



September 30, 2019

Mr. Scott Taylor, MCIP RPP  
Senior Planner  
County of Grey  
595 9th Avenue East  
Owen Sound, ON  
N4K 3E3

Mr. Trevor Houghton, MCIP RPP  
Manager Community Planning  
Town of The Blue Mountains  
32 Mill St, Thornbury, ON  
N0H 2P0

Dear Mr. Taylor and Mr. Houghton:

**RE: Blue Vista Draft Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment  
Supplemental Materials  
County File: 42T-2019-01  
Town File: P2737  
Our File: 18-2.281**

This is further to Mr. Taylor's May 15, 2019 email request for supplemental planning information, Mr. Postma's June 11, 2019 letter summarizing comments received through the Planning Review Committee process and, our meeting with Town staff on July 9, 2019 in response to Mr. Postma.

As the general approach with applications similar to the subject applications is to hold a joint public meeting (subdivision and zoning) with the Town and County working in conjunction with each other, this letter is addressed to both agencies. To that end, please note that in addition to this letter, we are providing:

1. Tatham Traffic Addendum letter of June 29, 2019. In response to question of 133 units vs 180 units impact of findings. Conclusion is that the additional 17 dwelling units has a minor overall impact with "no appreciable operational impacts on the surrounding road network" (page 2).
2. Tatham July 24, 2019 Response to Shawn's June 11, 2019 on matters relating to design, roads, servicing. Further to Shawn's June 11, 2019 letter we had a meeting with town staff on July 9<sup>th</sup> speaking to the points in Shawn's letter.
3. David Moote Golf Spray Analysis Report dated August 8, 2019 (final issue September 20, 2019). Concluding negligible impact on proposed draft plan lands due to subdivision design, separation, vegetation and play observations and analysis.

Regarding Mr. Taylor's request we refer to item 1, above in addition to the following:

#### A. Planning Justification Report Additional Information Per County Comment

##### *Planning Act:*

##### Section 2 – Matters of Provincial Interest

In addition to Section 2 to the Planning Act directs that among others, a Council of a Municipality shall have regard to matters of provincial interest. Section 2 identifies 20 such matters ( 2( a) through( s)).

Clearly it is the responsibility of the respective bodies identified under Section 2 to determine how regard to such matters is accounted for in making any decision on a planning matter. It is respectfully positioned that by virtue of the approved status of the Official Plans of both the County and the Town that most matters have been addressed in that the subject lands are designated in both Official Plans for development on full municipal services. In other words, the principles of land use development are clearly established. Nonetheless, for ease of reference, the following is provided (reference to each subsection per the Section 2 to the Planning Act):

- (a) Addressed through the underlying land use designations in the Official Plans. Also, as identified and addressed through submitted EIS and engineering reports.
- (b) Addressed by virtue of the approved land use designations.
- (c) Addressed through the approved land use designations and submitted reports and studies.
- (d) Addressed through the Archaeological Stage 1 and 2 report as submitted with the applications.
- (e) Addressed through utilization of existing municipal infrastructure.
- (f) Per (e) above.
- (g) Per (e) above.
- (h) Per (c) above. (h.1) to be addressed at building permit stage through compliance with the Ontario Building Code among others.
- (i) Per (c) above.
- (j) Provision of relatively small lots (in context of existing and approved developments in the immediate area) and potential for semi-detached dwelling types.
- (k) Not applicable.
- (l) The proposed development is in accordance with approved Official Plan policies, is subject to imposed Development Charges and, will be subject to standard MPAC valuations and property tax requirements.
- (m) To be met through established, coordinated public review, comment processes under provisions of the Act and in accordance with municipal standards.
- (n) Per (m) above.
- (o) Per (c) and (m) above.
- (p) Per (a) above.
- (q) Addressed through subdivision design that will enable transit route connections and coordinated public walkway and trail connections to the broader community.
- (r) Addressed through subdivision design implementing broader Official Plan policy in addition to design and build standards per (a) above.

(s) Per (q) above.

**Section 51 (24)** requires that consideration of a draft plan of subdivision shall have regard for several additional matters. These are considered as follows:

- (a) See above.
- (b) Addressed by approved Official Plan and municipal servicing schemes.
- (c) Addressed in the Planning Justification Report submitted with the application.
- (d) Addressed by the approved Official Plan land use designations along with the supporting engineering reports and studies. (d.1) – not applicable.
- (e) Addressed in the submitted engineering servicing and traffic reports.
- (f) Addressed in the subdivision design that accounts for accepted municipal zoning By-law performance regulations for residential lots. Subject lots are consistent with accepted standards and are similar to several approved subdivision plans within the municipality.
- (g) Addressed in the proposed zoning By-law to implement the proposed draft plan of subdivision.
- (h) Addressed through submitted EIS and engineering studies with appropriate lands set aside for conservation, drainage and flood control measures.
- (i) Addressed in the engineering reports submitted that conclude subject lands can be serviced with existing infrastructure.
- (j) To be addressed through response from School Boards.
- (k) Appropriate lands and location accounted for in the draft plan of subdivision as a result of subdivision design in accordance with engineering and EIS report conclusions.
- (l) Addressed through subdivision design enabling transit connections along with pedestrian connections to adjacent existing and future developments.
- (m) Subject lands subject to site plan control measures in accordance with the municipal Site Plan Control By-law.

### *Grey County Official Plan*

**Section 6.12.1** directs that the proponent of an application for subdivision shall “consider and prepared to justify” several matters. With reference to the Official Plan in effect at time of application the following is respectfully submitted:

- (a) This part deals with subdivision layout. Sub parts (i) through (xii). The proposed layout accounts for municipal standard road configurations and rights of way that provided for vehicular and pedestrian connectivity. Provisions for municipal sidewalks and off road trail connections in addition to a transit supportive road layout assist in non-car transportation options and “walkability”. Public parkland and open space are significant component and attributes to the proposed draft plan.
- (b) Is addressed through provision of small lot single detached and semi-detached dwellings.
- (c) Is partially addressed through (b) above. There is no proposal for a home for the aged or assisted living as the subject location lacks appropriate support/ancillary services for such uses. In addition, the area in which this draft plan is located is prioritized in planning policy as oriented to active lifestyles associated with the predominant recreational foundation of the immediate community.

- (d) This is partially addressed through proposed small lot single and semi-detached dwelling units. Nonetheless, the subject of affordable housing in terms of land use and land use policy remains vague in terms of definitions and directions.
- (e) This is addressed in the submitted Planning Justification Report.
- (f) These requirements are addressed in the Planning Justification Report which summarizes the formal preconsultations along with requirements for required studies. Required studies in support of the application were identified and summarized in the Planning Justification Report and were provided at time of application.

#### *Traffic Impact Study Additional Information Per Request*

See attached Tatham reporting letter dated June 29, 2019 (item 1, page 1 above). Additional units accounted for in an updated analysis concluding no material changes to original conclusions.

### **B. TBM PLANNING REVIEW COMMITTEE COMMENTS – JUNE 11 2019 TBM LETTER**

The June 11, 2019 letter advises that prior to scheduling a Public Meeting that Planning Staff are looking for “confidence” in the proposed lot and block layout for the Draft Plan. The letter states that at a minimum the following are required:

- Clarification on the potential road re-design of Street ‘B’ (cul-de-sac)
- Clarification on the Stormwater Management design
- A golf spray analysis

The aforementioned Tatham Engineering letter dated July 24, 2019 addresses the first two items on a point by point basis. The third item is addressed by the David Moote Golf Spray Analysis report. Both documents are appended to this letter submission. These items clearly demonstrate that the proposed lot and block layout are clearly technically supported.

The potential road re-design of Street ‘B’ would occur primarily as a result of deleting one or both of the proposed cul-de-sacs. At the July 9, 2019 meeting with Town Staff (in response to the June 11, 2019 letter) our engineers pointed out that the cul-de-sac design complies with adopted Town engineering standards regarding maximum number of units on a cul-de-sac and in terms of road right of way standards. Regarding the maximum number of units on a cul-de-sac, town standards could permit up to 80 dwelling units whereas the subject proposal would result in 42. In addition, it was pointed out that the proposed design does not preclude servicing looping and connectivity options. We also made the point that the cul-de-sac design allowed for a more efficient lotting arrangement: to eliminate the cul-de-sacs would require provision of two road linkages to Street ‘A’ the effect of which would be to increase the amount of public right of way road lengths and reduce lotting yield.

Regarding Stormwater Management design matters, the July 24, 2019 Tatham response letter itemizes a detailed response to each of the sub-points ‘a’ through ‘y’ in the June 11, 2019 town letter. In summary, the proposed block and lotting layout is supported. Overall, the response reiterates that

the proposed plan reduces downstream flooding, reduces peak flows along Silvercreek, meets MTO design flood criteria, and requested design detail will be provided as a matter of course through required and subsequent design and engineering submissions associated with municipal subdivision agreement provisions.

Regarding the Golf Spray Analysis, David Moote undertook on site observations, on-site interviews and detailed analysis through the summer of 2019. Mr. Moote concluded that there would be no impact of golf course play affecting the proposed lots backing onto the golf course. Notwithstanding this, our proposed By-law amendment would result in an increased rear yard requirement of 15m for lots backing onto the golf course.

#### *Other TBM Matters of June 11, 2019*

Regarding comments on Parks and Trails (Item 2), it is acknowledged that an arborist report addressing hazard trees on blocks to be dedicated to the Town will be undertaken as a condition of Draft Approval. Regarding trails, the opportunity for trail connections and recognition of broader community trail linkages was part of the original subdivision design approach. It was understood that detail on trail connections and linkages requires further discussion with the town and implementation through the subdivision agreement.

Regarding archeological we confirm that an archeological Stage 1 and 2 was completed with copy provided under separate cover. The conclusion is that the lands are "considered to be free of archeological material of further cultural heritage value or interest".

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Appropriate additional engineering information has been provided to the point that the proposed Draft Plan and implementing zoning By-law can be considered reasonable in terms of land use, scope and scale. This information confirms the draft plan is technically supported.
2. We have undertaken to provide additional information and design detail normally required during later design stages of reviews and approvals (i.e., Subdivision Agreement).
3. Major impacts on the proposed subdivision layout would occur through reconsideration of the proposed cul-de-sacs. Our position is that the cul-de-sacs conform to town Engineering Standards (2009) Section 4.5.13. There appears to be no bona-fide engineering/servicing related imperative justifying staff's request to delete the cul-de-sacs. It was acknowledged at our meeting with Staff the deletion was staff's "preference". Apart from the technical matters, deletion of the cul-de-sacs would result in loss of units. Therefore, in the absence of quantitative and objective data to the contrary, we maintain the cul-de-sac design is appropriate.
4. The Golf Spray analysis confirmed that the subject lands are not affected by golf play.

In light of the above-noted and in consideration of the attached supplementals we respectfully suggest there is ample and justifiable reason to continue with the legislated planning process resulting in the required Public Meeting. This additional information supports our initial submission materials that were based on the scoped preconsultation exercises undertaken prior to formal applications.

We ask that your respective agencies schedule the required Public Meeting(s) as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we are committed to continuing to work with Staff in order to provide necessary detail that are normally addressed as we proceed to final designs. We respectfully reiterate that our position is that we have provided sufficient supplemental information to support a Public Meeting.

Yours Truly,



Travis & Associates  
Colin Travis, MCIP RPP

Cc: Nathan Westendorp, TBM Planning Director  
Randy Scherzer, County Planning Director  
Shawn Postma, Planner, TBM  
Royalton Homes  
Jeremy Acres, Tatham Engineering