1) of the Planning Act authorizes the granting of a minor variance “in respect of the land, building or structure or use thereof”. For a successful variance, the following tests of Section 45(1) of the Planning Act must all be satisfied:

- The variance must be minor;
- The variance must be desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, building or structure;
- The variance must maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan; and,
- The variance must maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law.

The four tests, and policy conformity/consistency considerations are examined in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration Addressed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Policy Statement – Consistency</td>
<td>Specific policies relating to the yard setbacks/lot coverage for structures on an individual lot are not included within the PPS. Generally, the broad directions of the PPS for lands within Settlement Areas are carried forward in greater detail in local planning documents. Generally, lands in Settlement Areas (as is the Shoreline Designation of the Official Plan) are to be the 'focus of growth and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted’. Further the PPS notes that land use patterns in Settlement Areas shall be based upon densities and a mix of land uses which efficiently use land and resources. Matters relating to natural (shoreline) hazards will be addressed through the applicable regulations/permit process administered by the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The variance maintains the general intent &amp; purpose of the Zoning By-law.</td>
<td>The intent of the Zoning By-law with respect to interior side yard setbacks is to ensure access to the side yard and to provide adequate space for surface water drainage around the dwelling, where required. The side yard setback within the RLS zone is set at 2m vs. the 1.2m standard setback applying in an urban residential zone – this is largely a function of the fact that lands subject to the RLS zone are generally serviced on private well and septic and thus a larger side yard setback is favourable to facilitate equipment access around the house to the septic system for maintenance purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Addressed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In this case, the property has access to the rear yard via ROW over Georgian Beach Lane and the septic system will be located in this yard. Enhanced setback around the dwelling will not be necessary to facilitate rear yard access. Site grading and drainage is detailed on the construction plans and will incorporate drainage swales with the side yards to facilitate ongoing flow of surface water from west to east (to the Bay). The intent of the Zoning By-law with respect to accessory structure lot coverage is largely to maintain a scale relationship between the main and secondary structures on-site and to prevent over-building of a lot. In this case, the two-storey main structure is proposed at approximately 11% lot coverage (plus large unenclosed decks/porches) while the single-storey accessory garage is proposed at 6.45%. The accessory structure is expected to be visually subordinate to the dwelling. Regarding ‘over-building’ Staff would note that the RLS zone would permit the dwelling to occupy a maximum lot coverage of 30% in addition to the 5% usually permitted for the accessory structure (a total of 35%) – in this case the total lot coverage will be approximately 17.5%, far less than the maximum permitted by the zone. Staff are of the opinion that the proposed variances uphold the intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Addressed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The variance is 'minor'.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As described above, Staff are of the opinion that the proposed variances are minor in terms of impact on the subject lands and abutting properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The variance maintains the general intent &amp; purpose of Official Plan.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposal would facilitate the construction of a new residential dwelling and accessory structure on lands set out for shoreline residential use by the County and Local Official Plans. Staff are of the opinion that the intent of the Official Plans is maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Priorities

This report supports the mission, vision and values of the Municipality of Meaford, as well as the goals and objectives set out in Council’s Strategic Priorities 2015-2018.

### Consultation and Communications

Notice has been circulated in the manner prescribed by the Planning Act to the following:
- Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
- Grey County Planning, Transportation and Clerk’s Department
- Ontario Power Generation
- The City of Owen Sound
- Union Gas
- Municipal Property Assessment Corporation
- Metis Nation of Ontario
- Saugeen Ojibway Nation
- Historic Saugeen Metis Nation
- Military Training Facility
- Municipality of Meaford – Transportation, Legislative & Protective Services, Meaford & District Fire Chief, and Development & Environmental Services.
Nine (9) property owners within 60 meters of the subject lands were circulated notice of the application.

Conclusion

It is the opinion of Planning Staff that the subject application is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement; meets the four tests of a minor variance, and generally represents good planning. In this regard, Staff recommends that the Committee of Adjustment approve the requested minor variance application.

Respectfully Submitted:

[Signature]

Liz Buckton, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner
Liz

The Municipality of Meaford building department does not object to this variance but should be noted that

1) Thee stand by generator is not permitted in the side yard.
2) The septic system type be designed to accommodate the development and meet Ontario Building Code requirements.

Rick Carefoot
Chief Building Official
Municipality of Meaford
21 Trowbridge Street West, Meaford
519 538-1060 ext. 1113 | rcarefoot@meaford.ca
Twitter | Facebook | meaford.ca

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail contains legally privileged information intended only for the individual or entity named in this message. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of the communication is prohibited. If this communication was received in error, please notify us by reply e-mail and delete the original message.
The Historic Saugeen Metis (HSM) Lands, Resources and Consultation Department has reviewed the relevant documents and have no objection or opposition to the proposed development, land re-designation, zoning, land severance, Official plan and/or Zoning By-law Amendments.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this matter.

Regards,

Chris Hachey

Assistant Coordinator, Lands, Resources and Consultation

Historic Saugeen Métis
204 High Street
Southampton, Ontario, N0H 2L0
Telephone: (519) 483-4000
Fax: (519) 483-4002
Email: hsmasstlrcc@bmts.com

This message is intended for the addressees only. It may contain confidential or privileged information. No rights to privilege have been waived. Any copying, retransmittal, taking of action in reliance on, or other use of the information in this communication by persons other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please reply to the sender by e-mail and delete or destroy all copies of this message.
September 20th, 2018

Kara Rogers  
Municipality of Meaford  
21 Trowbridge St. W  
Meaford, ON, N4L 1A1  
*Sent Via E-mail

RE:  Minor Variance Application A11-2018  
Concession 6, Part Lot 22, Plan 284, part Lot 52 RP 16R-7806 Parts 23 to 26  
(138 Georgian Beach Lane)  
Municipality of Meaford (former Township of St. Vincent)  
Owner: Terry Olynyk  
Applicant: Jerry Slavish

Dear Ms. Rogers,

This correspondence is in response to the above noted application. We have had an opportunity to review the application in relation to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the County of Grey Official Plan (OP). We offer the following comments.

The purpose and effect of the subject minor variance application is to facilitate construction of a new dwelling on the property. The application requests relief from Table 6.2.1 of Zoning By-law 60-2009, which requires a minimum interior side yard setback of 2.0m; and relief from Provision 4.1.1.5 of Zoning By-law 60-2009, which allows for a maximum lot coverage applicable to detached accessory structures to 5%. The subject application requests that the interior side yard setback be reduced from 2.0m to 1.2m for the main dwelling, and for the lot coverage applicable to the detached accessory structure to be increased from 5% to 6.5%.

Schedule A of the County OP designates the subject property as ‘Inland Lakes & Shoreline’. Policy 2.6.6(2) outlines low-density residential dwellings are permitted within the Inland Lakes & Shoreline designation. Policy 2.8.6(5) also notes no development shall be permitted within 30 metres of the banks of Georgian Bay. Through reviewing the site plan, the proposed development is setback 12.5m from Georgian Beach Rd South. It shall be ensured that the proposed development is not within 30 metres from the banks of Georgian Bay.
Schedule A further designates a portion of the subject property as ‘Hazard Lands’. Section 2.8.2(3) of the OP states, *in the Hazard Lands designation buildings and structures are generally not permitted.* Development is not proposed within the hazardous lands. County planning staff have no concerns with the above noted policy.

Appendix B of the OP identifies ‘Significant Woodlands’ adjacent to the subject property. Policy 2.8.4(1) outlines, *no development or site alteration may occur within Significant Woodlands or their adjacent lands unless it has been demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Study that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.* County planning staff recommend comments are received from the local Conservation Authority.

Although the County does not map any other constraints on the subject property, the County is aware that updated mapping is available, which indicates that the subject property is within ‘Intake Protection Zone – 2’ (IPZ-2). It appears the proposed area is also within an Events Based Area, which is concerned with the storage of fuel. This does not appear to be proposed within the subject application; therefore, the IPZ policies shall not constrain the subject application.

Provided positive the proposed development is not within 30 metres from the banks of Georgian Bay, and positive comments are received from the local Conservation Authority, County planning staff have no further concerns with the subject application.

The County requests notice of any decision rendered with respect to this file.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,

Stephanie Lacey-Avon
Planner
(519) 372-0219 ext. 1296
stephanie.lacey-avon@grey.ca
www.grey.ca

Grey County: Colour It Your Way
Notice of Public Meeting – Committee of Adjustment

Purpose and Effect: Application B09/18 requests municipal consent to sever a lot of approximately 2.278 hectares (5.63 acres) with approximately 16.5 metres of frontage along Ridge Road for the purposes of creating a life lease development. The retained parcel would maintain an area of approximately 39.98 hectares (98.79 acres). The application also proposes to create easements for municipal servicing, a proposed storm water management pond/outlet and related infrastructure on the retained golf course property and to facilitate access to this infrastructure for ongoing maintenance by the landowner and municipality.

Application A10/18 requests a variance to reduce the front lot line setbacks, from the internal street, for one proposed 4-plex (a reduction from 7.5m to 7.4m), and for one proposed semi-detached (a reduction from 7.5m to 6.5m). This variance is requested as the buildings are located in proximity to endangered butternut trees on an abutting property and must meet a 25m setback from these trees which pushes the buildings slightly forward on the lots. Additionally, a variance is required to increase the maximum lot coverage for the semi-detached units on the North side of the internal road from 40% to 47%.

The lot creation, easements and variances are generally illustrated on the sketch submitted with the application and attached to this notice.

Related Applications: Official Plan Amendment OPA#12 and related Zoning By-law Amendment (By-law 2018-038)

Location: Plan 390 Part Lots 1654 to 1659 and 1695, and Registered Plan 16R-1810 Part of Part 1, and Registered Plan 16R-3593 Part 1, known municipally as 408 Ridge Road, in the former Town of Meaford, now in the Municipality of Meaford.

Meeting Date and Time: Thursday, September 27th, 2018 at 4:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: 157859 7th Line, Meaford, Ontario (Council Chambers)

If a person or public body that files an appeal of a decision of the Municipality of Meaford Committee of Adjustment in respect of the proposed consent does not make written submissions to the Municipality of Meaford Committee of Adjustment before it gives or refuses to give a provisional consent, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal may dismiss the appeal.

If you wish to be notified of the decision of the Municipality of Meaford Committee of Adjustment in respect of the proposed consent, you must make a written request to the Municipality of Meaford Committee of Adjustment.

Additional information and material regarding this application are available at the Municipal Administration Office during regular business hours.

Municipality of Meaford Administration Office
21 Trowbridge Street West
Meaford, Ontario N4L 1A1

Kara Rogers
Planner/GIS Coordinator
krogers@meaford.ca
519-538-1060 ext. 1119

Liz Buckton
Senior Planner
lbuckton@meaford.ca
519-538-1060 ext. 1120
If your property contains 7 or more residential units, please post in a location that is visible to all residents.

Proposal Sketch

How can I contribute my opinion?
Any person or agency may attend the Public Meeting and/or make verbal or written comments regarding the proposal

How do I submit my comments?
Submit written comments prior to the meeting or sign-up to be notified of a decision by contacting or mailing the Secretary-Treasurer:

Kara Rogers
Secretary-Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment
21 Trowbridge Street West
Meaford, Ontario  N4L 1A1
krogers@meaford.ca
519-538-1060 ext. 1119

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario’s Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), all information provided for, or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record, including resident deputations. This information may be posted on the Municipality’s website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable upon request.
That Committee of Adjustment of the Municipality of Meaford APPROVE Consent B09-2018, as illustrated on the drawings accompanying the application, to:

  a) sever a parcel of land measuring approximately 2.28 ha (5.63 ac) in size with approximately 16.5m of frontage on Ridge Road for the purposes of creating a life lease development; and,
  b) create easements over the parcels for municipal servicing, storm water management pond/outlet and related infrastructure.

That Committee of Adjustment of the Municipality of Meaford APPROVE Minor Variance A10-2018 as follows:

  a) The required front lot line setback, measured from the internal street, to one proposed multi-residential (4-plex) on the north side of the street, be reduced from 7.5m to 7.4m;
  b) The required front lot line setback, measured from the internal street, to one proposed semi-detached dwelling on the north side of the street, be reduced from 7.5 to 6.5m; and;
  c) The 'lot' coverage applicable to the semi-detached dwellings on the north side of the internal street be increased from a maximum of 40% to 47%, subject to the following condition:
That the construction facilitated by Variance A10-18 be substantially as shown on the sketch/drawings accompanying the application.

**Background**

The subject lands are designated as Major Recreation and Environmental Protection by the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan. The bulk of the lands to be severed are zoned Multiple Residential (RM-262-A-H5) with environmental heritage and hazard features identified by restrictive zoning of the RM-262-B (wildlife corridor), RM-262-C (woodland setback), RM-262-D (Butternut setback) and Environmental Protection (floodplain/slope setbacks) Zones by the Municipality of Meaford’s Comprehensive Zoning By-law 60-2009, as amended.

The zoning in place on the lands was approved by Council in June 2018 and was intended to apply standards and permissions for a proposed area of residential development, to be subsequently severed from the Golf Course use. This area (subject of the current consent application) is located at the north edge of the golf course property, currently occupied by the access laneway/parking and driving range. The zoning is intended to facilitate a maximum of 24 semi-detached dwellings (12 buildings X 2 units) and up to 16 townhomes/multi-residential units (4 buildings X 4 units) as well as related accessory structures.

The zoning also facilitates a shared laneway access and parking area for the residential & Golf Course use and confirms the current siting of the Clubhouse and other existing outbuildings relative to the existing and proposed new lot lines. The amendment also clarifies the standards that will apply for any new, expanded or replacement structures on the Golf Course lands in the future.

Final development detail and securities will be established via Site Plan Approval and a related development agreement.

At this time, the applicant wishes to sever the development lands from the balance of the golf course property and to establish easements over the
parcels for municipal servicing, the storm water management pond/outlet and related infrastructure (B09/18).

As the applicant has further detailed the proposed site layout (Appendix 1), they have also identified that minor variances (A10/18) are required to facilitate the proposed siting/placement of several of the structures on-site. In particular, the applicant requests:

a) The required front lot line setback, measured from the internal street, to one proposed multi-residential (4-plex) on the north side of the street, be reduced from 7.5m to 7.4m;

b) The required front lot line setback, measured from the internal street, to one proposed semi-detached dwelling on the north side of the street, be reduced from 7.5 to 6.5m; and;

c) The ‘lot’ coverage applicable to the semi-detached dwellings on the north side of the internal street be increased from a maximum of 40% to 47%.

The front lot line variances arise specifically due to the Butternut setbacks which have the effect of pushing two of the proposed buildings south, towards the internal street.

While the proposed semi-detached dwellings on the north side of the street are only slightly larger (5m²) than those proposed on the south side of the internal street, the northern lots are also slightly shallower, bringing the lot coverage up over the 40% permitted by the standards of the R3 zone which applies to the semi-detached dwellings, per exception zone #262. Thus the variance also requests an increase in lot coverage to a maximum of 47% (the semis ranging in coverage from 42.2.60% to 46.5% based upon the drawings provided).

Surrounding land uses include residential dwellings and lots, and lands designated for future residential and complementary purposes.

Analysis

Policy Tests for Consent

In considering the application for consent, the Committee of Adjustment must be satisfied that it is consistent with the Provincial Policy, conforms to the intent and direction of the County and Local Official Plans and Zoning By-law, and represents good planning. Staff note that the Official Plan and
Zoning By-law Amendments approved in June 2018 were directly intended to facilitate the subject redevelopment of the lands and related policy considerations were discussed in detail within Staff Report DES2018-27 (Appendix 2) and a Planning Report submitted by Ron Davidson Land Use Planning Consultants (Appendix 3). These amendments were approved by the County of Grey and Council of the Municipality of Meaford on the basis that the development is consistent with the Provincial Policy, conforms to the intent and direction of the County and Local Official Plans and Zoning By-law, and represents good planning.

Staff are of the opinion that the subject related consent and easement applications similarly uphold these directions and are technical in nature, allowing for the approved redevelopment lands to be owned and managed separately from the balance of the golf course lands. As such, Staff have limited the discussion within this report to the specific policies of Section D4.2.1 (New Lots by Consent) ensuring that such technical considerations of lot creation are evaluated and met.

**Policy Tests for Minor Variance**

An application for a variance to the Zoning By-law must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, County and Local Official Plans and must satisfy Section 45(1) of the Planning Act.

Section 45(1) of the Planning Act authorizes the granting of a minor variance “in respect of the land, building or structure or use thereof”. For a successful variance, the following tests of Section 45(1) of the Planning Act must all be satisfied:

- The variance must be minor;
- The variance must be desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, building or structure;
- The variance must maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan; and,
- The variance must maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law.

These four tests are examined in the table below.
D4.2.1 New Lots by Consent

Section D4.2.1 of the Official Plan reads as follows:

"Prior to considering an application to create a new lot for any purpose, the Committee of Adjustment shall be satisfied that the proposed lot:

a) fronts on and will be directly accessed by a public road that is maintained on a year-round basis;
b) will not cause a traffic hazard as a result of its location on a curve or a hill;
c) can be serviced with an appropriate water supply and means of sewage disposal. Where municipal services are not available, evidence shall be provided indicating the site's suitability to provide adequate quality and quantity of water supply and confirming that the site can accommodate an approved sanitary sewage disposal system with adequate area to accommodate a 100% contingency envelope on the lot;
d) will not have a negative impact on the drainage patterns in the area;
e) will not affect the develop ability of the remainder of the lands, if they are designated for development by this Plan; and,
f) will not have a negative impact on the features and functions of any environmentally sensitive feature in the area."

Evaluation against 4.2.1

a) The subject multi-unit residential development is proposed on the subject severed parcel (life-lease tenure) which fronts onto and will obtain access from Ridge Road, a year-round maintained municipal street.
b) A preliminary traffic assessment was provided in support of the application noting capacity of Ridge Road to service the development. Additionally, the applicant's engineer has confirmed that the access meets applicable sight lines.
c) The proposed development on the severed lot will be serviced with municipal water and sewer services. A preliminary servicing report was submitted in support of the related OPA/ZBLA. The subject servicing easements will facilitate appropriate municipal servicing for the parcel. Detailed design and securities will be established via the related development agreement.
d) A stormwater management report was submitted in support of the redevelopment application. The subject stormwater easements will facilitate appropriate stormwater management for the parcel. Detailed
design and securities will be established via the related development agreement.

e) The remainder of the lands will be retained for ongoing recreational (golf course) use. The applicable Official Plan designation and Zoning would facilitate this use and future redevelopment of these adjacent lands.

f) An environmental impact study, addendum and Butternut assessment report were provided in support of the related OPA/ZBLA. This applicable zoning includes a wildlife corridor and woodland setback, as well as setbacks from several butternut trees on an adjacent property. No negative impacts are anticipated.

Based on the foregoing, Staff are of the opinion that the subject consent (and development it will facilitate) conform to the policies of the Official Plan regarding lot creation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Addressed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Policy Statement – Consistency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Specific policies relating to yard setbacks and lot coverage for structures on an individual lot are not included within the PPS. Generally, the broad directions of the PPS for lands within Settlement Areas are carried forward in greater detail in local planning documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The variance is desirable for appropriate development of the lands.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The subject lands are intended to be used for multiple residential development on full municipal services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The variance is ‘minor’.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed reduced front yard setbacks (6.5m &amp; 7.4m) for two of the buildings abutting the 25m Butternut buffer are not significantly different than the setbacks for immediately adjacent buildings and it is not expected that this setback reduction will be visually prominent, particularly given that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the internal road curves, resulting in varied building placement/driveway lengths.

The proposed increased 'lot' coverage for the semi-detached units on the north side of the internal street is largely a function of the shallower nature of these lots. The proposed increase in lot coverage would not be expected to impact the visual character of the area as the building massing will remain generally consistent with the other semi-detached units within the development.

Staff are of the opinion that the proposed variances are minor in terms of extent and impact. The development that the variances will facilitate is desirable and represents an appropriate use of the lands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The variance maintains the general intent &amp; purpose of Official Plan.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The subject variances would facilitate construction of a municipally serviced multiple-residential development on lands within the Municipality’s primary urban settlement area. The enabling zoning amendment was evaluated against the Official Plan (see Appendices) and the multiple-residential use was found to generally conform to the applicable policies. The proposed variances are minor and would not reduce overall conformity with the broad policies of the Official Plan. 
Staff are of the opinion that the intent of the Official Plans is maintained. | Yes |
| The intent of the Zoning By-law with respect to front yard setbacks is typically to establish visual character and a reasonable degree of uniformity within a neighbourhood. Additionally, the typical 7.5m setback would facilitate parking on a driveway in the front yard, a required parking space measuring 5.8m in length. In this case, the minor reduction in front yard setback is not | Yes |
expected to be visually prominent, particularly given that the internal road curves, resulting in varied building placement/driveway lengths. The setbacks exceed the minimum parking space length and will not preclude provision of required parking spaces within these yards.

The intent of the Zoning By-law with respect to maximum lot coverage is again to establish a degree of uniformity within a neighbourhood with respect to the massing of buildings and to prevent over-building of a parcel.

In this case, the increased lot coverage on the semi-detached 'lots' on the north side of the internal street is largely a function of the lots being shallower than those on the south side. The buildings themselves will be very similar in size to those proposed on the south side of the street.

As the servicing and stormwater management for the development will occur on a comprehensive basis (rather than on a lot by lot basis) Staff are satisfied that the lots are not being 'over-built', there being adequate room to accommodate minimum yard setbacks, required parking and on-site drainage infrastructure.

It is the opinion of Staff that the proposed variances uphold the intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law.

Based on the foregoing, Staff are of the opinion that the subject applications are consistent with the Provincial Policy, conform to the intent and direction of the County & Local Official Plans and Zoning By-law, meet the four tests of a minor variance and generally represent good planning. Staff recommend approval of the consent/easements via B09/18 and variance(s) via A10/18.
Staff note that per D4.4.2.3 ‘Dedication of Land through the Development Process’ of the Meaford Official Plan and in accordance with the implementing Parkland Dedication By-law (050-2011), five percent of the land within a residential Plan of Subdivision/Consent is to be dedicated to the Municipality as parkland. Staff would note that this dedication (cash-in-lieu) will be calculated and required via the related Site Plan/Development Agreement and thus no consent condition has been recommended in this regard.

**Strategic Priorities**

This report supports the mission, vision and values of the Municipality of Meaford, as well as the goals and objectives set out in Council’s Strategic Priorities 2015-2018.

**Consultation and Communications**

Notice has been circulated in the manner prescribed by the Planning Act to the following:

- Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
- Grey County Planning, Transportation and Clerk’s Department
- Hydro One Networks Inc.
- Ontario Power Generation
- The City of Owen Sound
- Union Gas
- Municipal Property Assessment Corporation
- Metis Nation of Ontario
- Saugeen Ojibway Nation
- Historic Saugeen Metis Nation
- Rogers – Simcoe Communications
- Ontario Ministry of Transportation
- Municipality of Meaford – Transportation Services, Legislative & Protective Services, Meaford & District Fire Chief, and Development & Environmental Services.

One hundred and twenty eight (128) property owners within 120 meters of the subject lands were circulated notice of the application.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing evaluation, Staff recommend the Committee approve application B09/18 (severance & related easements), as well as application A10/18.
Supporting Documentation

Appendix 1 – Drawing/Plans
Appendix 2 – Staff Report DES2018-27 (OPA/ZBLA)
Appendix 3 – Planning Report, Ron Davidson

Respectfully Submitted:

Liz Buckton, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner
Date Monday, June 11, 2018
From Robert Armstrong, Director of Development & Environmental Services
Subject OPA12 & Zoning By-law Amendment– 408 Ridge Road (Meaford Golf Course)
Report No. DES2018-27 Roll No. 421049300119900

Recommendation

Be it resolved that By-law 2018-37, being a by-law to adopt Official Plan Amendment No. 12 to the Official Plan for the Municipality of Meaford, be taken as read a first, second and third time and finally passed.

That Council of the Municipality of Meaford

1. Direct staff to bring forward a by-law to amend the Municipality of Meaford Comprehensive Zoning By-law 60-2009, as amended, applicable to Plan 309 Part Lots 1654 to 1659 & 1695 and RP 16R1810 Part of Part 1 & RP 16R3593, Part 1, known municipally as 408 Ridge Road, to facilitate the proposed Phase A redevelopment of the lands, subject to receipt of supportive comments from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority regarding alteration of the Environmental Protection Zone adjacent to the Phase A lands proposed for redevelopment; and

2. Defer consideration of the Zoning By-law Amendment to facilitate the proposed Phase B development until such time that matters raised through agency consultation have been addressed.

Background

An application for Official Plan (OPA) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBLA) has been received from the Owners of the Meaford Golf Course, known municipally as 408 Ridge Road in the Geographic Town of Meaford, now incorporated as part of the Municipality of Meaford.

County of Grey Official Plan Designation:

The County of Grey Official Plan identifies the subject lands as ‘Primary Settlement Area’ and ‘Hazard’. Constraints mapped within the County Official
Plan for the area include a small patch of ‘Significant Woodland’ in the north-west corner of the subject lot which is contiguous with a larger woodland on the lots to the north and west of the golf course. The Hazard designation is generally applied to a number of ponds, watercourses and associated floodplain & slope hazards on-site. Additionally, the County Official Plan identifies the lands as being within the Intake Protection Zone 2 associated with the Water Treatment Plant & Surface Water intake from Georgian Bay. Based on the policies of the applicable Source Water Protection Plan which now include a fuel-storage-focused ‘Events Based Area’ for the Meaford intake, it is not anticipated that further study or consideration is necessary in relation to the Intake Protection Zone constraint – Residential uses are not considered to constitute a significant drinking water threat.

Municipality of Meaford Official Plan Designation:

The Municipality of Meaford’s Official Plan places the subject lands in the ‘Major Recreation’ designation which recognizes the existing golf course use within the urban area of Meaford. No detailed text policies for the Major Recreation designation are included within the Official Plan. Portions of the lands are identified as being within the ‘Environmental Protection’ designation, generally being consistent with the location/extent of the County’s ‘Hazard’ designation on the lands. The local plan also identifies the Significant Woodland and Intake Protection Zone constraints, as described above.

Municipality of Meaford Zoning By-law:

The Municipality of Meaford’s Comprehensive Zoning By-law (60-2009, as amended) places the lands in the ‘Major Recreation (MR)’ and ‘Environmental Protection (EP)’ Zones. The MR zone is intended to be applied to lands that are the site of large-scale, privately operated recreational uses and thus permits a golf course, driving range and ancillary uses on-site. Buildings and Structures are prohibited within the EP zone.

Surrounding Uses:

Surrounding uses to the Golf Course (subject lands) include:

- Residential dwellings, largely being single-detached dwellings on lots within traditional plans of subdivision;
- Vacant lands (to the north) within the urban boundary of the Meaford Primary Settlement Area and identified for future residential development; and;
- Lands designated for Agricultural uses (to the west), falling outside of the urban boundary/settlement area.
Description of Current Applications:

The applications submitted for the subject lands include:

1) An application for Official Plan Amendment (OPA#12) to the Municipality of Meaford’s Official Plan to establish text policies for the Major Recreation designation;
2) An application for Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBLA) to the Municipality of Meaford’s Comprehensive Zoning By-law to facilitate two proposed areas of residential development being Phase A & B on the lands; and,
3) An application for Consent to divide Phase A from the balance of the golf course and to establish necessary easements to facilitate ongoing servicing and access over the parcels once separated.

The OPA creates new text to be inserted into the Official Plan as Section B1.9. This policies proposed would establish the general intent/permission for inclusion of residential uses on the golf course lands, subject to Zoning By-law Amendment and only where specified development criteria can be met.

The ZBLA proposes the creation of site-specific zoning to permit 24 semi-detached dwellings (12 buildings X 2 units) and 16 townhouse or multiple unit dwelling units (4 buildings X 4 units) as Phase A on the lands. The site-specific zones have also been designed to capture the proposed shared access/parking to the golf course and proposed Phase A residential uses and establishes setbacks and standards for the existing and any future structures proposed on the golf course parcel. A minor reduction/alteration to the Environmental Protection zone adjacent to and within the Phase A lands is also proposed.

While the Zoning By-law Amendment application originally submitted requested site-specific zoning to also be put in place for a proposed Phase B residential development (comprised of 31 single-detached dwellings on vacant land condominium lots), based on discussion with the applicant, it has been agreed that a decision on Phase B be deferred at this time, as there are several matters raised through the review of the applications that need to be addressed before proceeding with the zoning for that phase.

The Draft Official Plan & Zoning By-law Amendments (excluding any proposed zoning applicable to Phase B) are affixed to this report as Appendix 1 & 2, respectively. The specific text and mapping for the draft amendments have been developed in an iterative review process between municipal planning staff and the applicant’s consulting Planner, Ron Davidson.
Supporting Documents:

The applications for Official Plan & Zoning Amendment were submitted along with a number of supporting documents, plans and studies:

- Planning report (Ron Davidson, Appendix 4)
- Environmental Impact Study – Initial & Addendum
- Butternut Health Assessment
- Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment Report
- Traffic Study/Comments
- Servicing Report
- Stormwater Management Report
- Plans & Drawings

Additionally, based on comments arising from preliminary engineering review and early staff, agency and public comment, the applicant has submitted:

- Addendum Stormwater Management Report
- Letter from Georgian Bay Golf Academy re: Course Design & Safety
- Pete’s Creek Tributary Hydraulic Modelling Memo

Notification & Public Process to-date:

Applications for Official Plan & Zoning Amendment and related consent/easement applications were submitted to the Municipality of Meaford on August 25th, 2017. These applications were reviewed by Staff and a letter notifying the applicant of ‘Incomplete Application’ was issued on September 22nd, 2017. This letter highlighted several items to be addressed, including the provision of a draft Official Plan Amendment for consideration; additional detail regarding Traffic & Stormwater for the proposed Phase B; and confirmation around unit counts to clarify some disparity between various reports/plans/drawings. At that time, the submitted plans and drawings were provided to the Municipal Engineer – with peer review comments being received back (and forwarded to the Applicant’s Engineer) on October 11th, 2017. The Municipal & Applicant’s Engineers corresponded over the subsequent months, resulting in submission of revised plans & drawings by the Applicant’s Engineer in mid-February 2018 along with an addendum Stormwater Management Report. Based on the amended Plans, Municipal planning Staff & the Applicant’s planning consultant worked together to refine the draft Official Plan & Zoning By-law Amendment documents. Generally supportive comments were received from the Municipal Engineer on March 8th, 2018 with respect to the revised plans and a Notice of Complete Application & Public Meeting was issued on March 19th, 2018. At
that time, the notice and related supporting documents were posted on the Municipal Website for public and agency review.

A number of written comments were received in response to the public notice issued. Additionally, the statutory public meeting was held on April 9th, 2018. A copy of the public comments & public meeting minutes are included as Appendix 3 to this report.

Subsequent to the public meeting and the receipt of comments from the County of Grey and Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, the applicants have also provided a letter from Georgian Bay Golf Academy re: Course Design & Safety as well as a ‘Pete’s Creek Tributary Hydraulic Modelling Memo’ which has been forwarded to the Conservation Authority for review & comment.

### Analysis

In order to approve the proposed amendments, Council must be assured that the application demonstrates consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), conforms to the objectives and directions of the County and Local Official Plans and represents good planning.

The applicant’s Planning Report, prepared by Registered Professional Planner, Ron Davidson provides a discussion of the applicable Provincial, County and Local policies and is attached as Appendix 4 to this report.

### Provincial Policy Statement 2014 (PPS)

The applicable policies of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) are addressed within Section 6 of Mr. Davidson’s Planning Report. Staff concur with Mr. Davidson’s conclusion that the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

### County of Grey Official Plan

The relevant policies of the County Official Plan are discussed within Section 5.1 of Mr. Davidson’s Planning Report. Staff concur with Mr. Davidson’s conclusion that the proposed OPA & ZBLA conform to the County of Grey Official Plan.

The County of Grey, Planning & Development Department provide comments attached within Appendix 3. Their comments focused around the following matters:

- Natural heritage & hazard features on-site, though generally Staff deferred to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry & the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority on these matters;
• Consultation was recommended with First Nation & Metis peoples regarding the Archaeological Report, as will occur via later Condominium application (Phase B)
• Support for provision of a Spray analysis & buffering for adjacent residential uses, if warranted
• Life-lease considerations
• Ensuring that current development does not bias against future development of the remainder of the lands and,
• The nature of the Official Plan Amendment itself, to ensure flexibility for technical justification/review/siting of future phases.

Generally, Staff believe that the items raised have been addressed by the applicant/application:

• Agency/Ministry comments have been provided in relation to the EIS & Butternut Assessment. Detailed comments have been requested from the GSCA regarding the alteration of the Environmental Protection zoning to facilitate the residential development via the related Zoning By-law Amendment. Staff recommend that GSCA support should be received before a decision is made on the Zoning By-law Amendments requested.
• As part of notification of a decision on the Official Plan Amendment, Staff will highlight the Archaeological Report to the First Nation & Metis peoples on the circulation list for such amendments. This report is available on the municipal website for review at their discretion.
• A letter has been submitted by Cameron Burechails (Golf Professional with the Georgian Bay Golf Academy & Member of the Canadian Golf Teachers Federation) which speaks to the proposed re-routing of several holes/greens and associated buffering/safety considerations.
• The applicant has met with County Staff regarding plan of condominium/life lease matters raised.
• The format of the Official Plan Amendment would establish a ‘general principle’ for development rather than area-specific designation on the land and thus will maintain flexibility for siting of future residential uses to be sited based upon detailed technical review to meet the development criteria established by the Official Plan Amendment. In particular, each phase of development shall take into account options for linking services with previous or future phases of development on the golf course property with regard to sanitary sewers, piped water, stormwater management and other services and utilities.

Municipality of Meaford Official Plan

The relevant policies of the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan are discussed within Section 5.2 of Mr. Davidson’s Planning Report. Staff
generally concur with Mr. Davidson’s conclusion that the proposed OPA & ZBLA are supported by the policies of the Municipal Official Plan and Staff are of the opinion that the amendments conform to the relevant policies of the Plan.

Staff wish to provide additional comment with respect to Mr. Davidson’s comments regarding Section B1.1.5 b) of the Official Plan which requires that new development be “easily integrated with surrounding land uses”.

Generally, Staff are of the opinion that the policy relating to ‘integration of uses’ is intended to prompt consideration of how the uses will be compatible and functional alongside existing and proposed land uses in the vicinity. In this regard Staff would suggest that the introduction of fully serviced residential uses in proximity to other residential and supportive uses in the Primary Settlement Area is appropriate and compatible.

With respect to compatibility and integration of the proposed residential uses with the abutting golf course/recreational use, Staff would note that a letter has been submitted by Cameron Burechails (Golf Professional with the Georgian Bay Golf Academy & Member of the Canadian Golf Teachers Federation) which speaks to the proposed re-routing of several holes/greens at the Meaford Golf Course, as well as proposed berming & plantings to ensure safety for the proposed residential development on-site. Should any further recommendations for buffering or mitigation of potential conflicts between the uses arise through detailed site review, or should it be determined that additional advice is necessary via peer review of the golf course design/safety elements, such matters can be addressed via site plan review and can/will be implemented via the related Site Plan Agreement.

In general, and for consideration of future phases of residential development on the lands, the proposed Official Plan policy would require that:

- ‘Dwellings and associated access and amenity areas shall be sited so as to minimize potential conflicts with the surrounding golf course use. Safety and compatibility must be addressed via a rezoning application to facilitate residential development. Related studies (e.g. Golf Ball Spray Analysis, etc...) may be required in support of the application.’
- ‘Each phase of development shall take into account options for linking services with previous or future phases of development on the golf course property with regard to sanitary sewers, piped water, stormwater management and other services and utilities.’

Thus Staff are satisfied that proposed and future residential development on the lands will be compatible and functional alongside existing and future development and thus will ‘easily integrate with surrounding land uses’.
Additionally, Staff would highlight that further to Mr. Davidson’s comments in Section 5.2.5 of his Report regarding anticipated outcomes of the Addendum Environmental Impact Study (EIS) as it relates to Section C8.2 of the Official Plan (Significant Woodlands), the Addendum EIS did in fact confirm that the updated Site Plan demonstrates EIS mitigation aspects and notes, finding that said plan is in compliance with the recommendations of the EIS. Additionally, the Addendum confirmed that MNRF-Owen Sound Office has approved a request for a 25m development setback from the 4 off-site Butternut trees (lands to the North) and confirmed that the proposed 15m watercourse setbacks; west tree corridor and 8m development setback from the woodland to the north remain valid despite the time elapsed since the first study.

Municipality of Meaford Zoning By-law

Considerations relating to Zoning have been addressed within Section 7 of Mr. Davidson’s Report. Within his report, Mr. Davidson outlines the nature of amendments proposed by the applicant, which included use of a Multiple-Residential Exception zone to apply to the whole golf course property within the Major Recreation designation. Staff do not concur with this blanket zoning approach and have worked with Mr. Davidson to create the proposed MR-Exception zone to facilitate the current proposed phase of development. Future phases would require Zoning By-law Amendment which would be evaluated against the policies of the Major Recreation designation.

In addition, the Holding Symbol (H5) is being applied to the property, which requires the execution of a Development Agreement prior to any development occurring.

Matters Raised through Public Consultation

A range of comments were provided in response to public notice of the applications. These were provided both orally at the public meeting and in written format, as noted previously the comments received are included as Appendix 3 to this report.

Staff have reviewed the comments provided and would suggest that they fall into six main themes, as follows:

1) Parking area/access laneway considerations:
   Several of the comments provided by the public speak to concern over the proposed access to Phase A residential uses via a shared laneway with the Golf Course. The public expressed concern relating to compatibility with abutting residences & the potential for conflicts between golf course and residential users.
Staff would note that the laneway and parking area proposed to service the Golf Course and Phase A largely exists, though will be structured and improved under the detailed site design/Site Plan Control process to better accommodate the shared use. A minimum setback of 1.8m is proposed between the parking spaces and north lot line, which abuts the rear yards of adjacent residential lots, fronting onto Fairway Avenue. Typically, fencing or plantings are employed in such scenarios to minimize potential impacts of a parking area on abutting use (to buffer car headlights, for example).

Regarding potential conflicts between users, Staff recommend that through the detailed design phase, design elements be employed to restrict entry of golf carts into the parking area and shared laneway. This intervention paired with the relatively low traffic generation of the residential use and posting of the lane as a fire route, are anticipated to minimize conflicts in this shared use area.

2) Compatibility of Phase A with abutting residences:
Several of the comments provided speak to perceived incompatibility of the proposed semi-detached and multi-unit dwellings with abutting single-detached dwellings. Staff consider mixed-density development within a neighbourhood to be a favourable way to achieve density; a variety of housing types; and, more efficient use of municipal services, provided any established character of the area is maintained and/or complemented.

Staff would suggest that the proposed Phase A development is separated in distance and orientation from the abutting residential lots such that no abrupt impact/change in visual character is anticipated.

Additionally, the broader area around the Golf Course includes a range of residential unit types (e.g. several multi-unit rental, life-lease and condominium developments on Victoria Street, apartment buildings on William, Albert & Parker Streets, along with single-detached dwellings in these locations as well). While the development on immediately abutting lots is predominantly single-detached dwellings, Staff are of the opinion that the proposed Phase A development is in keeping with the broader area’s diversity of unit type and densities.

3) The notion of the Golf Course as ‘green space’:
While the Golf Course certainly provides visual and natural amenity enjoyed by nearby residences, the property is privately owned and is sited within the boundary of the Primary Settlement Area, with availability of municipal water and sewer services to support the proposed redevelopment. Aside from those areas within the
Environmental Protection designation/zoning or having specific natural heritage value, where site alteration/development is prohibited, there is no requirement upon the landowner to maintain the lands as ‘green space’ or in a recreational or natural state.

4) **Traffic volume, speed and lack of pedestrian facilities:**

Arguably the most common comment received from the public was in relation to traffic volumes, speed and lack of pedestrian facilities in the general area. Staff would note that it is expected that the traffic generation from the proposed redevelopment can be reasonably accommodated by Ridge Road/Pearson Street and the abutting roads network, however, Staff acknowledge the concerns of the public with respect to the need for pedestrian facilities in the general area.

Staff propose that this specific matter be addressed in the following ways:

- That via the associated development agreement, a financial contribution be required for sidewalks on Ridge Rd. abutting the Golf Course to connect the proposed Phase A residential development with the existing sidewalks on St. Andrews Drive. A similar requirement was imposed on the Meaford Haven Development were it to proceed.

- That via the upcoming Development Charges Background Study, this area be considered for street urbanization, such that the Development Charges would include an amount to be collected for the installation of pedestrian facilities along Ridge Road when warranted or when upgrades are required.

5) **Construction phase considerations:**

Also raised in response to the public notice, is a comment speaking to construction-phasing concerns, in particular air quality and the raising of dust. These concerns are raised in light of the respiratory illness of the nearby landowner. Staff would note that dust and noise are elements of the construction process, however there are measures imposed under the Development Agreement to help mitigate these impacts, such as the use of mud-mats on-site to prevent spreading of debris onto area roads. Additionally, Staff would note that the proposed access lane and parking area for Phase A/the Golf Course is to be paved, which should minimize dust concerns associated with these uses following the construction phase.

6) **Water service & supply considerations:**

At the public meeting, oral submissions were made noting concern regarding water pressures in the general vicinity of the proposed
development. As part of the detailed design for the development, the applicant will be required to complete water system modelling to demonstrate that the proposed development will not adversely impact adjacent properties and to confirm adequate water pressure for the development. Staff acknowledge existing concerns regarding water pressure in the nearby area and anticipate that the proposed new water booster pumping station at the water tower, coupled with some improvements at the plant will address these issues.

Matters to be addressed via Site Plan & Development Agreement

As noted the proposed Zoning will include the Holding (H5) provisions, which requires to finalization of a Site Plan / Development Agreement prior to any development occurring. The required agreement will address, amongst other matters, the following:

1. Provision of the necessary easements to facilitate the municipal water system, including maintenance access, maintenance responsibilities of the stormwater management facilities on the golf course, sanitary sewer easements over the golf course and access;
2. Detailed Site Plan drawings showing buildings, grading, driveways, lighting, etc.;
3. Requirement to obtain the Site Plan Approval and the necessary Building Permits for the golf course buildings that were relocated without the benefit of any approval;
4. Provision of landscaping and buffering, where deemed necessary. It would be beneficial if this was undertaken in consultation with adjacent residential users. Further it is recommended that garbage enclosure be relocated so as to limit the impact on adjacent residential development;
5. Securities requirements to guarantee the provision of matters required in accordance with the Agreement;
6. Financial requirements including the 5% cash-in-lieu of parkland for the residential property and contribution for a pedestrian trail / sidewalk on Ridge Road.
7. Other matters noted earlier in the report that are appropriately included in the Development Agreement.

In light of the foregoing, Staff are of the opinion that the proposed amendments are is generally consistent with the objectives and directions of the PPS, conform to the County & Local Official Plans, and represent good planning.
Financial Impact

No adverse financial impacts to the Municipality are anticipated.

Implications

Approval of the Official Plan amendment application will introduce the general principle for residential development in conjunction with the Meaford Golf Course. Specific residential development proposals on the lands will be required to meet the development criteria set out by the Official Plan for the lands.

Approval of the Zoning By-law Amendment (Phase A) will facilitate creation of 40 units (single-detached & multi-unit) on the lands, having shared access and parking with the abutting Golf Course use. Additionally, the ZBLA will establish criteria to apply to future building construction/alterations on the Golf Course lands, and will protect a number of natural heritage and hazard features on-site.

Strategic Priorities

This report generally supports the mission, vision and values of the Municipality of Meaford, as well as the goals and objectives set out in Council’s Strategic Priorities 2015-2018.

Consultation and Communications

Notice has been circulated in the manner prescribed by the Planning Act to the following:
- Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
- Grey County Planning Department
- Hydro One Networks Inc.
- Ontario Power Generation Inc.
- City of Owen Sound
- Union Gas
- Municipal Property Assessment Corporation
- Métis Nation of Ontario
- Saugeen Ojibway Nation
- Historic Saugeen Métis
- School Boards
- Rogers – Simcoe Communication
- Canada Post – Delivery Planning
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
- Ministry of Transportation (Dev. Review & Corridor Management Divisions)
- Municipal Clerk’s, Building, Infrastructure (incl. Transportation) Departments
- Meaford & District Fire Department
One hundred and twenty seven property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands were directly mailed notice of the application.

Written and oral comments were received from members of the public and circulated agencies (Appendix 3) and have been considered in formulating the recommendations herein.

Further circulation/communications will occur as prescribed by the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990.

**Conclusion**

It is the opinion of Planning Staff that the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conforms to the County of Grey & Municipality of Meaford Official Plans and represents good planning. Staff recommend Council approve the proposed Official Plan Amendment.

With respect to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (Phase A), Staff note that final supportive written comments have not yet been received from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority regarding the detailed floodplain study provided for the north watercourse (abutting Phase A). Verbal comments have been provided by GSCA Staff indicating that the study findings are generally satisfactory, however Staff recommend that a decision on the Zoning Amendment be deferred until such comments are in-hand to provide justification for the proposed reduction of the Environmental Protection zone, in particular. Subject to receipt of supportive written comments from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, Staff are satisfied that the proposed (Phase A) Zoning Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conforms to the County of Grey & Municipality of Meaford Official Plans and represents good planning.

**Supporting Documentation**

Appendix 1 – Draft Official Plan Amendment
Appendix 2 – Draft Zoning By-law Amendment (Phase A)
Appendix 3 - Written & Oral Submissions Received
Appendix 4 – Planning Report, Ron Davidson Land Use Planning Consultant

Respectfully Submitted:

__________________________
Robert Armstrong, RPP
Director of Development and Environmental Services
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1. BACKGROUND

1.1 The Proposal

The Meaford Golf Course is located on a 42.26 hectare parcel of land within the former Town of Meaford.

The owner is proposing to develop various sections of the golf course for residential purposes in separate phases over the next several years, while keeping the golf course intact.

The first phase (Phase A) will involve 26 semi-detached dwellings (13 buildings X 2 units) and 16 townhouse dwellings (4 buildings X 4 units), for a total of 40 dwellings. The tenure of Phase A will be in the form of a life-lease arrangement, which involves the occupants owning their individual units but leasing the land from the owner of the larger property. This particular development will be severed from the balance of the golf course property. It is the owner's intentions to begin construction in 2017.

The second phase of residential development (Phase B) will comprise 31 detached dwellings in a condominium ownership arrangement. A Vacant Land Condominium will be applied to the property, and the 31 vacant building sites will sold to individual purchasers who will make their own arrangements to build their respective homes.

The developments proposed for Phases A and B are shown in the series of drawings provided by GSS Engineering Consultants Ltd.

The exact nature of the additional future residential development is not known at this time.

1.2 Approvals Required

In order to allow for residential development to occur on the subject property, an amendment to the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan is required. The amendment will essentially have the effect of adding "residential dwellings" as a permitted use in the 'Major Recreation' designation that applies to the subject lands.

A Zoning By-law Amendment is also necessary to change the current 'MR' (Major Recreation) zoning of Phases A and B to a residential zone that would permit detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and multiple residential (i.e. townhouse) dwellings. The rezoning of the future phases will occur when the specific nature of those developments are known. The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment schedule is provided in Appendix A to this Planning Report.
The severance of the Phase 1 lands from the golf course property is desired by the developer in order to keep the life-lease ownership separate from the golf course operations. An easement on the golf course in favour of the Phase A development will also be provided in order to allow for a stormwater management pond associated with the residential development to be constructed and maintained on the golf course lands. The easement will also allow for sanitary sewers and municipal water services to traverse the golf course lands to reach the Phase A development. The proposed lot creation and associated easement are shown on the sketch provided in Appendix B to this Planning Report.

Please note that upon severing the Phase A lands, the existing driveway, some parking and the storage shed associated with the golf course will be located on the new lot. In the short term, the golf course will continue to use these facilities through a leasing arrangement. Eventually, the shed will be removed and the golf course owner will create a new entrance and driveway with a new parking area. This will likely occur when a new clubhouse is erected.

The above-noted applications have been filed with the Municipality of Meaford.

Prior to development occurring in Phase 1, the developer will be required to enter into a Site Plan Control Agreement with the Municipality.

When the developer is ready is to proceed with Phase 2, an application for Draft Plan of Condominium will be filed with the County of Grey. As stated above, the developer intends to establish a Vacant Plan of Condominium. A Site Plan Control Agreement will also be required for this phase.

1.3 Purpose Of This Planning Report

Ron Davidson Land Use Planning Consultant Inc. has been retained by the owner to prepare a Planning Report for the purposes of explaining the proposed development and evaluating it within the context of sound land use planning principles.
2. SUBJECT PROPERTY AND ADJACENT LANDS

2.1 Location and Current Use of Subject Property

The subject lands are located in the southwest quadrant of Meaford.

The 42.26 hectare site has frontage primarily along Ridge Road, and also has three small sections of frontage along Nelson Street West, as shown on Figure 1 to this Planning Report.

The lands are occupied by an 18-hole golf course which includes the clubhouse and a storage building.

Two small watercourses meander throughout the property.

An aerial photograph (2015) showing the subject lands and surrounding area is provided in Figure 2.

2.2 Adjacent Properties

Land uses within the immediate vicinity of the subject property include:

- Residential detached dwellings and forested lands to the north;
- Residential detached dwellings and vacant lands to the east;
- Residential detached dwellings to the south; and,
- Agriculture to the west.
Figure 1: Location Map
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3. BACKGROUND STUDIES

The following background information has been prepared in support of the proposed development:

- Planning Report;
- Environmental Impact Study;
- Servicing Report;
- Stormwater Management Report;
- Archaeological Assessment;
- Traffic Impact Study; and,
- Engineering Drawings.

This Planning Report has been prepared to demonstrate compliance of the various phases of residential development within the context of the County Official Plan, local Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement. This Report provides detailed information only for Phases 1 and 2, and therefore an update to the Planning Report may be required for future phases. This should be stipulated in the text of the Official Plan Amendment.

The Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was completed by Aquatic and Wildlife Services in 2011 and applied to the first two phases of the development. The EIS provides recommendations to protect: the Significant Woodlands located to the northwest; the Butternut trees located on the subject property and adjacent lands; the two watercourses on the property; and, the wildlife corridor linkage in the northwest corner of the site. An addendum to the EIS is forthcoming, and will provide additional information on the status of the Butternut trees and investigate the possibility of new species of concern on the subject property and adjacent lands. The future phases of residential development on the golf course property, beyond Phases A and B, may require a further evaluation of the natural heritage features on the subject property and adjacent lands.

The Servicing Report prepared by GSS Engineering Consultants Ltd. addresses proposed road construction, sanitary sewer extensions, municipal water extensions and stormwater management in a general manner for the developments proposed in Phases A and B. A summary of this information is provided in Section 4 of this Planning Report. An additional Servicing Report will be required for future phases.

The Stormwater Management Report prepared by GSS Engineering Consultants Ltd. was conducted for Phases A and B. An additional report(s) will be required for future phases.
The Archaeological Assessment was prepared by Scarlett Janusas for Phases 1 and 2. The Assessment concluded that neither of the two historical sites nor the diffuse historic scatter on the fairway is considered of such significance to warrant any additional archaeological mitigation. An additional Assessment, however, may be required for future phases.

A Traffic Impact Study was completed in 2007 by Gamsby and Mannerow Ltd. At that time, the proposal involved 12 detached dwellings and 50 townhouses on those lands now shown as Phase A. The Study concluded that the no traffic operational improvements such as separate turning lanes are considered to be necessary. Given that the now-proposed development in Phase A is less intensive than the 2007 proposal, it is safe to assume that Phase A, as now proposed, will not warrant road improvements, and therefore an update to the original Study has not been completed. Prior to Phase B proceeding, or any other phase of development on the golf course property occurring, additional traffic review may be necessary.
4. SERVICING

4.1 Water Supply and Sanitary Sewage

The intended residential development will be serviced with municipal water and sanitary sewers. Capacity is available to provide such services.

The responsibility for maintaining these services will be discussed with the Municipality during the approval process associated with the development of Phase A. Easements in favour of the Municipality will likely be required at the Site Plan Control Agreement stage.

Additional information pertaining to the water and sanitary sewers services is provided in the Servicing Report prepared by GSS Engineering Consultants Ltd.

4.2 Stormwater Management

The two watercourses on the property cross under Ridge Road and join together approximately 35 metres east of Ridge Road to form Pete’s Creek. The drainage from the first two phases of development will enter the northerly watercourse. Minor storm sewers to accommodate the five-year peak storm are proposed along the new roads in Phases A and B, with both discharging to the northerly water course on the property. Two stormwater detention ponds will be required. Additional information regarding stormwater management is provided in the Stormwater Management Report prepared by GSS Engineering Consultants Inc.

4.3 Road Works

The new roads to be constructed in Phases A and B will remain in private ownership, and will not be assumed by the Municipality. The roads will consist of 7.5 metres (width) of asphalt with mountable curb and gutter on each side. Additional information regarding the road construction is provided in the Servicing Report.

4.4 Other Utilities

The new residential dwellings will be serviced with underground hydro, natural gas, telephone, cable television and internet.
5. **OFFICIAL PLAN CONFORMITY**

Land use planning in this area is governed by two Official Plans: (1) County of Grey Official Plan; and (2) Municipality of Meaford Official Plan.

Provided below is an evaluation of the proposed development within the context of the relevant policies from both Official Plans.

5.1 **County of Grey Official Plan**

Various sections of the Grey County Official Plan are relevant to the proposed development including the policies pertaining to the ‘Primary Settlement Area’ land use designation, housing, servicing, the natural environment and cultural heritage. Please consider the following:

5.1.1 **Land Use Designation**

The subject lands are designated ‘Primary Settlement Area’ on Schedule A (Land Use Plan) to the County of Grey Official Plan.

The ‘Primary Settlement Area’ policies acknowledge these fully-serviced urban communities as the focal points for a wide range of development including residential, commercial, industrial, recreational and institutional activities.

With regard to new residential development, Section 2.6.3 *Primary Settlement Areas* states:

> 5. For the City of Owen Sound and the Town of Hanover, it is recommended that an overall average development density of 25 units per net hectare shall be achieved. For all other Primary Settlement Areas, an overall average development density of 20 units per net hectare shall be achieved.

Comment: Phases A and B will yield a total of 79 residential dwelling units, which represents a density of approximately 19 units per net hectare. This density is in keeping with the intent of the above policy, especially given that no dwelling units were actually expected to be developed on this golf course property.
5.1.2 Housing

Section 1.8 Housing Policy of the County Official Plan encourages a wide variety of dwelling types and densities in order to meet the housing needs of the current and future residents of the community.

Included in the housing policies are the following:

| e) housing accessible to lower and moderate income households. In this regard, accessory apartments, semi-detached, duplex, townhouse and low rise apartment units will provide the bulk of affordable housing opportunities and will likely be provided within settlement areas with appropriate levels of servicing being available. Outside of the settlement areas accessory apartments will be the most likely means of increasing housing affordability. |

Comment: The proposed development involves detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and multiple residential units (townhouses). The dwellings will be moderately priced but won’t likely meet the definition of “affordable housing”.

Section 1.8 further states:

| To ensure that sufficient land is designated and available to accommodate the population and unit growth projections as well as to provide a range of housing types and densities, the County and/or the local municipalities shall maintain at all times the ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 10 years through residential intensification and redevelopment and if necessary, lands which are designated and available for residential development. Where new development is to occur, municipalities shall maintain land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a 3 year supply of residential units available through lands suitably zoned to facilitate residential intensification and redevelopment and land in draft approved and registered plans. |

Comment: The proposed development should assist the Municipality in providing a good supply of readily available, serviced, residential land.

5.1.3 Servicing

Section 5.3 Services states the following (edited for relevancy):
1. The provision of a public water supply and the provision of the public sanitary sewer treatment facilities is the preferred method of servicing but shall be provided on the basis that: the systems can be sustained by the water resources upon which services rely; is within the financial capabilities of the municipality; complies with all regulatory requirements of the appropriate approval authority; and protects human health and the natural environment as defined in Section 2.8 of this Plan. Waste water treatment and water supply servicing options must be based on a hierarchy which considers environmental, technical, and long and short term financial factors, to determine the appropriateness of the various servicing options for development.

Local municipalities shall plan for sewage and water services which direct and accommodate expected growth in a manner that promotes the efficient use of existing: municipal sewage services and municipal water services; and, private communal sewage services and private communal water services where municipal sewage and municipal water services are not available. Municipalities shall require the entering into of a responsibility agreement between the owner/operator and the municipality in order to ensure perpetual maintenance of these systems in order to avoid adverse human health and environmental impacts.

2. The following hierarchy of water or sanitary servicing options will be used to evaluate any development applications within the County, except where specific exclusions are made through this Plan or where more detailed policies have developed in a local Official Plan or Secondary Plan. The feasibility of the options will be considered in the following order of priority:

a) Municipal sewage services and municipal water services are the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas;

b) Private communal sewage services and private communal water services, where municipal sewage and municipal water services are not provided and where the municipality has established policies to ensure that the services to be provided satisfies Section 5.3.2(1) of this Plan;

c) Partial services in accordance with Section 5.3.2(11); or,

d) Individual on-site sewage services and individual on-site water services in accordance with Section 5.3.2(8), Section 5.3.2(9), and Section 5.3.2(10).
Comment: The proposed development will be connected to the Municipality’s water system and sanitary sewage treatment system, as preferred by the County Official Plan.

12. In all new subdivisions and other large scale developments, surface water management systems shall be incorporated to prevent on- or off-site flooding or erosion, and to prevent deterioration of environmentally sensitive watercourses. Other developments may also require such systems or studies, as determined by the County or municipality, if runoff from the location could increase existing drainage or water quality problems.

Applicants may be required to submit studies or information relating to:

a) Analysis of pre- and post-development storm runoff and water source flows, erosion, groundwater levels and infiltration;

b) Proposed storm water drainage facilities;

c) Means of controlling erosion and sedimentation;

d) A grading plan for the proposed development; and

e) An assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the water quality of any watercourse or waterbody, including fisheries habitat, and the means of mitigating any potential reductions in water quality.

Comment: The manner in which surface water will be handled is described in the Stormwater Management Report prepared by GSS Engineering Consultants Ltd.

5.1.4 Natural Environment

Section 2.8 Natural Environment of the Official Plan provides detailed policies pertaining to various components of the natural environment. Some natural heritage features have been mapped and incorporated into the Official Plan, including ‘Significant Woodlands’, ‘Significant Wetlands’ and ‘Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest’.

Appendix B to the County of Grey Official Plan recognizes the forested area to the northwest of the subject lands as a ‘Significant Woodland’, as shown on Figure 3 to this Planning Report. Section 2.8.4 Significant Woodlands states:
Figure 3: Appendix B to County of Grey Official Plan (GIS Version)

- Subject Property
- Significant Woodlands
1. No development or site alteration may occur within Significant Woodlands or their adjacent lands unless it has been demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Study, as per section 2.8.7 of this Plan, that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions. The adjacent lands are defined in section 6.19 of this Plan.

Comment: The Environmental Impact Study (2011) has addressed the potential impact of the development on the woodland and has concluded that no impact on this natural heritage feature or its function would result from the development provided an 8 metre natural buffer area is maintained. The forthcoming addendum to the EIS will provide updated information to confirm this conclusion.

5.1.5 Cultural Heritage

The following relevant heritage policies are found in Section 3 Heritage Policies of the County of Grey Official Plan:

5. Development proposals shall conserve significant built heritage properties and significant cultural heritage landscapes.

10. A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment is required for proposed Plans of Subdivision or Plans of Condominium. The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment shall be done in accordance with the Ministry of Culture Guidelines.

12. Local municipalities are encouraged to utilize zoning to prohibit any use of land and the erecting, locating or using of any class or classes of buildings or structures on land that is the site of a known significant archaeological resource in accordance with Section 34(1)3.3 of the Planning Act.

Comment: The Archaeological Assessment prepared in anticipation of the Phase A and B developments concluded that neither of the two historical sites nor the diffuse historic scatter on the fairway is considered of such significance to warrant any additional archaeological mitigation.

5.1.6 Grey County Official Plan Review Summary

It is evident that the proposed development will conform to every relevant aspect of the County of Grey Official Plan.
5.2 Municipality of Meaford Official Plan

5.2.1 Existing Land Use Designations

The Municipality of Meaford Official Plan addresses the unique characteristics, special needs and social and economic aspirations and goals of the Municipality. The Official Plan provides the needed additional policy detail to ensure effective and practical application of the broad County policies.

According to Schedule A (Land Use) to the local Official Plan, the golf course property is designated primarily ‘Major Recreation’, as illustrated on Figure 4 to this Planning Report. Several areas of the property are designated ‘Environmental Protection’. The ‘Major Recreation’ designation applies only to the Meaford Golf Course and is intended to recognize this existing land use activity.

5.2.2 Proposed Official Plan Amendment

In order to permit residential development on these lands, an amendment to the Official Plan is required. During the preconsultation discussions, Municipal Planning staff recommended that the proposed amendment maintain the current land use designations on the subject property, but add “residential dwellings” as a permitted use in the ‘Major Recreation’ areas. Such an amendment would facilitate the development proposed in Phase A and B and would also give consideration to future residential development elsewhere on the subject property subject to future studies be undertaken as required at that time.

5.2.3 ‘Urban Living Area’ Designation

The proposed residential development should be evaluated within the context of the ‘Urban Living Area’ policies of the Meaford Official Plan, which is the land use designation that applies to residential development in Meaford.

Permitted land uses within this designation include detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, multiple residential dwellings, townhouses and apartments. Low density development such as detached dwellings and semi-detached dwellings are generally permitted anywhere within the ‘Urban Living Area’ designation, whereas medium density housing is subject to the following locational criteria:

**B1.1.5 Townhouse, Multiple and Apartment Dwellings**

*In considering a zoning by-law amendment and site plan application to permit a townhouse, multiple or apartment development, Council shall be satisfied that the proposal:*
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Figure 4: Schedule A-1 to Municipality of Meaford Official Plan
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a) respects the character of adjacent residential neighbourhoods, in terms of height, bulk and massing;

b) can be easily integrated with surrounding land uses;

c) will not cause or create traffic hazards or an unacceptable level of congestion on surrounding roads;

d) is located on a site that has adequate land area to incorporate required parking, sustainable design elements, recreational facilities, landscaping and buffering on-site;

e) if large in scale, will not obstruct views of Georgian Bay along streets that terminate at or close to the water’s edge; and

f) can be serviced by municipal sewer and water services

Comment: The proposed multiple residential dwellings will be integrated with the semi-detached dwellings within Phase A of the development, but will not abut any existing residential dwellings located on adjacent lands. The assortment of residential development will easily integrate with the golf course.

The development will not create traffic hazards or an unacceptable level of congestion.

Full municipal services are available to the development.

5.2.4 Servicing

Section D1.2 Preferred Means of Servicing in Meaford Urban Area states the following:

The preferred means of servicing in the Meaford urban area is by full municipal water and sewage services. The existing form of development and extent of servicing arrangements make it feasible to provide or extend municipal water and sewage services to all land use designations pursuant to Section B1 of this Plan.

Prior to the creation of any new lot, approval of any new development or redevelopment or zoning by-law amendment in the Meaford Urban Area, Council shall be satisfied that Municipal Water and Municipal Sewage Systems are available to the lands and that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the use.

Comment: Full municipal services will be provided to this development.
5.2.5 Natural Environment

The forested lands located to the northwest of the subject property are shown as ‘Significant Woodlands’ on Schedule B to the local Official Plan, which reflects the ‘Significant Woodland’ mapping providing in Appendix B to the County of Grey Official Plan, as provided in Figure 3 to this Planning Report.

Section C8.2 Significant Woodlands state (edited for relevancy):

| No development and site alteration is permitted within Significant Woodlands and the associated adjacent lands unless it has been demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Study that there will be no negative impacts on their ecological functions. Fragmentation of the woodlands is generally discouraged. |

Comment: As stated previously in this Report, the Environmental Impact Study (2011) has concluded that the proposed development will have no impact on the adjacent woodland provided an eight metre natural buffer area is maintained. The forthcoming addendum to the EIS will provide updated information to confirm this conclusion.

5.2.6 Official Plan Amendments

Section E4 Amendments to the Plan states the following (edited for relevancy):

c) In addition to the relevant amendment policies of any land use designations, the following shall be considered for any Plan amendment:

i) the rationale or the basis for the change;

ii) the direction provided by the Provincial Policy Statement;

iii) the direction provided by the goals and objectives to this Plan;

iv) the desirability and appropriateness of changing the plan to accommodate the proposed use or action;

v) the impacts the proposed change will have on the character of the area;

vi) conformity with the direction provided by the upper tier plan; and,

vii) that sufficient documentation has been provided to support the proposed amendment including information related to the physical growth of the Municipality, impacts on the economy, the environment, agriculture and social well being of the community.
Comment: The developer proposes to create a series of residential developments throughout the golf course property over the next several years. The dwellings will be established in a very attractive, park-like setting, which will undoubtedly prove to be a desirable and highly sought-after means of accommodation.

Because the ‘Major Recreation’ policies don’t consider residential development as a permitted use, the Official Plan must be amended.

The proposed amendment will uphold the goals and objectives of the Meaford Official Plan and will conform to County Official Plan, as demonstrated in this Planning Report.

The impacts on the character of the area should only be positive. There is no downside to this development in any regard.

5.2.7 Official Plan Evaluation Summary

Based on the foregoing, it is evident that the proposed development is supported by the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan.
6. CONSISTENCY WITH THE PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

Section 3 of The Planning Act (R.S.O. 1990) requires all decisions regarding land use planning matters to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).

The PPS contains several sets of Provincial directives covering a variety of topics that are relevant to this development proposal. Listed below are the relevant policies.

6.1 Settlement Areas

Section 1.1.3 Settlement Area policies state (edited for relevancy):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1.3.1 Settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development, and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.2 Land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) densities and a mix of land uses which:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. efficiently use land and resources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. minimize negative impacts to air quality and climate change, and promote energy efficiency;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment in accordance with the criteria in policy 1.1.3.3, where this can be accommodated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.3 Planning authorities shall identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.3.4 Appropriate development standards should be promoted which facilitate intensification, redevelopment and compact form, while maintaining or mitigating risks to public health and safety.

1.1.3.6 New development taking place in designated growth areas should occur adjacent to the existing built-up area and shall have a compact form, mix of uses and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure and public service facilities.

1.1.3.7 Planning authorities shall establish and implement phasing policies to ensure:

a) that specified targets for intensification and redevelopment are achieved prior to, or concurrent with, new development within designated growth areas; and

b) the orderly progression of development within designated growth areas and the timely provision of the infrastructure and public service facilities required to meet current and projected needs.

Comment: The former Town of Meaford is a recognized settlement area in the County of Grey Official Plan and the local Official Plan. The subject lands are situated within an existing built-up area of Meaford and, as such, the proposal represents infilling. The density of this development is appropriate based on the servicing available, and the style of housing should complement the existing built neighbourhood.

6.2 Municipal Services

Section 1.6 Infrastructure and Public Service Facilities of the PPS states:

1.6.6.2 Municipal sewage services and municipal water services are the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas. Intensification and redevelopment within settlement areas on existing municipal sewage services and municipal water services should be promoted, wherever feasible.

Comment: Full municipal services will be provided to the townhouse development.
1.6.6.7 Planning for stormwater management shall:

   a) minimize, or, where possible, prevent increases in contaminant loads;
   
   b) minimize changes in water balance and erosion;
   
   c) not increase risks to human health and safety and property damage;
   
   d) maximize the extent and function of vegetative and pervious surfaces; and
   
   e) promote stormwater management best practices, including stormwater attenuation and re-use, and low impact development.

Comment: Stormwater management has been addressed in the Stormwater Management Report.

6.3 Natural Environment

Section 2.1 Natural Heritage provides detailed policies aimed at protecting various natural heritage features, as explained in Section 5.1.4 of this Planning Report.

Comment: The EIS (2011) has addressed the natural heritage policies of the PPS. The forthcoming addendum to the EIS will provide updated information to confirm the conclusions of the original study.

6.4 Archaeology

Section 2.6 Cultural Heritage Archaeology states:

2.6 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

2.6.2 Development and site alteration shall only be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential if the significant archaeological resources have been conserved by removal and documentation, or by preservation on site. Where significant archaeological resources must be preserved on site, only development and site alteration which maintain the heritage integrity of the site may be permitted.
Comment: The Archeological Assessment identified no archaeological resources of significance on the subject property.

6.5 **Provincial Policy Statement Evaluation Summary**

Based on the foregoing, it is evident that the proposed development is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.
7. ZONING BY-LAW

7.1 Current Zoning

The subject lands are zoned 'MR' (Major Recreation) and 'EP' (Environmental Protection) according to the Municipality of Meaford Zoning By-law, as shown on Figure 5 to this Planning Report.

The 'MR' recognizes the existing golf course and does not give consideration to residential development.

7.2 Proposed Zoning

A Zoning By-law Amendment is necessary to change the current 'MR' zoning of Phases A and B to a residential zone that would permit detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and multiple residential (i.e. townhouse) dwellings. The rezoning of the future phases will occur when the specific nature of those phases are known.

No zone listed in the Meaford Zoning Bylaw permits detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and multiple dwellings. An 'RM-Exception' zone is therefore being requested for Phases A and B. The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment schedule is provided in Appendix A of this Planning Report.

The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment should allow for 40 dwelling units on one lot in Phase A and 31 dwelling units on one lot in Phase B. The Amendment could also recognize the frontages and areas of Phases A and B.

Furthermore, the Zoning By-law Amendment should apply the lot area, lot frontage, minimum yard requirements and maximum lot coverage provisions that are typically applied to detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and multiple dwellings. In this particular instance, however, the individual "sites" will be treated as "lots" for the purposes of applying these provisions.

A site-specific zoning should be created to allow for single family/semi-detached and fourplex units. This zoning should apply to the whole of the golf course property within the major recreational area.
8. CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed residential development represents a highly appropriate use of this site and will assist in providing an assortment of housing types in Meaford.

As demonstrated in this Planning Report, the proposed development conforms to the County Official Plan and is in keeping with the intent and purpose of the Meaford Official Plan. The proposal is also consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

Based on the foregoing, the submitted applications for Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and consent represent sound land use planning and should be given favourable consideration. No final decisions should be given, however, until the EIS update has been finalized.

Site Plan Control Agreements will be required for each of the phases.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Davidson, BES, RPP, MCIP
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Appendix A: Proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment
Appendix B: Severance and Easement Sketch
Hello,

We are in receipt of your Application for Consent, B09-18 dated September 12, 2018. We have reviewed the documents concerning the noted Application and have no comments or concerns at this time. **Our preliminary review considers issues affecting Hydro One’s ‘High Voltage Facilities and Corridor Lands’ only.**

For proposals affecting ‘Low Voltage Distribution Facilities’ please consult your local area Distribution Supplier.

To confirm if Hydro One is your local distributor please follow the following link:  
http://www.hydroone.com/StormCenter3/

Please select “Service Territory Overly” and locate address in question by entering the address or by zooming in and out of the map.

If Hydro One is your local area Distribution Supplier, please contact Customer Service at 1-888-664-9376 or e-mail CustomerCommunications@HydroOne.com to be connected to your Local Operations Centre.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Helena Targosinski
Good Morning,

Please find attached the Notice of Application and Public Meeting for Consent B09/18 and Minor Variance A10/18 – Meaford Golf Course, along with the related application.

Thank you and have a great day!

Kara Rogers
Planner/GIS Coordinator
Municipality of Meaford
519 538-1060 ext. 1119 | krogers@meaford.ca
Twitter | Facebook | meaford.ca

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail contains legally privileged information intended only for the individual or entity named in this message. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of the communication is prohibited. If this communication was received in error, please notify us by reply e-mail and delete the original message.

This email and any attached files are privileged and may contain confidential information intended only for the person or persons named above. Any other distribution, reproduction, copying, disclosure, or other dissemination is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply email and delete the transmission received by you. This statement applies to the initial
Your File: B09/18
   A10/18

Our File: Meaford Municipality

Ms. Rogers,

The Historic Saugeen Metis (HSM) Lands, Resources and Consultation Department has reviewed the relevant documents and have no objection or opposition to the proposed development, land re-designation, zoning, land severance, Official plan and/or Zoning By-law Amendments.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this matter.

Regards,

Chris Hachey

Assistant Coordinator, Lands, Resources and Consultation

Historic Saugeen Métis
204 High Street
Southampton, Ontario, N0H 2L0
Telephone: (519) 483-4000
Fax: (519) 483-4002
Email: hsmasstlrcc@bmts.com

This message is intended for the addressees only. It may contain confidential or privileged information. No rights to privilege have been waived. Any copying, retransmittal, taking of action in reliance on, or other use of the information in this communication by persons other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please reply to the sender by e-mail and delete or destroy all copies of this message.