



Minutes

The Blue Mountains, Council Meeting

Date: September 19, 2022
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Location: Town Hall, Council Chambers and Virtual Meeting
32 Mill Street, Thornbury, ON
Prepared by: Kyra Dunlop, Deputy Clerk

Members Present: Mayor Alar Soever, Councillor Paula Hope, Councillor Andrea Matrosovs, Councillor Rob Sampson, Councillor Bill Abbotts

Members Absent: Deputy Mayor Peter Bordignon, Councillor Jim Uram

Staff Present: CAO Shawn Everitt, Director of Operations Shawn Carey, Director of Community Services Ryan Gibbons, Director of Finance & IT Services Ruth Prince, Director of Legal Services Will Thomson, Director of Planning and Development Services Adam Smith

A. Call to Order

A.1 Traditional Territory Acknowledgement and Moment of Reflection

We would like to begin our meeting by recognizing the First Nations, Metis and Inuit peoples of Canada as traditional stewards of the land. The municipality is located within the boundary of Treaty 18 region of 1818 which is the traditional land of the Anishnaabek, Haudenosaunee and Wendat-Wyandot-Wyandotte peoples.

A.2 Council Member Attendance

Mayor Soever called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. with all members in attendance except Deputy Mayor Bordignon and Councillor Uram who sent their regrets.

Mayor Soever called for a moment of silence to recognize the passing of Queen Elizabeth II.

A.3 Approval of Agenda

Moved by: Councillor Matrosovs
Seconded by: Councillor Bill Abbotts

THAT the Agenda of September 19, 2022 be approved as circulated, including any items added to the Agenda.

Yay (5): Mayor Soever, Councillor Hope, Councillor Matrosovs, Councillor Sampson, and Councillor Bill Abbotts

Absent (2): Deputy Mayor Bordignon, and Councillor Uram

The motion is Carried (5 to 0, 2 absent)

A.4 Declaration of Pecuniary Interest and general nature thereof

NOTE: In accordance with the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act* and the Town Procedural By-law 2021-76, Council Members must file a written statement of the interest and its general nature with the Clerk for inclusion on the Registry.

None

B. Public Meetings (1:00 p.m.)

B.1 Public Meeting: Proposed Plan of Subdivision at 24 Alfred Street

Mayor Soever noted that this was a Public Meeting regarding a proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and site-specific Zoning By-Law Amendment for Town Plot Park, Part of Lots 5 & 6, N/E Alfred Street, Plan 107; Part of Lots 5 & 6 Reference Plan 16R-10171; Parts of 2 to 4; and Part 1, Plan 107, Part of Lot 6, Registered Plan 16R-10171, Part of Lot 33, Concession 10. Mayor Soever noted that the Draft Plan of Subdivision proposes to create seventeen (17) residential dwellings, eight (8) of which are semi-detached residential units and nine (9) are single detached units. The proposed lots will be located along a condominium road. In addition to the residential units, a stormwater management block would also be created. The lands are currently zoned Residential One 'R1-1'. The application proposes to re-zone a portion of the lands to Residential Density One Exception (R1-1-XX) Zone to permit a reduced lot frontage on one lot facing Alice Street West. To rezone a portion of the lands to Open Space Zone abutting Alice Street and Alfred Street. To rezone a portion of the lands to Residential Density two (R2) to permit semi-detached dwelling units, and to maintain a portion of the lands as Residential Density One (R1-1) Zone which permits single detached dwellings.

Mayor Soever noted that this Public Meeting is an opportunity for members of the public to learn more about the proposed development, and that the moderator will keep the meeting in order and allow the applicant (and their development team), the public, and members of Council to speak and ask questions. Mayor Soever noted that no decisions are made at this meeting, it is simply an opportunity to learn and provide feedback and that individuals must make a request in writing if you wish to receive a notice of any decision of Council on this proposal.

Mayor Soever noted that if a person or public body would otherwise have an ability to appeal the decision of Council of The Town of The Blue Mountains or County of Grey to the Ontario Land Tribunal, but the person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to Council before the by-law is passed, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision and that they also may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Tribunal, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

The Deputy Clerk advised that Notice of the meeting had been given in accordance with the Planning Act and that comments had been received. The Deputy Clerk read aloud the comments received from Blue Water District School Board, Canada Post, Ontario Lands, Historic Saugeen Metis, Hydro One, Enbridge Gas, Saugeen Ojibway Nation, Wendake, Bell, County of Grey, Jennifer O'Brien, Peter Butler, Terry McWhirter, Virginia Jamieson, Karen and Glenn Goldenapple, Jacqueline Van Strien, Michele Vaughan and Renato Allesandrini, Andrea Nicholls, Catherine Milne, Stephanie Fletcher, Paul Fletcher, Peggy Holden, Don Parks, Matthew Morton, Stephanie James, Bruce and Charlene Stewart, and Lorraine Sutton.

Hiba Hussain, Grey County Planner, provided an overview of their presentation. Hiba noted that she would be presenting on behalf of the Town and County an application for a Zoning By-law amendment and a Plan of Subdivision that was submitted for 24 Alfred Street West. Hiba noted that Krystin Rennie, the applicant's agent, was in attendance today to represent the development team. Hiba noted that the application submitted to date is a Zoning By-law amendment with a file number P3195; a Plan of Subdivision filed with the Town was file number P346, and a Plan of Subdivision submitted with the County with file number 42T200201. Hiba noted that the lot area of the subject property is approximately 10,941 square metres equivalent to approximately 1.09 hectares. Hiba noted that the application was received in February 2022, and Town and County staff had deemed the application incomplete as the draft plan needed some revisions. Hiba noted that the applicant's team re-submitted the application in June 2022 and the application was deemed complete on June 29, 2022. Hiba noted that the Public Meeting was being held to hear comments from the public and Council, and that the next step would be continued review by staff of the application in regards to the submitted reports and studies as well as public comments received today, which would then be assessed against the planning documents including the Provincial Policy Statement, local and County Official Plans and the Town Zoning By-law. Hiba noted that once the review is completed staff will bring a report to the Committee of the Whole recommending either refusal or approval of the Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment. Hiba noted that the date to bring a follow-up staff report had not yet been determined. Hiba provided an overview of an aerial photo of the subject property. Hiba noted that the property is bound by Alice Street to the east, Alfred Street to the west, Elma Street to the north and Bruce Street to the south. Hiba noted that the access to the property is currently off of Alfred Street West but there is proposed access off of Alice Street if a condominium road is approved on site. Hiba noted that the subject property is currently designated Hazard and Community Living in the Town's Official Plan, and this designation is intended to allow for planned development on full municipal services in a primary settlement area such as Thornbury. Hiba noted that permitted uses within these designations including single-detached, semi-detached, duplex, townhouses, multiple and apartment dwellings and accessory apartments. Hiba noted that the permitted density ranges include for single-detached 10 to 20 units per hectare; for semi-detached 15-25 units per hectare; and the maximum height permitted was 2.5 storeys. Hiba noted that the current zoning of the subject property is R1-1, and the zoning currently permits single-detached dwelling, accessory apartments, group homes, home child-care, or home businesses. Hiba noted that the proposed Zoning By-law amendment would re-zone the entirety of the subject property from R1-1 to R1-1, so the lots highlighted in white in the slides would continue to maintain the R1-1 zone, and the lots highlighted in orange in the slide would be re-zoned to R2 which would permit semi-detached dwellings. Hiba noted that the lots highlighted in green would be re-zoned to Open Space and the lots highlighted in yellow would be rezoned to R1-1 Exception, which will allow for a relief from the minimum lot frontage requirement which is 18 metres, where the proposed lot frontage for Lot 7 is 17.3 metres. Hiba noted that the proposed Plan of Subdivision includes 17 residential units, 8 of which are semi-detached and 9 being single-detached. Hiba noted that the proposed lots will be located among a condominium road and the plan will include a stormwater management block. Hiba noted that Lot 7,6,5,4,3,11, 10,9 and 8 are all single-detached dwellings with the stormwater block located along Alice Street West. Hiba noted that Lot 13, 12, 2 and 1 will be semi-detached units, and Block 15 and 16 will

be Open Space, and all of these will be located along Street A which is a condominium road.

Krystin Rennie, the applicant's agent, provided an overview of their presentation. Krystin noted that Gord and Holly Stone, the property owners, were also in attendance today and that they live on the subject lands right now and are residents of Thornbury. Krystin noted that the purpose and effect of the Public Meeting was to consider a draft Plan of Subdivision for a residential development which contains 9 single-detached dwellings and 8 semi-detached dwellings, as well as a Zoning By-law amendment which will implement the draft Plan of Subdivision specifically related to the semi-detached dwellings. Krystin noted that support documents submitted as part of the application included a planning justification report, a draft Plan of Subdivision and a Functional Servicing Report, Stormwater Management Report and Traffic Impact Study which are currently being reviewed by the Town. Krystin noted that they had also completed an archaeological assessment and a Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment which identified that there were no contaminants located on the property. Krystin noted that they had also concluded with a geotechnical report which is before Town staff as well. Krystin noted that the proposed Plan of Subdivision includes a condominium road, 17 units within 13 lots, with one lot on Alice Street which is already existing, and so technically 16 new residential lots are being proposed. Krystin noted that the proposed density is 20 units per gross hectare which is a requirement and access to the site is via Alfred and Alice Street. Krystin noted that Grey County Official Plan designates the property as primary settlement area. Krystin noted that the County noted that primary settlement areas are areas suitable for high intensification targets, public services and will have development within full municipal services, and that the primary settlement area will have a full range of residential, commercial, industrial, recreational and institutional uses. Krystin noted that the County Official Plan also states that the primary settlement area will be the focus of the majority of the growth within the County and requires that the primary settlement area have a minimum density of 20 units per hectare for new development. Krystin noted that the Town Official Plan designates the property as Community Living and is within the primary settlement area, and includes a requirement for a density of 20 units per net hectare within settlement areas in the Town of Thornbury-Clarksburg. Krystin noted that with respect to the County and Town Official Plan there are two types of policies within the Official Plans; one being prescriptive, which means it is required, and that is the density policy regarding the 20 units per hectare; and the second being that other policies are encouraged by goals and policies. Krystin noted that the property is currently zoned R1-1 and the permitted uses include single detached dwellings at this time. Krystin noted that the applicant was asking for 3 amendments to the Zoning By-law; the first being the re-zoning of the semi-detached lots from R1-1 to R2 as the lots are currently not permitted within the R1-1 Zone; to re-zone lot 7 to reduce the minimum lot frontage from 18 metres to 17.3 metres; and to re-zone Open Space landscaped area in the stormwater management from R1 to Open Space. Krystin provided an overview of the images in the presentation showing the development in relation to how it would fit within the existing area.

Mayor Soever noted that in the staff report it mentioned some of the area was zoned Hazard but he did not see a Hazard Zone on any of the maps. Mayor Soever noted that the County presentation made reference to an area being re-zoned from Hazard. Krystin Rennie noted that she was unaware that there was any Hazard zoning on the property. Hiba noted that this was included in error and advised that

there were no hazards on the property. Mayor Soever noted that regarding the stormwater management block on the northeast side where the water would be discharged to. Krystin noted that the stormwater management block contains a buried structure, so it would not be an open pond and the intent is to capture the water and release it in a timely manner into the municipal system. Mayor Soever asked if that would be designed for a new 100-year storm. Krystin noted that she would refer that inquiry to the engineer. Mayor Soever noted that when we get a heavy rainfall on our main street there is no capacity to move the water until the rain stops, and that he was hoping that there was an adequate reserve on the subject property. Krystin noted that the developer would like the sewer system to be municipally serviced and were in the process of having those documents reviewed and were working with Town staff. Mayor Soever asked if the snow plowing and removal on the condominium road would be the responsibility of the condominium corporation, and Krystin confirmed that. Mayor Soever noted whether insurance providers would be able to get insurance in the future which poses a problem.

Councillor Sampson noted that this Council had not been a huge fan of condominium roads for the reasons expressed by the Mayor, the least of which would be the municipal infrastructure under a condominium road that makes for a complicated relationship. Councillor Sampson noted that he was assuming it was a condominium road because the setback was needed for the extra lots to comply with the density. Krystin confirmed that and also noted that it was needed for the access from Alfred Street. Councillor Sampson asked if the developer could provide Council with the price range for the units. Krystin noted that since they were at the beginning of this project and the design had not been finalized yet that there was not a price point at this time. Councillor Sampson noted that there was a Provincial Policy obligation as a Council to enforce and implement a minimum target for affordable housing and that they would be looking for this project to have that.

Councillor Matrosovs asked where in the subject property the snow storage would be located, because her concern would be that the snow could not be pushed off from the condominium road to the municipal roads on either sides. Krystin noted that there were some Open Space areas that could include some snow storage, but if that does not work then it would be the condominium corporations' responsibility to move the snow offsite. Councillor Matrosovs asked what was the anticipated way to address visitor parking when there were more cars than could fit in the driveways. Krystin noted that they were in discussions with the municipality about possibly having parking on one side of the street. Councillor Matrosovs noted with regards to the stormwater management that there were significant tree root system in the subject property, which was a natural asset already providing for stormwater management, and asked what is the anticipated utilization of the current natural assets that are available that would offset needing to build and reinvent stormwater management to accommodate the infill. Doris Casullo, from Tatham Engineering, noted that there would be grassed areas and swales which will promote some infiltration back into the ground. Doris noted that the stormwater management facility is an underground structure discharging from 5 year to 100 year storm events to the Alice Street stormwater system. Doris noted that no discussions around water balance arose from the engineering discussions. Councillor Matrosovs noted that several comments had come in around concerns about 100 year storms and how excess water in the area will be managed, and asked what discussion had been had with the Town regarding stormwater management and that rather than having to construct the stormwater management what was being done to use the existing

natural assets. Councillor Matrosovs noted that if the trees were being removed how was that being compensated for. Doris noted that the land was pretty flat right now and in order to make the subdivision work with the lots they anticipated some re-grading which would then be conveyed to the stormwater management pond without effecting neighbouring lands. Doris noted that they were also investigating how to ensure they were not negatively impacting existing residences, and that with respect to groundwater conditions it was approximately 4 metres below surface. Doris noted that there would be some landscaping done to replenish the trees that may need to be removed but as of this point not knowing exactly where the trees are, it was thought most of the trees would be removed. Councillor Matrosovs noted that in studying the GIS mapping from 2010, 2015 and 2020 there was a tree there that was older and asked what was being done to work around that particular tree. Krystin noted that they would have a look and follow up. Gord Stone, the applicant, noted that he came from a tree-farming background and would keep any trees that he could. Gord noted that if anyone had seen their previous developments in the past he kept as many trees as he could.

Councillor Hope noted that her first concern was also around the trees and wanted to know how many trees would be lost. Councillor Hope noted that we wanted to maintain our natural environment. Councillor Hope noted that Council had also had discussions about attainable housing and about the role of secondary suites, and that in Collingwood they are doing a project of 100 secondary suites, and in Barrie they had two projects around this. Councillor Hope asked what though had been given to secondary suites, even if they were like the Whistler model where they were roughed into the homes. Krystin noted that there were opportunities in the single-detached dwellings to have secondary units but had not gotten that far into the design process. Krystin noted that the semi-detached homes provide for a less expensive type of unit type on the properties. Councillor Hope asked what would be done with the Open Space as proposed. Krystin noted that that land would be planted and landscaped, and from a parkland perspective they would be looking to do cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication. Krystin noted that most municipalities do not like small parks that they have to manage so they would be providing the cash-in-lieu to go to the more regional parks that are within close proximity of the development.

Virginia Jamieson, resident, noted that she supported smart, ecologically friendly development and that it is essential for the community and its future. Virginia noted that the subject proposal and re-zoning application was not smart or ecologically friendly. Virginia noted that the lead engineer just said that all the trees would need to be cut down and this was heart-breaking. Virginia noted that she had consulted with a progressive planner who stated that the proposal threatens the ecological integrity of the community and is not in keeping with the local vernacular of the neighborhood design, appears to be excessive and will use every square inch of available lands at the cost of the environment, the neighbours and the character of the community. Virginia noted that the Ministry of Natural Resources has identified 5 species of special consideration that have documented habitat within the site, one endangered, two threatened and two having special concern. Virginia noted that there needed to be more attention on the butternut trees and if a tree can be saved it should be, and there should be specific trees factored in and identified and planned around. Virginia noted that the soil study also identified soil as brightened sands sources by a 1954 document, and that this was potentially incorrect and should be analyzed. Virginia noted that current residents living there do recall hazardous materials that were repeatedly sprayed across the entire build area, and

when things are unearthed during the build process and given all of the water in this site, the hazardous materials could be leached in the neighbouring homes. Virginia noted that before continuing with the proposed development and re-zoning the following should happen: a species at-risk assessment to ensure compliance with the 2007 Endangered Species Act; a full environmental impact study should be completed; extensive soil study and analysis across the entire site. Virginia noted that some of neighbouring homes are very close to the area that will be unearthed. Virginia noted that based on the drawings shown at the meeting that there were a couple of trees shown to be planted around the houses, in particular one tree per lot, and asked where are the green corridors and the natural green boundaries between the development and the existing houses. Virginia noted that those will not be able to exist with the proposed development and that this is not in character with the Town. Virginia asked why the development needed to be built right up to every property line stripping out all the nature, and if that is really required. Virginia asked how this is a progressive plan given that it does not support biodiversity and the ecological values of our community. Virginia noted that today we have a forest that is serving as a natural corridor enabling nature to move, and that nature needs to move, and it enhances the Town's ecological value. Virginia noted that the re-zoning and the plan, if accepted, would tear down the balance of our natural corridor in a very visible part of Town and will tip the ecological balance as not a stitch of the forest will remain. Virginia noted that Council and the Town should not be able to determine the feasibility of the proposed development based on the information provided, nor approve a zoning change at this time, and that a lot more consideration for the environment needs to be put in place.

Kelly Nichols, resident, noted that his concern is that if this development were to move forward that he would look for assurances that there would be no cost to the current homeowners if there are any damages throughout the development.

Jacqueline Boland, resident, noted that she had a number of concerns relating to this development. Jacqueline noted that her presentation would be focusing on the density being suggested on the property. Jacqueline noted that density was approved under a prior zoning change to allow the Town to retain control of the development moving forward. Jacqueline noted that amending the zoning opens up the possibility of increased density beyond the proposed site plan to not just semi-detached, but townhouses, triplexes, duplexes and multiple dwellings. Jacqueline noted that even if such higher density were not approved in a site plan by the Town the developer then has a greater chance of applying to the Ontario Land Tribunal and achieving the higher density. Jacqueline noted the decision to mend the zoning to R1 was decided upon to avoid just this. Jacqueline noted that both R1 and R2 zoning allow for accessory apartments, which would effectively double density. Jacqueline noted that to bring the density potential to this area for 34 units is more like an apartment-level equivalent density being constructed entirely inside an existing neighborhood block. Jacqueline noted that the justification report does not address this potential additional density. Jacqueline noted that higher density units, accessory apartments and coach-houses are much more likely to be used for short term accommodation or seasonal vacation rentals. Jacqueline asked how low-impact design was being addressed. Jacqueline noted that R2 zoning allows for single short term accommodation every 120 metres, and that this is entirely inappropriate for the residential neighborhood and we would request registry on title prohibiting short term accommodation. Jacqueline noted that the proposed lots are significantly narrower and shallower than the surrounding lots, and that developments and

intensification when done well focus higher density segments on the main arteries, not on the interior parcels. Jacqueline noted that this reduces impact on existing neighborhoods directly affected by the development. Jacqueline noted that the configuration of the proposed development has limited frontage on existing roadways and has the increased density portions located inside an existing neighborhood block as a result, and that special consideration is required for density here. Jacqueline noted that the Town undertook a density and intensification study in February 2022 and identified 214 Alfred Street as one such area for infill potential. Jacqueline noted that the purpose of this study was to solidify appropriate methods and locations for infill development and that the developer's first submission was for single-family developments where intensification is balanced with compatible form and design that protects and enhances the character of Thornbury's neighborhoods and distinct areas. Jacqueline noted that the density and preliminary site plan suggested now does not meet this criteria. Jacqueline noted that the average size of the surrounding properties is 1,237 square metres, and the average size of the development properties is 490 square metres. Jacqueline noted that the study identifies the need to ensure developments are designed in order that new lots backing onto existing single-detached residential lots have rear yards comparable in size to these existing residential lots. Jacqueline noted that the proposed zoning amendment from R1 to R2 for Lots 1, 2, 12 and 13 creates small lots measuring only 374 square metres. Jacqueline noted that the study specifically identifies that a new residential lot between 350 and 400 square metres may not be appropriate in the context of a neighborhood where the established adjacent lots are all above 500 metres. Jacqueline noted that the adjacent lots were all above 500 square metres. Jacqueline noted that the study is clear in its disapproval of misaligned development without consideration for surrounding developments. Jacqueline noted the study noted that where smaller lots are proposed than those existing within an area that these should be located internal to development sites providing a transition to larger lots located on the edges of the new infill subdivision. Jacqueline noted that the development has higher density, semi-detached homes backing onto larger lots, and does not meet the Town's Official Plan criteria. Jacqueline noted that the Town's Official Plan states that development and re-development is to be compatible with the scale and density of existing development. Jacqueline noted that the Official Plan indicates that new greenfield areas should be developed at a minimum density of 20 units per hectare in keeping with the Grey County minimum targets and it appears that the density was targeted to meet this criteria. Jacqueline noted that the Official Plan recognized that in some areas maximum density may not be appropriate. Jacqueline noted that recently approved developments in the Town have already presented density plans that have been lowered below plan minimums and that like those developments this one should be lower density too. Jacqueline noted that another issue regarding the density and re-zoning is in regards to backyard setbacks. Jacqueline noted that based on Grey County mapping the shortest distance from the main dwelling to the rear property line exists on Alice Street and is an 11.4 metre setback. Jacqueline noted that the proposed lots have backyard setbacks of 9 metres only, and would be reduced to 6 metre setbacks. Jacqueline noted that for Bruce Street the lowest yard setback is 12.2 metres, and the semi-detached lots backing onto them will have minimum setbacks of only 6 metres. Jacqueline noted that while some properties back onto multiple lots, 5 other properties back out onto interior sideyards, where minimum interior sideyard setbacks are 1.2 to 2 metres. Jacqueline noted that the depth of the semi-detached lot is only 11 metres, matching the backyard of the smallest of the surrounding

properties. Jacqueline noted that an amendment should include an increase to setbacks to provide appropriate backyard depths and room for privacy. Jacqueline noted that there is not enough information available to make an informed decision, and that the justification report does not include or address provincial changes for the properties, and only refers to the R1 zoning impacts but not the reduced setbacks. Jacqueline noted that the report refers to basement apartments but does not address the potential for double the density from these apartments. Jacqueline noted that density calculations and justifications should be based on the maximum density possible to fully understand the impacts of such changes. Jacqueline noted that to make a proper decision Council requires a more detailed site plan with all the houses incorporated, and that the existing plan minimizes the number of surrounding residences impacted and falsely portrays the existing space around each house and suggests there is more property for certain existing house owners. Jacqueline noted that the interior properties are targets for infill development and that where the R2 density is targeted is inappropriate. Jacqueline noted that our preference is for lower residential density, but that if we must have density to then consider a plan that takes into consideration surrounding neighbors more appropriately. Jacqueline noted that 4 semi-detached lots are proposed to have widths of 10.1 to 10.3 metres, back onto lots that are double to triple their size and that there were concerns about privacy. Jacqueline noted that for properties backing onto sidelots that we would request most significant buffers than those provided, preferable green space buffers or increasing setbacks. Jacqueline noted that she urged Council to deny the application at this time and the current R1 zoning is consistent with the existing built form and should be maintained within the new development. Jacqueline noted that setbacks should be modified to approximately match existing areas and that more work is needed in the submission to reflect the increased density. Jacqueline noted that the developer is known for their executive style detached single-family dwellings that are quite lovely, and we should be focusing on their strengths. Mayor Soever noted that County recently considered an Official Plan amendment which states that the County does not want RR1 zoning because this zoning only includes single-family homes. Mayor Soever noted that in the event this were to be exclusively R1 would that mean the County would turn this plan down as it would only have single-family homes. Hiba noted that the County requires the applicant to meet the conditions of the policies it is subject to, which would be the current Official Plan and that this plan requires them to provide 20 units per net hectare, and that if the applicant was proposing a density less than that they would have concerns regarding this.

Catherine Milne, resident, noted that that her concerns were with respect parking in the development, as 17 homes were proposed each with 2 parking spots, and that there appear to be no sidewalks in the subdivision, and no spaces to allocate any guest parking on the 6.5 metre wide condominium road. Catherine noted that a number of these homes are going to have more than the 2 allocated cars and that they had heard today about potential secondary suites available in some of the single-detached homes. Catherine asked where guest parking is going to be located and where any cars in excess of the 2 allocated spots will be parked. Catherin noted that the expectation was that they would end up on the surrounding streets and that this will block the street and that this will impact snow removal and buses. Catherine noted that in order to implement the proposal the developer was looking for an amendment to the County's entrance permit because the way it is drawn currently is not supposed to be accessible onto the County Road, and they were seeking to amend that to access the condominium road to access it from both Alfred Street and

Alice Street. Catherine asked what the justification would be to have a road through the middle rather than as a cul-de-sac, and asked if that had been considered, and that this was the nature of a lot of surrounding streets to have cul-de-sacs rather than a through street. Catherine noted that with respect to the traffic study completed that there was data from the traffic study that was outdated. Catherine noted that the suggestion of there being 13 proposed vehicles in the rush-hour period in addition on the main streets seems grossly below what is practical, given that there will be 34 cars in the subdivision and that she was concerned about the impacts on the side streets and into the downtown where there is significant traffic backup all the way to Alfred Street. Catherine asked that the Town require the developers to conduct an updated traffic study and take into consideration current density, planned density for this subdivision and other development that has gone on in the community, and using accurate forecasting to determine what the actual traffic impact is going to be in the area as a result of the development.

Mike Gillis, resident, noted that with regard to the water management system something that was not brought up regarding buffering, privacy and maintaining trees, that in reading the document there was a 4.5 metre easement running along the properties fronting onto Bruce Street to accommodate the transfer of that water. Mike noted that if that drainage was subterranean that it reduces the ability to put proper buffers in place in terms of trees or plants because of the underground system, and that this might impact the ability to create privacy through those plants. Mike noted that the County's requirement for 20 units per hectare is open to exception if needed, and that this may be a situation where this is the case. Mike noted a lot of people recognize this is a great opportunity for infill development in Thornbury based on its size and location, and that the requirement for density may not be practical in this situation. Mike noted that the condominium road is being proposed because it allows for a smaller road which will allow for more lots to be accommodated in this area, and it comes down to at what cost is this being done. Mike noted that he was concerned that the road was being built for density purposed but is increasing traffic flow through the area with it being an open road, and a smaller road which is a safety hazard. Mike noted that the planning justification report states that the proposed development will not create a traffic hazard or an unacceptable increase in traffic on local roads and the street will be designed to ensure safe and convenient access for all users. Mike noted it was his opinion that that conclusion is being on inaccurate interpretation of the data presented, and that the traffic impact study has relied upon questionable and dated data, and is in direct contradiction to the Grey County and Transportation Association of Canada guidelines. Mike noted that a 6.5 metre road does not ensure safety or convenient access, and that its limited size comprises pedestrian and emergency vehicle access. Mike noted that the Town's Transportation Master Plan ideally recommends that local roads consist of 16 metres, include carriageway, curbs, boulevards and sidewalks. Mike noted that while the condominium road is not a local road it does not mean it could not be one, and that the impacts will be an issue. Mike noted that the proposed road will be used as a shortcut to avoid busier streets and increased street parking on those streets. Mike noted there are other examples in Town of these instances occurring. Mike noted that the proposed road is not in conformity with all 3 Grey County Guidelines that the Traffic Impact Study identified as relevant procedural references regarding access, and that it stated that where a subdivision or individual lot fronts on both a County Road and a local road the entrance from the local road should be used where feasible. Mike noted that the development would have frontage onto Alice Street, a local road, and Alfred Street,

a County Road. Mike noted that the Traffic Impact Study justifies this potential variance from the guideline by stating the desire to avoid the need for an internal cul-de-sac. Mike noted that it is not necessary to create a suitable infill development to avoid creating this cul-de-sac. Mike noted that the Grey County Guidelines also state the distance between municipal intersecting roads should be at least 400 metres, and that the access to Alfred Street would be located 78 metres east of Elma Street and 144 metres west of Bruce Street. Mike noted that the Traffic Impact Study justifies the variance from the guidelines by stating that the site access will not be a municipal road but serve as a private driveway to a private road and thus the requirement would not be applied as a new municipal road is not being proposed. Mike noted that the statement suggests that the County Guidelines, which are about safety, are considered irrelevant because the developer has decided to use a private condominium road, negating the requirement to conform to the standards. Mike noted that these smaller condominium roads pose a lot of problems, safety being one of them. Mike noted that to make a smaller road to accommodate more density at the cost of increasing safety issues seems nonsensical. Mike noted that the County Guidelines states that the minimum separation distance between entrances shall be 100 metres. Mike noted the separation between the proposed access to Alfred Street and existing residential driveways on either side do not meet the 100 metre requirement and the Traffic Impact Study provides no justification for this variance. Mike noted that in addition to the lack of conformity with the Grey County Guidelines the Traffic Impact Study also states that in some instances the siteline guidelines established by the Transportation Association of Canada to facilitate road safety are slightly less than the guidelines. Mike noted that considering this proposed road does not conform to the 3 relevant procedural guidelines established by Grey County to support safe access as well as the Transportation Association of Canada guidelines the developer needs to consider alternative access and road options. Mike noted that the Town has a duty of care to maintain a safe environment for all residents and to that end consideration should be given to a wider road and sidewalks for the proposed development to provide safe pedestrian mobility but also street parking and improved emergency vehicle access. Mike noted consideration should be given to a cul-de-sac or hammerhead design to fall more in line with guidelines, and that these steps will assist in providing safer streets, better traffic flow and a successful infill development in keeping with the neighborhood character, look and feel.

Emily Daoust, resident, noted that she lived at one of the adjacent properties where one of the trees previously referenced is located. Emily noted that the tree is about 100 years old and is very large and a large root system, and asked how the developer will work around the tree. Emily noted that with the plans submitted some of the houses will be built close to the tree. Emily noted that her house backed onto the new construction and they were located on the southern part of the development. Emily noted that their house was located far away from the tree but that given its robust limbs and roots how housing built close to it would effect it. Mayor Soever noted that they had heard from the developer that they would try to work around trees whenever possible. Emily noted that they, like a lot of people in the area, had animals and kids and that there was no fence on the back of their property because there was currently a large field behind them. Emily noted that when or if the construction starts if they would be providing a fence to ensure the safety of the people around the development.

Dave Graxton, resident, noted that he asked why all the semi-detached homes are jammed in one area and not be spread out. Dave noted that he was against the semi-detached homes in the first place but they were jammed in one area. Gord noted that with the ways the lots were laid out the semi-detached homes needed more depth in their lots and so the single-family homes did not have as much depth. Gord noted he tried to pick them such that they were concentrated in one area and looked alike and felt like a community. Gord noted that the semi-detached provided enough space and that they were told by the County to have semi-detached and that they were trying to satisfy everyone. Gord noted that they did not want the development to be an eye-sore and have it be a community that everyone could be proud of, and that it was important to them to create something that is part of the community, the people feel is not just some developer coming up from Toronto and laying out the homes as designed everywhere else, and that they wanted the design to fit in with the community. Gord noted that he has a degree in landscape architecture and he would do everything he could to make it a really pleasurable atmosphere to live on. Gord noted that he would try to save every tree he could in particular the walnut tree.

As no one else was in attendance to speak Mayor Soever closed the public portion of the meeting.

C. Notice of Meeting Dates

Council Meeting, September 26, 2022
Town Hall, Council Chambers and Virtual

Committee of the Whole Meeting, September 27, 2022
Town Hall, Council Chambers and Virtual

Council, Public Meeting, October 3, 2022
Town Hall, Council Chambers and Virtual

D. Adjournment

Moved by: Councillor Matrosovs
Seconded by: Councillor Bill Abbotts

THAT this Council does now adjourn at 2:30 p.m. to meet again on October 3, 2022 at Town Hall, Council Chambers and Virtually, or at the call of the Chair.

Yay (5): Mayor Soever, Councillor Hope, Councillor Matrosovs, Councillor Sampson, and Councillor Bill Abbotts

Absent (2): Deputy Mayor Bordignon, and Councillor Uram

The motion is Carried (5 to 0, 2 absent)

Alar Soever, Mayor

Kyra Dunlop, Deputy Clerk