

## **C. 5:00 PM Public Meetings / Deputations**

---

Mayor Soever noted under the authority of the *Municipal Act, 2001* and in accordance with Ontario's *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (MFIPPA), The Corporation of the Town of The Blue Mountains wishes to inform the public that all information including opinions, presentations, reports and documentation provided for or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record. This information may be posted on the Town's website and or/ made available to the public upon request.

### **C.1 Statutory Public Meetings**

#### **C.1.1 Public Meeting: Application for a Draft Plan of Subdivision Re: Block 38, RP 16M-24 (Ridge Estates)**

Mayor Alar Soever read the Notice of Public Meeting regarding Subdivision Application that would consider 31 single detached residential units. Mayor Soever noted the legal description is Block 38, Registered Plan 16M-24, Town of The Blue Mountains.

Mayor Soever noted the purpose of the proposed amendment is to change the permitted uses from a maximum of forty two (42) multi-residential uses to thirty one (31) single detached lots plus a private recreation facility serviced by a private condominium road.

Mayor Soever noted the effect of the proposed amendment is to rezone the subject lands from the Residential 'R2-47-h7' Zone, Open Space 'OS' Zone and Hazard 'H' Zone to the Residential 'R1-3-Exception' Zone and Recreation 'REC3' Zone. An Exception to the Residential 'R1-3' zone is requested to increase the maximum permitted height from 8 metres / 2 storeys to 9.5 metres / 2.5 storeys. The Recreation 'REC3' Zone would permit the development of the private recreation facility potentially consisting of a private pool, shared building and visitor parking proposed on Block 32.

Mayor Soever noted the public meeting is an opportunity for members of the public to learn more about the proposed development. Attendees have the opportunity to hear a brief presentation about the development, ask questions, and/or make statements either in favour of, or in opposition to the development.

Mayor Soever further noted under the legislation governing this development process, which is sections 34 and 51 of the *Planning Act*, you have the following rights:

1. Any persons may attend the public meeting and/or make written or verbal representation either in support of or in opposition to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment or Plan of Subdivision/Condominium.
2. If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Town of The Blue Mountains before the zoning by-law is approved or refused, or to the County of Grey before the Plan of Subdivision/Condominium is approved or refused, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decisions of the Town of The Blue Mountains or the County of Grey to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT).
3. If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Town of The Blue Mountains before the zoning by-law is approved or refused, or to the County of Grey before the Plan of Subdivision/Condominium is approved or refused, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the LPAT unless, in the opinion of the LPAT, there are reasonable grounds to do so.
4. If you wish to be notified of the decision by the Town of The Blue Mountains in respect to the approval or refusal of the Zoning By-law Amendment, or the County of

Grey in respect to the approval or refusal of the Plan of Subdivision/Condominium, you must make a written request to the Town or the County.

The Town Clerk spoke noting that the Notice of the Public Meeting was given in accordance with the Planning Act, and in response, comments were received from Historic Saugeen Metis, Hydro One, Wendy Muller, Heather Laidlaw, Fab Corazzola, David Camplin, Ron and Lesley Wilson, and Canada Post.

Andrew Pascuzzo, consultant acting on behalf of the applicant, Solcorp Developments, spoke and identified their project team present. Andrew noted that Grey County, Director of Planning, Randy Scherzer is unable to attend this joint public meeting due to illness. Andrew noted that Grey County is the approval authority for the draft plan of subdivision and draft plan of condominium, and that The Blue Mountains is the approval authority for the zoning by-law amendment.

Andrew spoke regarding the LPAT shortened approval timeline and the restriction on third party appeals of plans of subdivisions, further noting that neighbours do not have appeal rights on a draft plan or subdivision.

Andrew then reiterated what is being requested by the applicant, being a zoning by-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision to create 31 freehold single detached residential units. Andrew noted that an associated draft plan of condominium has also been submitted to create private road allowances as well as a private recreational facility on proposed Block 32. Andrew noted that the lot sizes are between 16m and 20m wide, or 50' to 60' wide, and lot depths of 27 to 40m deep or 90 to 130 feet.

Andrew reviewed the timing of the project and the history of the timeline, noting that the 180 day mark was reached in March 2019.

Andrew reviewed the project team and noted that all reports are available on the Grey County website, and identified the studies completed to date.

Andrew then spoke regarding The Blue Mountains Official Plan 2016, residential recreational and hazard designation and reviewed the plan of subdivision that was approved in the early 2000s. Andrew noted that the current zoning permits 42 dwelling units, with multi-residential units and uses, building structures accessory thereto. Andrew noted that the proposed zoning R1-3-X would permit 31 single detached residential units only, a private road and a private recreation facility.

Andrew reviewed the proposed amenity area, proposed pool and visitor parking area with mailboxes and a shared community building. Andrew then reiterated that the rezoning is required as the plan is currently zoned for multi-residential and an amendment is required to single family dwellings.

Andrew spoke regarding the height increase requested, noting that they are requesting an increase in the permitted height from 8m to 9.5m, further noting that no decision will be made this evening.

Andrew spoke in response to Mr. Camplin's comments regarding neighbouring agricultural uses, and noted that minimum distance separation does not apply as this development is within a settlement area, further noting that his client will install a fence on the western boundary. Andrew spoke in response to the comment regarding the signage being improperly placed and noted that this has been addressed.

Andrew spoke in response to the comments of Ms. Laidlaw regarding the existing condition of the roads and noted that his client requires access through this development and that staff are looking into this as the previous developer went into default. Andrew noted that there will be buffers.

Councillor Sampson spoke questioning if the R1 zone excludes short term accommodation uses and if there will be a notice to this effect registered on title. Councillor Sampson noted that a recreation complex will be expensive and questioned where the request for a recreation complex is coming from. Andrew spoke in response noting that this is a requirement of the Town and that the official plan suggests recreation facilities in the residential designation. Andrew noted that his client would be satisfied to remove the recreation centre and replace with another building lot.

Councillor Matrosovs questioned the fence along the Camplin property and buffers, Andrew spoke in response noting that the applicant will develop to the fenceline.

Councillor Potter spoke questioning how the Town can protect agricultural uses that currently exist. Senior Policy Planner Shawn Postma spoke noting that the fence will create a physical barrier, further noting that there is not much the Town can do to prevent conflicts, including odours, as the minimum distance separation does not apply as the lands are within a settlement area. Shawn noted that these lands have been available for development since 1980, further noting that there was no minimum distance separation at that time. Shawn noted that the Town will do what it can to minimize conflict between the two uses.

Deputy Mayor Bartnicki spoke noting there is concern with people purchasing units that are not familiar with farm practices, including odours. Shawn spoke in response noting that there are tools available, including adding notice of warning clauses, similar to that on developments that border golf courses regarding golf spray, etc. Shawn noted that a notice of warning will be included.

Councillor Matrosovs spoke noting that she toured the neighbouring farm and noted there is reference to farm buildings and cattle grazing along the property line, further noting that we need to also maintain the wildlife corridor in this area, and questioned how we may implement a shared wildlife corridor.

Councillor Uram spoke noting that the condo road allowance is 16m, and questioned the measurement on the access location. Andrew spoke in response noting that the access is a 10m wide entrance, south of Block 40.

Councillor Uram spoke regarding the Right to Farm legislation and questioned how the road will be maintained through the existing subdivision. Shawn Postma spoke in response noting that the existing subdivision was registered in the mid-2000s, but that the roads have not been assumed by the Town. Shawn noted that the developer is in default, so the Town has taken over duties of snowclearing and regular maintenance, but reiterated that the Town has not assumed the road at this point.

Councillor Uram questioned who will maintain the condo road in the subject development, Andrew spoke in response noting that the condominium corporation will hire a private contractor to maintain the roads and garbage collection.

Councillor Uram questioned if the recreation facility can be a building without a pool, Andrew replying yes, further noting that this can be considered and that the applicant will consider what the neighbours, Council and staff want

Mayor Soever questioned the road to the west, Andrew spoke in response noting that this allows for further development should it occur, further noting that there is insufficient space for a public road, being only 10m.

Councillor Uram spoke noting that the condo road accesses the property to the west and if there will be a .3 metre reserve owned by the municipality. Councillor Uram questioned the design potential to replace the road and put a common lot between the property to the

west and the end of the property road. Andrew noted that this is a good suggestion, further noting that snow removal will be the responsibility of the condo corporation.

Shawn Postma spoke noting that the connections on the draft plan are not adapted to provide access to the westerly lands.

Heather Laidlaw, Lot 24 on the adjacent subdivision, spoke noting that the previous developer was involved in her subdivision. Ms. Laidlaw noted that there is one light on her road and that there are children living there, further noting it is difficult to see, the roads are terrible and that the Town continues to place asphalt into the potholes. Ms. Laidlaw expressed concern with the safety, road and lighting as the subject development will be accessed through her development and asked that the concerns of her development be addressed before proceeding with the next development that is beyond her development. Ms. Laidlaw asked that the residents of her development be provided the status of her development, further noting that the owners want to be involved and that the purchasers are entitled to have an understanding of what they are purchasing. Ms. Laidlaw noted that the previous development went into receivership and that the monies put into trust by the previous developer have been taken by the Town. Ms. Laidlaw noted if the Town has the developer's monies that were for the roads, that in her opinion, the Town has assumed the roads. Ms. Laidlaw expressed concern with the snow removal and asked why her road has a different level of snow removal than other roads.

Shawn Postma spoke noting that the Town's Development Engineer is reviewing the development, and the default status. Shawn noted that the road has failed and is being investigated and that there will be a determination of what can be done to correct using the securities. Shawn noted that the Town has not assumed the roads, and that this is more complex as the developer is in default. Shawn noted that a staff report is scheduled for this fall outlining the deficiencies.

Councillor Matrosovs spoke asking if the report will include a calculation of the traffic continuing though this road. Shawn spoke in response noting that this would be a different process, further noting that the report will deal with the original subdivision, including roads, curbs and sewers to bring the development up to a standard. Shawn noted that this report will not include traffic counts, further noting that the current approval allows 42 units, and the proposal is for 31 units.

Bryan Haier, George McRae Road, spoke noting that the school bus travels the road and that the road condition is concerning.

Councillor Sampson noted that the existing owners need to be made aware that the neighbouring developer defaulted and should be provided with the status of what the Town is and is not doing.

As no one further wished to speak, the Mayor declared the Public Meeting to be closed.

### **C.1.2 Public Meeting: Proposed Revisions to Regulating Sewer Discharge By-law 2013-37**

Mayor Alar Soever read the Notice of Public Meeting regarding proposed revisions to regulating Sewer Discharge By-law 2013-37.

Mayor Soever noted the Town is considering revisions to its existing Regulating Sewer Discharge By-Law 2013-37 to address the regulatory framework for high strength and industrial wastewater users.

Mayor Soever noted that by updating the By-Law and incorporating both sanitary and storm sewer discharge criteria, the By-law, if passed, will allow the Town to take a proactive and fiscally responsible initiative to safeguard the Town's infrastructure, public health, property and the environment, now and into the future. Mayor Soever noted the proposed draft