



Public Meeting Minutes

Joint Public Meeting – County Official Plan Amendment 6

Wednesday, January 27, 2021 – 1:40 p.m.

A joint Grey County and Township of Southgate public meeting was held by a Zoom video call with the following members in attendance:

Township Council Members Present: Barbara Dobreen, Jason Rice, Jim Frew and Martin Shipston

County Council Members Present: Chair John Woodbury and Brian Milne

Regrets: Councillor Michael Sherson

Township Staff Present: Clint Stredwick, Lindsey Green and Elisha Milne

County Staff Present: Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning and Monica Scribner, Recording Secretary

Also present: Kory Chisholm and Andrew Edwards, Applicant's Consultants; Nazy Majidi and Shakir Rehmatullah, Applicants

Proposed County Official Plan Amendment, Southgate Official Plan Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment affect those lands described as Concession 2 SWTSR, Part Lots 225 & 226, in the geographic Township of Proton, now in the Township of Southgate.

Call to Order

Chair Woodbury called the public meeting to order then welcomed everyone on behalf of the County and the Township. Introductions then followed.

Randy Scherzer read the regulations.

This development requires four applications. A County of Grey Official Plan Amendment, Southgate Official Plan Amendment, a draft Plan of Subdivision, and a Township of Southgate Zoning By-law Amendment. In order for the development to move forward, approvals are needed on all four of the applications. The County makes

the decisions on the County Official Plan Amendment and Draft of Subdivision applications, as well as the Southgate Official Plan Amendment if adopted by the Township of Southgate. The Township makes decisions on the Southgate Official Plan Amendment application as well as the Zoning By-law Amendment application. Decisions regarding the official plan amendments need to occur first before decisions can be considered on the proposed plan of subdivision and the zoning by-law amendment.

The effect of the proposed **County Official Plan Amendment** would be to redesignate the subject lands from Rural and Hazard Lands to Primary Settlement Area and Hazard Lands to permit the proposed development. A comprehensive review report has been submitted in order to justify the proposed expansion to the settlement area of Dundalk.

The effect of the **proposed plan of subdivision** application, known as Southgate Meadows Glenelg Phase 2 (County file number 42T-2020-09) proposes to create a total of 155 residential units comprising of 83 single detached units, 66 townhouse units and 6 partial lots on the subject lands. The site is proposed to gain access through the draft approved plan of subdivision known as Southgate Meadows Phase 1 (42T-2018-12) from Corbett Street and Aitchison Avenue. Further internal roads are proposed to be constructed to provide access to the proposed lots. The proposed lots would be serviced by municipal water and sewer services.

The effect of the proposed **Southgate Official Plan Amendment** would be to redesignate the subject lands from the Rural and Hazard Lands designations to the Neighbourhood Area and Hazard Lands designations to permit the proposed development.

The effect of the **zoning by-law amendment application** (C21-20) is to rezone the subject lands from Restricted Rural (A2) zone and Environmental Protection (EP) zones to the Residential Type 1 with exceptions zone (R1-378-h), Residential Type 3 with exceptions zone (R3-379-h), Open Space zone (OS) and Environmental Protection zone (EP).

As required by Section 17 and 34 of the Planning Act RSO 1990, as amended, Council shall ensure that at least one public meeting is held, notice of which shall be given in the manner and to the persons and public bodies containing the prescribed information.

In accordance with the Planning Act and the implementing Regulations, the County of Grey and the Township of Southgate gave notice of this Public Meeting, by individual prepaid first class mail to persons within 120 metres based on the most recent assessment information provided by MPAC (Municipal Property Assessment Corporation), and to an extensive list of agencies as set out in the regulations. A sign

was also posted on the property. The public meeting notice is located on the County web site at www.grey.ca.

It is imperative to note that:

If a person or public body would otherwise have an ability to appeal the decision of County of Grey or the Township of Southgate in reference to the official plans, plan of subdivision and zoning by-law amendment, to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal but the person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to Grey County or Township of Southgate before the plan amendments are decided upon, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decisions, and may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Tribunal, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

If you wish to be notified of the decision of the proposed Official Plan, Local Official Plan, Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment you must make a written request to the County of Grey at 595 9th Ave. East, Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 3E3, or the Township of Southgate at 185667 Grey Road 9, Dundalk ON, N0C 1B0. Alternatively, you can also send an email to Clint Stredwick, Township Planner, or Randy Scherzer, County Planner. Both Clint and Randy's email addresses can be found on the mailed public meeting notice.

If there are any comments, questions or concerns for those in attendance this afternoon, please address the Chair and give your name and Lot and Concession, or civic address, for the record.

Comments received from the following:

Agency Comments:

Enbridge Gas, dated November 19, 2020

Enbridge Gas Inc. request that as a condition of final approval that the owner/developer provide to Union Gas the necessary easements and/or agreements required by Union Gas for the provision of gas services for this project, in a form satisfactory to Enbridge.

Bruce Telecom, dated November 19, 2020

Bruce Telecom have no concerns or issues with the work being done at this location.

Canada Post, dated November 19, 2020

Canada Post will provide mail delivery service through centralized Community Mailboxes; and will work with the developer to determine a suitable permanent location

for them. Once the development is approved, they require notification of the new civic addresses.

Eastlink, dated November 20, 2020

Once the subdivision is approved, Eastlink staff will require detailed Hydro plans for their planning.

Township of Southgate Public Works Department, dated November 20, 2020

The subdivision will need to be on municipal water, sanitary sewer and storm water service connections. No road widening is required.

The property is located in a Well Head Protected Area “D”; applicable to Dense Non Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL) products managed by education and outreach programs.

Bell Canada, dated November 24, 2020

Bell Canada requests conditions of draft approval to ensure that there are necessary easements provided to Bell Canada to service this new development and that the Owner will be responsible to provide entrance and service ducts from Bell Canada’s existing network infrastructure to service this development.

Hydro One, dated November 27, 2020

Hydro One has no comments or concerns at this time.

Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), dated November 27, 2020

The subject lands fall completely under the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) jurisdiction, therefore GRCA staff defer commenting to the SVCA.

Historic Saugeen Métis, dated November 27, 2020

The Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) Lands, Resources and Consultation Department has reviewed the relevant documents including the Environmental Impact Study and Archaeological Assessment and have no objection or opposition to the proposed Southgate Meadows Glenelg Phase 2 Plan of Subdivision Application as presented.

Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA), dated January 8, 2021

SVCA staff has reviewed the applications in accordance with the SVCA’s MOA with the Township of Southgate, and as per our mandated responsibilities for natural hazard management, including our regulatory role under the Conservation Authorities Act.

It is the opinion of the SVCA staff that:

- Consistency with Section 3.1, Natural Hazard policies of the PPS, 2020 has been demonstrated.
- Consistency with Section 2.1, Natural Heritage policies of the PPS, 2020 has been demonstrated; and
- Consistency with local planning policies for natural hazards and natural heritage has been demonstrated.

Therefore, SVCA staff note that the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision; proposed Grey Official Plan Amendments; and proposed Zoning By-law Amendment are generally acceptable to SVCA staff, provided that recommended conditions of draft approval are included in the draft Plan of Subdivision approval:

- That prior to any grading or construction on site, and prior to Final Approval of the subdivision by Grey County, the owner shall prepare studies/reports/documents to the satisfaction of SVCA, including:
 - Final lot grading and drainage plan
 - Final functional servicing and Stormwater Management Report,
 - Final Hydrologic/Hydrogeologic Assessment (water balance) demonstrating no net loss of surface and groundwater to the receiving wetland feature
 - Final Sediment and Erosion Control Plan;
 - A letter from the applicant's ecologist advising that the final proposed stormwater management and grading plans are in conformance with the recommendations of the EIS, and
 - Landscaping Plan for the 10 metre wide wetland buffer and Stormwater Management Plan
- That the Subdivision Agreement contain provisions with wording acceptable to the SVCA regarding the previously noted matters
- SVCA has also requested notice of any decisions from the County and the Township

Public Comments:

To date there have been no public comments received in writing.

There were verbal comments provided by Shan Elliot, 356 Glenelg St, indicating that she supports both Phases 1 and 2 of Southgate Meadows and is hopeful that sewer services will be extended all the way down Glenelg Street in the future so that their property can connect to municipal sewer services.

COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANTS CONSULTANT

Mr. Chisholm, MHBC Planning presented the following information on the proposed application.

Site works have begun on Glenelg Phase 1 and will be registered later this year.

This new phase of 155 residential units, 89 single detached units and 66 townhouses, will also comprise of a public park and a landscaped stormwater management pond, as well as additional connections to the existing rail trail to the east and an extension of the Glenelg walking trail to the west.

The increased density will help Dundalk to work towards the overall density target. The site will be fully serviced, and the new phase will be accessed through the two road connections from the first phase.

The comprehensive review concluded there is a need for a residential settlement expansion in Dundalk and the proposed site is the most logical location for a residential expansion.

All of the application submission requirements were reviewed, including planning reports and technical studies addressing local and provincial level planning policy.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Chair Woodbury asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. There were no verbal comments. There was one question asked in the Zoom chat function, from an unknown caller from Doyle Street, who asked if there will be any impacts to their area.

Mr. Chisholm stated the Grey County Rail Trail acts as a divider between the homes on Doyle Street and the current Glenelg Subdivision, which is located closer to Doyle Street than the proposed phase 2 addition, so impact to the owners on the other side of the rail trail should be minimal.

COMMENTS FROM THE TOWNSHIP STAFF/COUNCIL

Councillor Dobreen questioned what the future plans are for the quantity of traffic flowing north on Glenelg Street.

Mr. Scherzer acknowledged that secondary access for connection on Ida street would have been ideal but there are wetlands and hazard land areas preventing that option. If

Southgate chose to further explore this option, at a later date, an Environmental Assessment process would be required. The current priority is providing safe access to the residents. There will be further review to design a secondary access through the parkland which would maintain the proposed parkland setting, while allowing emergency vehicle access if required.

Councillor Dobreen asked questions about the CP Rail Trail, located to the east of the build site. She inquired what future conflict concerns could arise, will there be fencing required for the homes that border the rail trail and are there future plans for rail returning to our area.

Mr. Scherzer responded that in the first phase there were provisions outlined to make home buyers aware before purchasing, that the trail is used for many uses, including motorized vehicles such as ATV's and snowmobiles. The same notification will occur with this second phase.

Mr. Chisholm replied that board fencing and landscape buffers were created along the rail trail in the first phase and will continue on to phase 2.

Mr. Scherzer commented that as stated in our Official Plan policies, if rail returned to our area, it would be comprehensively explored with the rail servicing provider, ways to best mitigate the impacts along the whole stretch of the trail lands. Ideas such as creating more permanent fixtures like higher fencing to reduce noise impacts, larger barriers, etc would need to be explored at that time should rail return.

Deputy Mayor Milne inquired what metrics are being used to determine how much parkland is needed in a subdivision and if township park staff had been consulted.

Mr. Chisholm clarified there was preliminary discussion with planning staff about parkland sizes. 5% is considered usual parkland dedication and this project is approximately 4%, so there would be a possible cash in lieu for the 1% which will be clarified with township staff before final decisions are made.

Mr. Milne indicated he would rather see bigger lots, with a few trees planted instead of parkland in one spot. Is there a way to keep the character and small town feel, to prevent Dundalk from looking like the bigger cities?

Councillor Martin agreed with Mr. Milne and noted to keep in mind the cost and time of park staff to upkeep parklands.

Councillor Martin asked if there will be fencing along the wetland area on the east side, near block 98 to deter animals venturing onto properties. Mr. Chisholm confirmed they will make sure that the area mentioned is reviewed in detail.

Councillor Shipston inquired about the stormwater management Block 102 area. With lots of water coming off the rooves and paved roads, would any excess overflow going into the wetlands save on infrastructure money.

Mr. Chisholm stated there is a water balance requirement that needs to be retained and deferred to the consultant from Croziers & Associates, who verified the wetlands were

analyzed in conjunction with the hydrogeologist company SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd. Any flow going from Glenelg phase 1 and 2, into the wetlands pre-development, will match the post-development flow. They have an obligation through the conservation authority's review of proposals they must uphold.

Mr. Stredwick commented that fencing can be helpful as a noise buffer, as well as to keep people from extending their property line out further, while others prefer to not have a fence so they can view and interact easier with nature. Ms. Dobreen mentioned that fences with gates may be a good option and/or catwalks for access to the trails.

Councillor Shipston was concerned of the liability of the landscaped storm water management area. Mr. Stredwick stated there is a liability on any municipal property and this should not be a big concern since it will not be very deep. Putting up a chain link fence could be an option but may draw people towards it as well as change the aesthetics.

Mr. Rehmatullah thanked everyone for their hard work on this project. He stated he is proud to say they build communities not just homes. He assured that he heard the comments provided today and will make sure everything, including the fencing is done well on this project and any future developments. He hopes that the parkland option remains as an asset for young families to have a small park close to home. He clarified the density of the homes would have been tighter if they were being built in a bigger city and he promises they will look nice. He is excited about the future of Dundalk, especially with busing, better internet, and the new medical clinic coming.

Mayor Woodbury stated he is happy to have a developer who listens to our concerns, follows through and is a part of our community. He then thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the public meeting at 2:23 p.m.

Chair John Woodbury