## County of Grey – Proposed Official Plan Amendment 11 Table with Modifications and Rationale – July 4, 2022

| **Item No.** | **Section / Schedule** | **Proposed Modification** | **Rationale** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Various sections throughout the Plan | Any references to a “20-year” planning horizon or growth supply are hereby deleted replaced with a “25-year” planning horizon. | The 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the County’s Growth Management Strategy (GMS) Update now allow for a 25-year planning horizon. |
| 2 | Sections 2, 2.1 and Tables 1 – 4 | Sections 2 and 2.1 of the Plan, including Tables 1 – 4, are hereby deleted and replaced with the following:  “2 MANAGING OUR GROWTH  From 2016 to 2021, Grey *County* has grown more rapidly than in the previous five years. Population, housing, and employment growth have been increasing, and will continue to grow throughout the horizon of this plan to the year 2046. The growth which has been occurring in the *County* has been unevenly distributed among the nine local municipalities. The County will continue to monitor this growth with updates to the Growth Management Strategy and to this Plan, throughout the planning horizon.  How and where we grow is an important consideration for this Plan. We heard different comments from the community about growth and *development*. Some residents are hoping to see more growth and change while other residents told us that they love the *County* the way it is and do not want to see change. Those hesitant to see change were primarily concerned about wanting protection of the natural areas and farmland in order to minimize urban sprawl. The majority of our growth is directed to our *settlement areas* where there are existing services and *infrastructure* (e.g. water and sewer services, schools, hospitals, *recreation* facilities, etc.) to support more growth. This Plan continues to plan for the majority of growth within our *settlement areas*. Growth can occur in our rural areas where it fits well with our natural, resource, and farming areas.  The Provincial Policy Statement requires that the *County*, in consultation with local municipalities:   * Identify, coordinate and allocate population, housing and employment projections for local municipalities; * Identify areas where growth will be directed; * Identify targets for *intensification* and re*development* within each local municipality including minimum targets that should be met before the expansion of *settlement area* boundaries can be considered; and * Identify and provide policy direction for the local municipalities on matters that cross municipal boundaries.   The Province request the *County* to identify targets for how much we should intensify and redevelop within the Settlement Area *Land use type*s. The *County* will work with each local municipality to identify how and where this growth should occur. *Settlement Area Land use type*s in this Plan identify the locations for growth and what needs to be considered before growth can happen in those areas. Municipal official plans and zoning by-laws will further map out the locations for and policies surrounding various types of growth including residential, employment, commercial, etc.  The *County* retained consulting services to update the previous Growth Management Strategy. The most recent growth projections and allocations are identified in the Growth Projections section below. The Growth Management Strategy identified the growth projections for each local municipality which are identified in Tables 1 to 3 below. Growth projections can be amended over time, should the growth exceed or lag behind the projected totals. These growth projections are not hard limits on the future growth potential of the County, but changes to the projections will require future study and justification.  It is a principle of this Plan to promote healthy and diverse communities where residents can live, work, learn, invest and play. Every attempt should be made to make wise use of existing *infrastructure* (i.e. roads, water and sewer services) and to enhance that *infrastructure*. The amount, location, and timing of *development* in some cases will be limited by the availability of services to support that *development* as well as the policies of this Plan. The County will work with local municipalities to ensure that *infrastructure* is in place to support the future growth needs of the County. When assessing the location for future growth and/or settlement area expansions, the availability of *infrastructure* as well as any planned upgrades to *infrastructure* will be of primary importance. **2.1 Growth Projections** Population and employment projections for the planning period have been prepared for the *County*. These projections help us plan our communities by anticipating what services and *infrastructure* will be required to support this new growth. The projections also help us determine whether additional lands are required to be identified as a Settlement Area *Land use type* to accommodate the projected growth and what housing will be required to ensure people have a place to live. We look at how the *County* has grown over the past number of years to help us predict what growth might happen in the future. We also look at economic forecasts to predict how many jobs we will grow by (employment projections), whether people will leave or come to the *County* (migration patterns), as well as other factors that drive growth.  The County continues to grow and has seen an increased growth rate between the 2016 – 2021 census period. All nine member municipalities are growing, some more rapidly than others. The County will work with each municipality to ensure that this growth can be accommodated in a responsible fashion to meet the needs of each municipality. Coordination between the County and municipalities will be required where there are growth pressures near municipal boundaries.  Seasonal growth (cottages/second homes) is another important consideration for Grey *County*. There are parts of our *County* that have seen a large amount of seasonal/recreational growth in the past. Seasonal growth projections help determine future housing needs and the services that will be required to support this growth.  The following tables provide growth projections for population, households, and employment growth for up to the year 2046.  As outlined in the tables1-3, we anticipate that there will be a total of 127,130 people by 2046, a total of 55,570 households, and total employment of 52,230 people in 2046. In comparison, as of 2021 we had a total of 103,320 people, 43,540 households, and 43,550 employment.  The allocations are further subdivided to establish targets for the amount of growth to be directed to *settlement areas* and for *intensification* in Section 3.4 of this Plan. The projections outlined in Tables 1, 2 and 3 do not address seasonal recreational *development*. Table 4 below provides what we anticipate for seasonal recreational units throughout the planning horizon.  **Table 1: Permanent Population Growth Projections and Allocations to 2046**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ****Year**** | ****2021**** | ****2026**** | ****2031**** | ****2036**** | ****2041**** | ****2046**** | ****Growth**** | | **Town of The Blue Mountains** | **9,550** | **10,960** | **12,310** | **13,620** | **14,900** | **16,300** | **6,750** | | **Township of Chatsworth** | **7,240** | **7,430** | **7,580** | **7,730** | **7,880** | **7,980** | **740** | | **Township of Georgian Bluffs** | **11,210** | **11,590** | **11,910** | **12,220** | **12,520** | **12,780** | **1,570** | | **Municipality of Grey Highlands** | **10,590** | **10,910** | **11,180** | **11,450** | **11,700** | **11,920** | **1,330** | | **Town of Hanover** | **8,450** | **9,180** | **9,870** | **10,540** | **11,190** | **11,870** | **3,420** | | **Municipality of Meaford** | **11,800** | **12,200** | **12,540** | **12,880** | **13,190** | **13,480** | **1,680** | | **Township of Southgate** | **8,610** | **9,500** | **10,330** | **11,140** | **11,930** | **12,780** | **4,170** | | **Municipality of West Grey** | **13,360** | **13,780** | **14,140** | **14,490** | **14,830** | **15,110** | **1,750** | | **City of Owen Sound** | **22,510** | **23,100** | **23,590** | **24,080** | **24,540** | **24,910** | **2,400** | | **Grey County** | **103,320** | **108,650** | **113,450** | **118,150** | **122,680** | **127,130** | **23,810** |   Table 2: Household Growth Projections and Allocations to 2046   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ****Year**** | ****2021**** | ****2026**** | ****2031**** | ****2036**** | ****2041**** | ****2046**** | ****Growth**** | | **Town of The Blue Mountains** | **4,440** | **5,230** | **5,980** | **6,650** | **7,250** | **7,990** | **3,590** | | **Township of Chatsworth** | **2,770** | **2,860** | **2,930** | **2,990** | **3,050** | **3,070** | **300** | | **Township of Georgian Bluffs** | **4,540** | **4,730** | **4,890** | **5,040** | **5,160** | **5,240** | **700** | | **Municipality of Grey Highlands** | **4,190** | **4,360** | **4,500** | **4,630** | **4,750** | **4,810** | **620** | | **Town of Hanover** | **3,650** | **4,060** | **4,420** | **4,740** | **5,030** | **5,350** | **1,700** | | **Municipality of Meaford** | **5,150** | **5,440** | **5,680** | **5,910** | **6,110** | **6,270** | **1,120** | | **Township of Southgate** | **3,280** | **3,750** | **4,180** | **4,570** | **4,920** | **5,320** | **2,040** | | **Municipality of West Grey** | **5,410** | **5,640** | **5,830** | **6,020** | **6,160** | **6,250** | **840** | | **City of Owen Sound** | **10,140** | **10,480** | **10,750** | **11,000** | **11,220** | **11,270** | **1,130** | | **Grey County** | **43,530** | **46,550** | **49,160** | **51,550** | **53,650** | **55,570** | **12,040** |   **Table 3: Employment Growth Projections and Allocations to 2046**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ****Year**** | ****2021**** | ****2026**** | ****2031**** | ****2036**** | ****2041**** | ****2046**** | ****Growth**** | | **Town of The Blue Mountains** | **5,220** | **5,540** | **5,840** | **6,150** | **6,480** | **6,810** | **1,590** | | **Township of Chatsworth** | **1,560** | **1,630** | **1,680** | **1,730** | **1,790** | **1,860** | **300** | | **Township of Georgian Bluffs** | **3,570** | **3,720** | **3,870** | **4,010** | **4,170** | **4,310** | **740** | | **Municipality of Grey Highlands** | **4,320** | **4,470** | **4,600** | **4,730** | **4,880** | **5,030** | **710** | | **Town of Hanover** | **5,120** | **5,410** | **5,690** | **5,970** | **6,280** | **6,590** | **1,470** | | **Municipality of Meaford** | **3,700** | **3,840** | **3,960** | **4,080** | **4,220** | **4,350** | **650** | | **Township of Southgate** | **2,120** | **2,320** | **2,500** | **2,700** | **2,910** | **3,120** | **1,000** | | **Municipality of West Grey** | **3,550** | **3,690** | **3,820** | **3,940** | **4,080** | **4,230** | **680** | | **City of Owen Sound** | **14,390** | **14,740** | **15,030** | **15,280** | **15,610** | **15,930** | **1,540** | | **Grey County** | **43,550** | **45,360** | **46,990** | **48,590** | **50,420** | **52,230** | **8,680** |   For the purposes of the analysis done as part of the Growth Management Strategy, employment data is sourced from Statistics Canada - Census information about Place of Work employment. ‘Place of work’ refers to where an individual has worked irrespective of place of residence. This includes jobs of those who worked at home, worked outside of Canada, had no fixed workplace address, or worked at a specific address or usual place of work. This is different from data sources relating to labour force, which refers to the number of residents that are willing and able to work regardless of whether or not they are employed or where they work. Differences between data sources on employment occur due to timing, coverage, and nature of data collection however the Census provides our most reliable source of data, collected at regular five-year intervals for all residents of Canada.  With any forecasts and allocations, it will be important to continue to monitor this over time and to analyze various data sources so that we develop a ‘complete picture’ of what is happening on the ground. Data sources could include building permit information, e-analyst, Four County Labour Market Planning Board, Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, etc. By continually monitoring various data sources, we will ensure that the policies in this Plan are responding to the needs of our communities and if not, consider amendments to this Plan. The *County* will work with local municipalities and other community partners to analyze the various data sources and look for new data sources and partnership opportunities to develop common forecasts and projections.  **Table 4: Seasonal Recreational Unit Estimate by Municipality to 2046**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ****Year**** | ****2021**** | ****2026**** | ****2031**** | ****2036**** | ****2041**** | ****2046**** | | **Town of The Blue Mountains** | **2,850** | **2,730** | **2,650** | **2,610** | **2,690** | **2,770** | | **Township of Chatsworth** | **390** | **370** | **360** | **360** | **370** | **380** | | **Township of Georgian Bluffs** | **720** | **690** | **670** | **660** | **680** | **700** | | **Municipality of Grey Highlands** | **1,240** | **1,190** | **1,150** | **1,130** | **1,170** | **1,200** | | **Town of Hanover** | **60** | **60** | **60** | **60** | **60** | **60** | | **Municipality of Meaford** | **670** | **650** | **630** | **620** | **640** | **660** | | **Township of Southgate** | **250** | **240** | **230** | **230** | **230** | **240** | | **Municipality of West Grey** | **510** | **490** | **470** | **470** | **480** | **500** | | **City of Owen Sound** | **420** | **400** | **390** | **380** | **390** | **400** |   On-going monitoring and updating of the County’s growth projections is crucial to meeting municipal and County growth and infrastructure needs. Settlement Area *Land use type*s identify the cities, towns and villages throughout the *County* where the majority of our growth is to be directed. Other Settlement Area *Land use type*s include our recreational areas including areas around our ski hills as well as along our shorelines, and the Sunset Strip Settlement Area and the Industrial Business Park Settlement Area. Boundary adjustments to any *Settlement Area* *Land use type*s (designated growth areas) or the conversion of *employment areas* can only be considered if a *comprehensive review* is completed. A *comprehensive review* looks at whether additional land and infrastructure is required to accommodate the projected growth. If additional land is required, it looks at all the lands surrounding the existing Settlement Area *Land use type* to determine the best location for future growth. There are a number of matters that need to be considered as part of a *comprehensive review* which are outlined under Section 3.4.2 of this Plan. It will be important to continue to monitor growth patterns and trends to make sure we have enough designated *land use type*s and infrastructure available to accommodate any new growth.  It is the goal of this Plan to use the permanent population projections presented in Table 1 as a guide to the *County*’s future growth and *development*. *County* growth projections should be updated from time to time, and settlement area *land use type*s shall be expanded through a *comprehensive review* or an updated comprehensive review as outlined in Section 3.4.2 of this Plan.  Section 3 of the Plan clearly identifies the *County*’s Settlement Area *Land use type*s and provides a hierarchy of *settlement area* types. The Settlement Area *Land use type*s applies to existing urban centres, towns, villages, and recreational areas. Settlement Area *Land use type*s are divided into Primary and Secondary Settlement Area *Land use type*s based on servicing capabilities, population, and function. These areas will be the focus of the permanent household and employment growth. Additional *Settlement Area* *Land use type*s include Recreational Resort Settlement Area and Inland Lakes and Shoreline Settlement Area which may experience a larger percentage of seasonal residential and commercial growth, as well as the Sunset Strip Settlement Area and the Industrial Business Park Settlement Area which support commercial and employment growth.” | The County’s GMS Update has now been finished, and accounts for a 25-year planning horizon to 2046. When the new official plan was created (Recolour Grey) 2019, the changes to the planning horizon had not yet come into effect as per the PPS. Planners are now required to plan for a horizon of up to 25 years. These changes will now update the population and employment projections in tables 1 – 4 to the year 2046. |
| 3 | Various sections throughout the Plan | All references to the terms “second units”, “secondary suites”, “accessory apartments”, or “accessory units” are hereby deleted and replaced with the term “additional residential units”. | These changes reflect the terminology as well as the provisions of the *Planning Act* regarding additional residential units. |
| 4 | 3.4 | Two new subsections are inserted at the end of section 3.4 as follows:   1. “New or expanded livestock operations shall generally not be permitted within *settlement areas*. Municipalities may establish official plan policies or pass by-laws for limited urban faming uses, such as backyard chickens or beehives. Municipalities may choose to recognize existing livestock operations within *settlement areas* and create policies that allow for on-going use and limited expansions. 2. Where new residential *development* is occurring on larger landholdings, it must be demonstrated that short-term *development* projects do not unduly prejudice the efficient use of the lands for future *development* purposes. Lot creation occurring on larger landholdings may require the completion of concept plans to demonstrate the efficient development of the remainder of the lands.” | 21) The general nature and intent of settlement areas are to accommodate *compatible* residential and non-residential growth. Livestock operations tend to have associated odours, noise, and land needs that are better suited for agricultural or rural areas.  22) When considering other policy directions of the Official Plan, a comprehensive perspective should be applied to all planning decisions. That is, looking at servicing needs, roads, sidewalks, and other infrastructure, achieving intensification and density targets, etc. Considering short-term development patterns in relation to the future development viability a remnant parcel of land is critical to achieving good planning outcomes. |
| 5 | 3.5 | Section 3.5 is modified by inserting the following clauses after the first paragraph of this section:  “Minimum residential *development* densities will be applied in Primary Settlement Areas to ensure the efficient use of land and *infrastructure* to meet County and Municipal growth needs. Increased residential density can provide numerous benefits including but not limited to;   * lowering impacts on air quality, while promoting efficient energy use, * supporting active transportation and transit supportive communities, * enabling and encouraging lifestyles that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, * providing a range of housing types including owned, rental, and accessible units, * preserving other lands for natural, farm, or resource use, and * providing infrastructure that is financially sustainable throughout its life-cycle, including replacement costs.” | Additional clarity around why minimum residential development densities are applied in Primary Settlement Areas will prove helpful when aiming to achieve stated intensification and density targets. |
| 6 | 3.5(5) | Subsection 3.5(5) is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:   1. “Within Primary Settlement Areas a minimum residential *development* density of 25 units per *net hectare* will be achieved for new residential *development*. In calculating the minimum residential *development* densities, the possibility for future additional residential units shall not be included in the density calculation. The *County* encourages new development to be of a form and density which is supportive of future transit needs in accordance with the Province’s Transit Supportive Guidelines, or to develop similar municipal guidelines that achieve the same objective;    1. Notwithstanding subsection (5) above, where a municipality has adopted detailed municipal official plan policies and land use designations, municipalities may consider densities less than 25 units per *net hectare* for Primary *Settlement Areas* in low-density residential areas, provided other medium or high-density areas provide for densities that exceed the above minimum densities. Municipalities shall achieve overall minimum residential densities for new development of 25 units per *net hectare* in Primary *Settlement Areas.*    2. In the absence of detailed municipal official plan policies and land use designations, the County shall not consider new residential *development*, redevelopment, or infill *development,* by way of plan of subdivision, plan of condominium, or multiple consent applications that do not meet the above-noted minimum residential *development* densities, unless two of the three following criteria can be met;       1. The *development* includes a range of residential unit types including single-detached, semi-detached, townhouses and/or rental apartments,       2. Demonstration that it not feasible to meet the minimum lot density based on natural features, existing abnormal lot configuration (e.g. limited road frontage), or lack of suitable infrastructure, or       3. Demonstration that the infrastructure is financially sustainable throughout its life-cycle, including replacement costs. This demonstration should include an analysis of the current costs of the infrastructure, as well as projected maintenance and replacement costs, versus the tax dollars the *development* will generate. Coordination with municipal or county asset management plans is recommended here.” | This policy section aims to encourage local municipalities to assess their settlement area development patterns and identify certain locations that may be suitable for high density development types, and others for lower density development types. Should municipalities choose to adopt this approach, staff would have no concerns provided the overall minimum densities for new development met the identified threshold. Currently, the minimum density thresholds as outlined under section 3.5(5) of the OP are required to be met for every proposed development, regardless of the lot (i.e., greenfield or infill). This may be challenging to achieve or may not present an overly compatible development outcome, in particular for infill development.  An additional alternative is being provided through the County OP for proposed development types that do not meet the identified minimum residential development densities. This would require a developer to incorporate a range of housing types, demonstrate that meeting the minimum lot density is not feasible due to various lot constraints (abnormal lot configuration), and demonstrate the infrastructure is financially sustainable throughout its life-cycle.  Generally, staff are aiming to find a balance within the lot density policies that emphasis the minimum lot densities, but also consider alternative options that could achieve the same result (i.e., identifying high- and low-density areas) and to also recognize that some parcels of land may not be suitable to meet the identified development targets. |
| 7 | 3.5.1(3) | Subsection 3.5.1(3) is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:   1. “Lands identified as Future Secondary Plan Area on Schedule A – Map 3 and Secondary Schedule Map 3j and described as;  * Part Lots 1 – 10, Concession 3 North of the Durham Road (NDR), Geographic Township of Bentinck, Municipality of West Grey, * Part Lots 8 – 15, Concession 1 South of the Durham Road (SDR), Geographic Township of Bentinck, Municipality of West Grey and * Part Lots 9 – 14, Concession 2 SDR, Geographic Township of Bentinck, Municipality of West Grey,   shall be utilized primarily for uses existing as of June 6, 2019. Limited infilling between existing uses on the existing lots may be permitted where the infill *development* would not contribute to future municipal servicing problems or would not prejudice future *development*.  A Secondary Plan entitled “Hanover / West Grey Secondary Plan” exists on the *adjacent lands* described as Part Lots 8 - 11, Concession 1 SDR, Geographic Township of Bentinck, Municipality of West Grey, as shown on Schedule A – Map 3, Secondary Schedule Map 3j, Secondary Schedule Map 3k. The policies for this Secondary Plan are found in section 11 of the Official Plan.  An expansion of this existing Secondary Plan onto lands identified as Future Secondary Plan Area shall only be permitted where it has been demonstrated that:   1. The lands designated for new *development*, by *land use type*, shall not exceed the growth requirements of the Town of Hanover including the existing “Hanover / West Grey Secondary Plan” area for a 25 year planning horizon; 2. A phasing plan has been established for new *development*, including future road and *infrastructure;* 3. The subject lands can be serviced by municipal water and municipal sewer services within the planning horizon; 4. The subject land uses cannot first be accommodated within the Town of Hanover or the Hanover / West Grey Secondary Plan through redevelopment or *intensification* of their existing land supply; 5. Impacts on agricultural operations adjacent or close to the Future Secondary Plan Area are mitigated to the extent possible, consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement; 6. Impacts on the Natural Environment are minimized, consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.   In determining the amount of land to be designated for future *development* and included within the secondary plan expansion area, the supply and growth in the Town of Hanover shall be assessed. An update to the *comprehensive review* conducted for the existing Hanover / West Grey Secondary Plan, or a new *comprehensive review*, shall be required prior to the expansion of the existing secondary plan area.  Notwithstanding the above, lands which are outside of the Primary Settlement Area, Hanover / West Grey Secondary Plan area or the Future Secondary Plan Area may be considered for growth, provided a *comprehensive review* has been completed and that the above-noted criteria have been met through the secondary plan process. With respect to the Future Secondary Plan Area shown on Secondary Schedule 3j, the underlying *land use type* applies, until the Plan is amended to take the lands out of the Future Secondary Plan Area.” | Amended both the property descriptions of the Future Secondary Plan Areas to match the Town of Hanover’s recent comprehensive review work, as well as the planning horizon to 25 years. |
| 8 | 4.1 | In the first paragraph of section 4.1 the reference to “10” years is hereby deleted and replaced with “15” years. | To reflect changes in the PPS 2020. |
| 9 | Various sections throughout the Plan | All references to “bonus zoning” or “bonusing” or “Section 37 agreements” throughout the Plan are hereby deleted. In instances such as 4.2(c) the entire subsection (c) is deleted and remaining subsections are re-lettered accordingly. | This section of the Plan needed to be updated based on the provincial changes to section 37 of the *Planning Act* regarding bonusing, which removed the ability for municipalities to ‘bonus’. |
| 10 | 4.2.4 | Section 4.2.4 is hereby deleted and replaced with the following: “Tiny Homes Populations are seeking alternative housing styles that can accommodate smaller family sizes, minimalist lifestyles, affordability pressures, and those looking to downsize. Tiny homes are recognized in certain parts of North America as filling a need in the current housing market. The County is generally supportive of Tiny Homes as an opportunity to contribute to affordable home ownership and increase rental opportunities where there are appropriate lands and servicing available.  For the purposes of this Plan, a *Tiny Home* is defined as a small, private and self-contained unit with living and dining areas; kitchen and bathroom facilities, a sleeping area, and is intended for year-round use. They are generally between 17.5 m2 and 37m2 in total floor area. Tiny Homes should meet all requirements of the Ontario Building Code (OBC), unless other certification standards are defined within local Municipal Zoning By-Laws.  Within defined settlement areas, the County encourages Tiny Homes to be considered *additional residential units*, whereby they should be permanent, built structures, connected to available municipal servicing where available. Outside of settlement areas, tiny homes could be used as permanent *additional residential units* or as temporary *garden suites,* per the policies of Section 4.2.6*.* In the case of tiny homes as *garden suites*, the County recognizes that these units can create more accessible opportunities for home ownership, whereby a tiny house owner may own the unit and enter into a private land-lease agreement with a property owner.  In keeping with Official Plan goals and opportunities of developing complete communities in Section 1.4.1, and *complete streets* in Section 8.2, minimum lot and unit size standards should be updated within zoning by-laws to allow for more compact *development*. This will facilitate cohesive community design, where people’s needs are easily accessible and convenient. Complete compact communities are aligned with the County’s greenhouse gas reduction goals. *County* planning staff recognize the planning context varies within each municipality, and certain zones within a municipal zoning by-law, and certain neighborhoods may not be suitable for the above noted recommendation.” | Added flexibility to Tiny Home policies that would consider different development and location arrangement possibilities. The focus for permanent structures will still be prioritized but this should not limit short-term, temporary tiny home structures if there is a desired need/interest.  Added definition of “tiny home” and guidance around certification standards. |
| 11 | 4.2.5 | Section 4.2.5 is hereby deleted and replaced with the following: “Additional Residential Units *Additional Residential Units (ARUs)* are also known as basement apartments, and accessory apartments. They are structurally permanent self-contained residential units with private kitchen, bathroom, and sleeping facilities within a main residence or structures additional to a *dwelling* (e.g., above garages).  *Additional residential units* increase the supply and range of affordable rental accommodation while offering homeowners additional income. Further they provide alternative housing options for the elderly, young adults, and populations looking for smaller living quarters; increase the efficiency of the rental housing stock and offer more affordable housing options. Gentle densification as achieved by ARUs also supports reduced GHG emissions per capita from the existing housing stock. To encourage the long-term use of ARU’s for affordable housing, the County supports municipalities to develop short-term accommodation by-laws to regulate or limit the use of ARU’s as short-term accommodation, to facilitate the correct balance with long-term rental options that meet local housing needs.  The *Planning Act requires that official plans permit additional residential units* by authorizing:   * the use of two residential units in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse; and * The use of a residential unit in a building or structure ancillary to a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse.   Variations of the above noted policies may be considered by the County, provided the total *additional residential units* does not exceed two per property or unless otherwise stated throughout this Plan (i.e. two ARU’s may be permitted in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse or two ARU’s may be permitted in a structure ancillary to a detached house, semi-detached house, or rowhouse).  Municipalities shall develop local policies and zoning regulations that establish appropriate standards, which protect neighbourhood character, public health and safety, and enjoyment of abutting properties without unduly restricting the creation of such dwelling units. Municipalities may choose to establish zoning provisions that further limit the creation of ARUs on private or seasonally maintained public roads.  The *County* is generally permissive of *additional residential units* provided *development* meets zoning provisions outlined by the local municipalities. In *settlement areas* or the *countryside* without full municipal services, well water records or designated appropriate authority for sewage systems may be necessary prior to granting a building permit. In the *countryside* *additional residential units* shall be within the farm cluster. An ARU established on Agricultural designated lands shall not be severed through a surplus farmhouse severance application.  *Additional residential units* shall not be permitted in the Hazard Lands *land use type*, and may be allowed in the flood fringe overlay subject to *conservation authority* review. Up to one *additional residential unit* shall be permitted on lands designated Inland Lakes & Shoreline.  If a temporary by-law is in place for an approved *Garden Suite*, only one *additional residential unit* would be permitted on a property until such time that the *garden suite* is converted to a permanent dwelling, or the temporary use by-law expires or is annulled.  Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to prevent the conversion of residential dwellings in *settlement areas* to rental units that exceed the ARU provisions of this Plan, provided local official plan and zoning by-law policies can be met.” | These changes reflect the intent and direction of the Planning Act regarding additional residential units. Staff have had discussions with provincial staff regarding ARU policies and it was shared that consideration could be given to different arrangements of ARU’s on a given property (i.e., 1 in the primary residential unit, 1 in an ancillary structure, 2 in primary residential unit, and/or 2 in the ancillary structure).  ARU limitations were identified for lands within the Inland Lakes and Shoreline designation (only 1 permitted), as there tend to be greater natural heritage and environmental concerns in these areas. And the provision of greater development density is not generally encouraged.  Formal recognition that a garden suite would count toward the number of ARU’s permitted on site.  Second round: GHG policies; encouragement to develop short-term rental by-laws to regulate the use of ARU’s for short-term rental versus long-term rental accommodation; recognition that municipalities may limit ARUs on private/seasonal roads; ARU’s shall not be severed through surplus farmhouse severances. |
| 12 | 4.2.6 | The final paragraph of section 4.2.6 is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:  *“**Garden Suites* shall not be permitted in the Hazard Lands *land use type*, and may be allowed in the flood fringe overlay subject to *conservation authority* review. If a property already contains two *additional residential units* (or one, in the case of lands designated Inland Lakes & Shoreline) on fully private services, then a *garden suite* would not be permitted.”  And the following paragraph is added to the end of section 4.2.6:  “The County supports deferring to the Ontario Building Code for gross-floor area requirements for *garden suites* within local zoning by-laws, to improve opportunities for affordable housing creation. Garden suites should meet all criteria within the Ontario Building Code, as well as local zoning by-laws.” | Further clarity around the relationship between garden suite policies and ARU policies.  Support to minimize floor area requirements for Garden Suites, to encourage more affordable housing options. |
| 13 | 4.4 | Section 4.4 is hereby modified by inserting the following clause at the end of the second paragraph:  “The below graph is subject to change without amendment to this plan.” | Clarified that should future planning responsibilities or delegated approvals change it will not require an amendment to the County Plan. |
| 14 | 5.2.1(6) and 5.2.1(7) | Subsections (6) and (7) are hereby deleted and replaced with the following:   1. “*Additional residential units* are permitted in the main house and in a non-agricultural accessory structure, provided the appropriate servicing is available and it is not located within hazard lands. *Additional residential units* and *garden suites* are required to be in the farm cluster. 2. At no point shall the total number of permanent residential units on a farm property exceed three; however housing for temporary farm labour shall not be considered within this unit total. Severances will not be permitted to sever a secondary *dwelling*, or *additional residential unit* from a farm property. *Surplus farmhouse* severances will still be considered where two houses are the result of farm consolidation. Farm consolidation is the acquisition of additional farm parcels to be operated as one farm operation. All severances are required to meet section 5.2.3 of this Plan.” | Clarified the relationship between ARUs, garden suites, and farm labour accommodations. |
| 15 | Table 7 | Column 3 of Table 7, under the heading of On-farm diversified Use is hereby modified by inserting a new bullet with the following phase after the term “wine tasting)”   * “a *campground* shall not be recognized as an on-farm diversified use” | Campgrounds are permitted as per Section 5.4.2(9), under the rural land use type. On-farm diversified land use types apply to agricultural, special agricultural and rural land use types. These development types (campgrounds) tend to conflict with agricultural operations. |
| 16 | 5.2.2(5) and 5.2.2(6) | Note the current plan inadvertently has two subsection (5)’s. It is only the second subsection (5) that is deleted through this modification. The second subsection (5) and subsection (6) are hereby deleted and replaced by a new subsection (6) as follows and the remaining subsections are renumbered accordingly.   1. “Development shall not conflict with Section 5.6 – *Aggregate Resource Area* and *Mineral Resource Extraction land use types*.” | These policy sections were duplicates from section 5.6. |
| 17 | 5.2.2(14) | Section 5.2.2(14) is hereby deleted and replaced by the following:  “New on-farm diversified uses shall be limited in size and scale, as per Table 8 below and to those uses that can be sustained by local service and infrastructure levels. New agricultural-related uses shall also be limited to uses that can be sustained by local service levels. Municipal official plans may choose to set local road standards required for such uses, which are in-line with the level and type of traffic being generated by the uses. Traffic Impact Studies may be required to determine the impact of the proposed operation on the local road network, as per section 8.3 of this Plan. Servicing or Noise Studies may also be required for new or expanded on-farm diversified or agricultural-related uses. Municipal official plans or zoning by-laws may also choose to limit individual uses that could otherwise be directed to settlement areas. Agricultural-related uses are not required to be limited in size, whereas on-farm diversified uses are required to be limited to the sizes shown in Table 8. Subject to the size limitation requirements of Table 8 of this Plan and section 5.2.2(16), on-farm diversified uses may be considered on lots less than 10 hectares in size in the Rural land use type.  Notwithstanding the above, *home rural occupations* may be permitted in the *Rural land use type* on lots less than 10 hectares in size, which exceed the size limitations in Table 8, only where permitted in municipal zoning by-laws, or where adequate justification has been provided in support of a zoning amendment.” | Changes are proposed to this section to support the changes proposed through modification # 90 to support on-farm diversified uses on smaller farm parcels, and to make it clear that noise or servicing studies may also be required, in addition to traffic studies which were already listed in this subsection of the Plan. |
| 18 | 5.2.2(15) | Subsection (15) is hereby modified by adding the following clause after the first sentence of this section.  “In order to promote the reuse of existing buildings, or structures, when calculating the maximum permitted size for an *on-farm diversified use*, existing buildings or structures being used as part of the *on-farm diversified use* shall be discounted by a 50% factor (i.e. a 200m2 existing building being reused as an *on-farm diversified use* shall only count as 100m2 towards the maximum total size for buildings).” | Added in a policy to further encourage the reuse of existing farm buildings by applying a 50% discount to their area calculations when used as an on-farm diversified use. |
| 19 | 5.2.2(20) | Subsection (20) is hereby deleted and replaced by the following:  “As farming practices evolve, there may be built heritage structures (i.e. barns or *dwelling*s) that could disappear as a result of no longer being required for agricultural purposes. The County recognizes the potential cultural heritage and rural aesthetic value of historic farm buildings and encourages adaptive reuse of vacant or under-utilized structures for residential, *agricultural-related uses*, or *on-farm diversified* uses. Appropriate standards addressing variation in the size due to the architecture of such structures may be implemented through site-specific zoning provisions. Where appropriate, the County would encourage Municipalities to consider taking inventory of historic farm structures and to develop formal Heritage Designation policies for unique farm buildings to facilitate long-term preservation. *Building Code* requirements shall be met for the re-use of the existing structure for new purposes.” | These changes endeavour to address recent policy concerns that were brought forward regarding historical barn preservation efforts throughout rural areas in Ontario.  Further emphasis was included throughout this policy section that speaks to the cultural heritage and rural aesthetic value of historic farm buildings. |
| 20 | 5.2.3(1)(b)(2) | Subsection (2) is hereby deleted and replaced by the following:   1. “The lot proposed for the *surplus farmhouse* (and accessory buildings if applicable) will be limited in area and shall only be of sufficient size to accommodate the *surplus farmhouse* to the farming operation, accessory buildings (including any unused *livestock facility*, if this does not make the lot excessively large), a well, and a sewage treatment and disposal system, while ensuring that as little land as possible is removed from the agricultural lands.”   Section 5.2.3(1)(b) is hereby further modified by adding new subsections (7), (8), and (9) as follows:   1. “If an existing *livestock facility* is located within close vicinity of the surplus farmhouse, it is recommended that it be included in the severed parcel and be converted to a *decommissioned livestock facility*. 2. If a *livestock barn* is located on the retained parcel and fails to meet MDS requirements relating to a severed surplus farmhouse, it is recommended that it be converted to a *decommissioned livestock barn.* 3. “Policies 5.6.2(8) and 5.6.6(2) shall not constrain a *surplus farmhouse* severance. Non-farm size lot creation (i.e., the *surplus farmhouse* and accessory buildings if applicable) may be considered under this policy section where an *Aggregate Resource Area, Bedrock Resource Area and/or Shale Resource Area* has been identified.” | These changes endeavour to address recent policy concerns that were brought forward regarding historical barn preservation efforts throughout rural areas in Ontario.  Further emphasis was included throughout this policy section that speaks to the cultural heritage and rural aesthetic value of historic farm buildings.  Subsection (9) changes would have the effect of clarifying that the *Aggregate Resource Area, Bedrock Resource Area, and Shale Resource Area* policies will not restrict a *surplus farmhouse* severanceproposal. |
| 21 | 5.2.3(5) | Subsection (5) is hereby deleted and replaced by the following:   1. “Where a *non-farm sized* consent is being proposed to create a new lot on a split *land use type* property (e.g. a split *Agricultural* and *Rural land use type*), the consent may only be supported if; 2. The entirety of the *Agricultural land use type* lands remain intact; 3. All other options for consent have been deemed unviable (i.e. the more restrictive consent policies shall be initially considered and assessed), and 4. The lands outside of the *Agricultural land use type* meet the policies and criteria for a severance in the other *land use type*. In the *Rural land use type*, the lot would need to meet the Rural lot density and frontage provisions. In the *Special Agricultural* *land use type*, the lot would need to meet the *Special Agricultural* minimum farm lot size. Lands within the *Niagara Escarpment Plan Area* need to comply with the Niagara Escarpment Plan. In the event of a conflict between the policies of this Plan and the policies of the Niagara Escarpment Plan, those of the Escarpment Plan will prevail.   For the purposes of this policy, determining the percentage Agricultural versus the percentage Rural, *Hazard Lands and Wetlands* *land use type*s shall not be counted in the split *land use type* calculation. Hazard Lands and Wetlands policies of this Plan still apply to such severances.  For farm sized lot creation, where one lot is being severed to create a farm parcel of generally 40 hectares in size, provided both the severed and retained lots are 40 hectares in size and are both intended to be used for *agricultural uses,* then farm-sized lot creation can occur where the *Agricultural land use type* is being divided between the severed and retained lots. Where both the severed and retained lots are 40 hectares in size and are both intended to be used for *agricultural uses,* the *Rural* lot density shall not limit such split *land use type* lot creation.  Consents shall not be in conflict with Sections 5.2.2, 8, or 9 of this Plan.” | Added clarity on the various applications of the split land use policy. |
| 22 | 5.4.2(8) and 5.4.2(9) | Section 5.4.2 is hereby modified by adding a new subsection (8) as follows. The remaining subsections are renumbered accordingly.   1. *“Campgrounds* shall only be considered under the rural land use type as per policy 5.4.2(9).”   Section 5.4.2 is hereby further modified by deleting the existing subsections (8) and (9) and replacing them with the following:   1. Innovative forms of Rural *development* including, residential farm cooperatives, *agri-miniums*, *resource based recreational uses, recreation* or tourist-based rural clusters (e.g. cottages, *campgrounds*, or a similar form of *development* under common ownership) on large lots, which meet the *Ontario Building Code* and servicing requirements, may be considered for approval, subject to the following criteria:    1. A minimum of 60% of the original land holding will remain available for the active primary agricultural or recreational use;    2. Encroachment of actively farmed agricultural lands shall be limited;    3. Maintains the agricultural/rural character of the area. The character of *development* must be low density and *compatible* with the surrounding land uses;    4. The *development* will comply with the Provincial *MDS* *formulae*;    5. Ensuring surrounding agricultural operations can pursue their agricultural practices without impairment or inconvenience. Consideration should also be given to any potential development constraints (setback requirements) affecting future agricultural use on adjacent lands. This can be determined through the application of the Provincial *MDS formulae* (i.e., as per implementation guideline #6, all existing livestock facilities or anaerobic digesters within a 750 m distance of a proposed Type A land use and within a 1,500 m distance of a proposed Type B land use shall be investigated and MDS I setback calculations undertaken where warranted). The inverse shall be considered, such that should the proposed Type B land use be developed, review shall be completed identifying lands on adjacent properties that may be limited for a future livestock facility or anaerobic digester. When situating the new use, it would be encouraged to identify a location that would have limited future impact to the surrounding agricultural land.    6. Technical studies are likely to be required for these application types to ensure limited impact. Some of the key areas of concern that will need to be addressed include (but not limited to), planning justification report, noise assessment, visual impact assessment (i.e. how is the rural landscape aesthetic being maintained and/or how is the historic character being supported), traffic impact study, functional servicing report, MDS calculation, and/or an environmental impact study. Depending on the nature of development, comments may be required from the local health unit. Further details of what typically entails a complete application can be found under section 9.17 of this Plan;    7. For recreation-based developments, is viewed as *compatible recreation,* meaning the use(s) will not negatively impact the natural features or function of the *Core Areas* or *Linkages* and other identified natural heritage features as per Section 7;    8. That a zoning by-law amendment be approved by the local municipality;    9. Public road access and internal private roads, provide suitable access for users and emergency services,    10. All *Building Code* requirements can be met, and    11. Water, septic, and stormwater management facilities can be provided in compliance with applicable regulations.        1. Where viable, integrating *low-impact development* techniques for the land use planning, urban design, and engineering approaches to manage stormwater, through site arrangement and design, green *infrastructure*, and on-site natural features;        2. Efforts should be made to limit large-scale servicing demands for these development types, through considering the application of off-grid, low-impact, non-polluting energy sources (e.g. rainwater harvesting, compost toilets, passive heating and cooling systems, solar, etc.).    12. Other considerations for recreation or tourist-based cluster development types include:        1. A mix of land uses that support a diversity of uses and opportunities such as residential and commercial activities;        2. A built form that integrates and/or establishes lifestyle and/or cultural elements for the public within the *development*; and        3. When practical, contributing to existing trails, cultural landscapes, cultural events, or outdoor activity within the *County*;        4. A built environment that provides meaningful visual and physical access to nature throughout the site; and,        5. Onsite public educational/interpretive information about the location’s unique natural resource.” | More recently, staff have noticed an increase in inquiries related to these use types. Staff see merit in these proposed uses as they contribute toward the County’s local tourism and economic development. But staff see the need to further emphasize the importance of being considerate and compatible with the surrounding land use types prior to proceeding. Further emphasis has been incorporated through the additional policies noting encroachment of actively farmed agricultural lands shall be limited, the agricultural/rural character will be maintained, and development shall not hinder further agricultural operations in the area.  Staff have also offered additional wording throughout this policy update that speaks to the general technical requirements that tend to be needed for a development of this type. Additional consideration has also been included, such that these proposals shall be viewed as *compatible recreation* and will not negatively impact other identified natural heritage features on a given property.  Additional wording was provided that encourages limiting large-scale servicing demands and the consideration of environmental and sustainable development standards. |
| 23 | 5.4.3(1) | Subsection (1) is hereby modified by adding a new third sentence in the first paragraph as follows:  “In considering whether to pro-rate up or down, the land area must be within 15% of the required maximum to be pro-rated up, otherwise it will be pro-rated down e.g. an original township lot size of 50 hectares would be pro-rated down to 40 hectares; however an original township lot of 58 hectares would be pro-rated up to 60 hectares.”  Subsection 1 is hereby further modified by adding the following onto the last sentence after the words “conservation organization”:  “*,* or where a lot is being created for *public service facilities* or *infrastructure*” | Clarified how rural consent policies get pro-rated based on a recent Ontario Land Tribunal decision.  Exceptions are also considered for new public service facility and infrastructure lots. |
| 24 | 5.6.2(7) | Subjection (7) is hereby deleted and replaced by the following:   1. “In *Aggregate Resource Area*s shown on Schedule B, new *non-agricultural uses* may be considered on existing lots of record, where they are a permitted use in the Agricultural, Special Agricultural, or Rural land use types. Where such *non-agricultural uses* are not permitted by those land use types, and an official plan amendment is required, new *non-agricultural uses* may only be permitted if:    1. The extraction of the aggregate resource is not feasible due to the quality or quantity of material or the existence of incompatible development patterns. The quality and quantity of the material will be determined by having a qualified individual dig test pits within the area proposed for the non-agricultural development; or    2. The proposed land use or development serves a greater long-term interest of the general public than the aggregate extraction; and    3. Issues of public health, public safety, and environmental impact are addressed.   Notwithstanding the foregoing, a proposed land use that conforms with the Official Plan and Zoning By-law, but requires Site Plan approval pursuant to Section 41 of the Planning Act, shall not be required to address the above criteria.” | Policy conflict with section 5.6.2(8), as well as clarifying the relationship between when these tests get applied for new proposed uses. |
| 25 | 5.6.2(11) | Subsection (11) is hereby modified by adding a new second bullet as follows, while the existing second bullet would then become the third bullet:   * “Demonstrate that the outcomes of the lot addition will not unduly impact future resource extraction, both from an availability of land and potential land use conflict perspective, and”   Subsection (110 is hereby further modified by adding the following clause at the end of this subsection.  “Lot additions for the purposes of consolidating resource lands may also be permitted, provided a new non-farm sized lot is not created.” | This offers some flexibility for lot additions within the rural land use type provided no new non-farm lots are being created and the result would not unduly impact future resource extraction. |
| 26 | 5.6.6(2) and 5.6.6(3) | Subsection 5.6.6(2) is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:   1. “The *Province* has provided mapping for Bedrock and Shale Resource Areas, within 8 metres of the surface, which have been mapped on Appendix E. This mapping is shown for two purposes;    1. To identify where these resources exist, and where resource use or extraction could reasonably be predicted in the future, and    2. To guide strategic land use decisions where future *development* may pose land use incompatibilities with these resources.   Within Bedrock and Shale Resource Areas shown on Appendix E and on *adjacent lands*, new non-agricultural uses that require an official plan amendment on existing lots of record, or new non-farm sized lot creation, which would significantly prevent or hinder new extraction operations may only be permitted if:   * + 1. the resource use would not be feasible for extraction as per current industry standards (i.e., resources with greater than 8 m of overburden);     2. or the proposed land use or *development* serves a greater long-term public interest;     3. and issues of public health, public safety and environmental impact are addressed.”   Section 5.6.6 is hereby further modified by adding a new subsection (3) as follows. The renumbering subsections are renumbered accordingly.   1. “Minor lot additions to existing lots may be permitted in Bedrock and Shale Resource Areas, if the following criteria can be met:  * Demonstrate the appropriateness of the land area to be severed (i.e. land need, boundary error, servicing, parking, etc.); * Demonstrate that the outcomes of the lot addition will not unduly impact future resource extraction, both from an availability of land and potential land use conflict perspective, * Demonstrate the need for the lot addition, * Demonstrate that the policies of section 5 of this Plan are addressed, and * To explain the hardship imposed by not permitting the severance.   All reasonable efforts shall be made to minimize any impacts on the Bedrock and Shale Resource Areas through any lot additions.  Lot additions for the purposes of consolidating resource lands may be permitted, provided a new non-farm sized lot is not created.  Lot adjustments in the *Agricultural land use type* and *Special Agricultural land use type* may only be permitted for *legal or technical reasons.”* | This offers some flexibility for lot additions within the rural land use type provided no new non-farm lots are being created and the result would not unduly impact future resource extraction. |
| 27 | 7.1(8) | Subsection (8) is modified by inserting the following sentence after the third sentence of this subsection:  “Farm sized lot creation may be considered.” | Clarifies that the creation of new farm-sized lots could be created or Core Areas or Linkages. |
| 28 | 7.12(5) | Subsection (5) is modified by adding the following sentence at the end of this subsection:  “Municipalities are encouraged to define further parameters for new parkland including locational attributes, minimum road frontage, accessibility, etc.” | A policy encouraging municipalities to define criteria for what lands they will accept as part of parkland dedication, to ensure the parkland is accessible and practical. |
| 29 | 7.13 | Section 7.13 is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:  “Climate change is considered by many to be the world’s biggest challenge in the coming century. Grey *County*’s weather is already changing and will continue to change. We can expect that there will be more frequent snow squalls, more extreme rain and flooding events, and warmer summer temperatures. We must take action to adapt to and mitigate the effects of a changing climate. This will include making greater efforts to protect and to enhance the resiliency of our natural, built, and social environments while also implementing actions that will reduce our collective greenhouse gas emissions both community-wide and corporately. This Plan has been written with this objective in mind.  The *County* of Grey has adopted a Climate Change Action Plan that will coordinate the *County*’s efforts to embrace and facilitate resilient, sustainable *development* to mitigate the effects of climate change within our communities. Through the Climate Change Action Plan, the County aim to be net-zero for corporate greenhouse gas emissions by 2045 and net-zero for community emissions by 2050.  The *County* can become more resilient to climate change. Our efforts to adapt can also help Grey *County* remain affordable and economically competitive. The emerging green economy will provide significant opportunities for creative solutions, innovation, and job growth.  The following are principles and policies to assist with mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change:   * Parks and open spaces provide opportunities to increase tree canopy and woodland cover across the *County*. * The proper construction, maintenance, and upgrading of *infrastructure* reflective of our changing climate and future climate projections is essential in maintaining its capacity to function currently and in the future. * Monitoring the impacts of climate change on our systems, for example the *natural heritage system*, will allow us to adjust management activities, to best maintain their integrity and resiliency. * Under climate change, the risks associated with natural hazards are changing and this should be considered as we plan for the future. * Ensure the protection of waterways and shorelines including lakes, rivers, and streams, and to reduce the impact of flooding on local infrastructure. * Preserving and expanding Grey County’s natural areas to create healthy, vibrant, sustainable communities to live, work and play. * *Transition Grey County’s transportation sector to low-carbon vehicles and increase participation in active transportation modes and transit throughout Grey County, reduce emissions, increase air quality, and encourage healthy lifestyles while increasing connectivity and mobility amongst rural and urban spaces across the County.* * Continue to promote compact, mixed-use development and integrate smart growth principles into land use planning processes to allow for more efficient use of existing and planned infrastructure * Encourage reduction of building demolition waste through the adaptive reuse of older and existing building stock. * Prioritize energy conservation by building cleaner more efficient buildings, retrofitting existing structures, creating indoor spaces that are more comfortable for residents while ensuring policies are equitable and reduce energy poverty across our communities. * Developing a ‘climate lens’ whereby all County policy decisions are assessed in terms of the potential risks and opportunities from a climate change perspective. * Promote retrofits for energy efficiency in built heritage structures while maintaining their cultural integrity. * Developing a green building standard for all new buildings in partnership with local municipalities. * Promoting electric vehicle adoption and ensuring that the infrastructure is available to support electric vehicles by having charging stations at strategic locations as well as encouraging new buildings to include EV charging hook-ups. * Collaborating with local municipalities to support waste diversion, establishing innovative ways to create a circular economy in Grey, and work together with the community to sustainably manage our waste well into the future. * Collaborating with agricultural organizations and the agricultural community to prioritize the needs of farmers and provide support by developing resources and tools, leveraging funding for on-site projects and new technologies as well as recognizing the importance of a vibrant, sustainable and health farming community to Grey now and into the future. * Promoting renewable energy in the County that is owned and operated locally and supports the energy independence of residents and businesses.” | Through the recent hiring of the Manager of Climate Change at the County, and adoption of the County’s first Climate Change Action Plan, we have been able to incorporate additional policy and best practice recommendations that emphasize the importance of a ‘climate lens’ throughout planning decision-making. |
| 30 | 8.2(j) | Subsection (j) is hereby modified by adding the following clause at the end of this subjection:  “This policy shall not be interpreted to limit intensification on increased density; however, where the above standards for multiple accesses cannot be met, it shall be demonstrated that suitable and safe access can be provided to the satisfaction of the road authorities and emergency services.” | Earlier in this same policy section, it requires that new residential developments greater than 150 units will need to have two or more full accesses. This may not be achievable under certain circumstances, where roadway accesses are limited, or there are other land constraints. This additional policy wording is intended to recognize that the 2 accesses may not always be met, and under those circumstances it shall be demonstrated that the road authorities and emergency services are satisfied. |
| 31 | 8.8 | Section 8.8 is hereby deleted and replaced by the following: “Rail Corridors The Provincial Policy Statement says rail facilities should be protected from new *development* by ensuring new *development* is designed, buffered, and/or separated from each other. Although Grey *County* no longer has rail, we still have a number of former rail corridors that are primarily being used for trails. The following policies will protect these former rail corridors for trail use and for future rail use in the event rail returns to the area:   1. The *County* CP Rail Trail corridor is identified as a unique and irreplaceable public asset. The *County* CP Rail Trail should be preserved for existing and future transportation uses, including the potential re-introduction of rail service to the *County*. Should rail not return, the *County* will continue to maintain and improve the *County* CP Rail Trail as a key trail connection within the overall *complete transportation system* as well as a key connection within the overall Province-wide cycling network. Other rail trail corridors throughout the County should be managed similarly. 2. The *County* will maintain ownership of the rail corridor right-of-way and will generally not permit any new crossings or encroachments, on the rail right-of way for the private benefit of one or two properties that may compromise the multi-use recreational trail or the return of the property to a rail use, should such an opportunity arise (e.g., water pipeline, gas pipeline, hydro, telecommunications, residential laneway, or other). Utilizing the CP Rail Trail corridor will be considered for extension of broader public based services such as water and sewer services as well as the extension of *utilities* (e.g., broadband/fibre).   Efforts by the County shall be encouraged to regularize and document existing encumbrances along the rail trail corridor right-of-way.  Where a new crossing or encroachment is being proposed and/or requested, the following order of priority shall be implemented when determining the feasibility and approval of said request:   * Investigate alternate locations for access (utility and/or laneway) that avoid crossing over or under the rail trail corridor; * Laneway access for agricultural uses only (i.e., for agricultural trucks and equipment) (this does not include *agricultural-related* and *on-farm diversified uses*) * Where parcels of land are bisected by the rail trail and under the same ownership, development on the parcel with frontage along an open and maintained roadway shall be given first consideration; only in the event the lands with frontage along an open and maintained roadway are too small to support development, or there are alternative development constraints (i.e., hazard lands, wetlands, etc.), will consideration be given to the parcel of land requiring access from the rail trail; * In the event a parcel of land is landlocked with the only means of access via the rail trail, County staff will consider access needs;   Should a crossing or encroachment along the rail trail corridor right-of-way be proposed, the following shall be ensured:   * The registered property owner must meet all of the requirements of the local municipality, the County, and any other agency having jurisdiction; * A survey, plan preparation and registration of the easement. The developer would be responsible for costs of any necessary applications (i.e., consent for easement), survey, and legal costs of all parties (private and County) to formalize easement registrations. Further details regarding technical and financial requirements will be assessed on a case-by-case basis; * The use of the stated access across the rail trail shall only be for the use stated on the formal easement (i.e., utilities, residential crossing, etc.); * Vegetation along the right-of-way must not be cut or trimmed without written permission of the County;   Additional processes and agreements may be required as determined by the County. To minimize issues related to the proposed function and use of the trail, alternate access points other than the rail trail should be prioritized and considered where available.   1. New *development*s proposed adjacent to the *County* CP Rail Trail corridor will need to be designed to integrate with the CP Rail Trail by establishing connections to the Trail. To mitigate against the potential compatibility of *development* adjacent to the rail corridor based on current motorized trail users (e.g., snowmobiles and ATV’s), new *development* may be required to provide buffers/setbacks and/or screening which could include fences, berms, tree plantings, and/or landscaping to the satisfaction of the *County*. 2. The *County* encourages the conversion of abandoned railway corridors for trails and cycling routes. The *County* also encourages that these abandoned railway corridors remain under public ownership. 3. The *development* of public trails on abandoned rail corridors is appropriate in certain communities and where the trail can provide a link between communities. This will be explored further with local municipalities as part of the future Recreational Trails Master Plan and the future Trails and Cycling Plan. 4. Where land development may affect drainage being diverted toward the rail trail, the County may require alterations to such drainage proposals or construction of such drainage works as may be necessary to safeguard the interests of the CP Rail Trail.” | Clarified some policies around the CP Rail Trail including crossings and abutting land uses. |
| 32 | 8.10.1(3) | Subsection (3) is hereby deleted and replaced by the following:   1. *“Abandoned landfill sites* have been classified into three categories based on the Historic Landfill Site Review completed by Azimuth Environmental Consulting dated March 2015. The categories and policies associated with the *abandoned landfill sites* are as follows:    1. D-4 Recommended to Clear Site – for these sites, any proposed *development* or *site alteration* within 500 metres of these *abandoned landfill sites* will require the completion of a *D-4 study* in accordance with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) D-4 Guidelines or its successor document. The *D-4 study* or its successor document will need to identify that the lands to be developed are secure from potential methane gas and/or leachate migration from the landfill site or what remedial measures or conditions are required prior to any *development* approval being granted. Notwithstanding the above referenced buffer, if an approved Landfill Closure Plan exists, the requirements of that plan prevail.    2. Previously Evaluated Sites – these *abandoned landfill sites* have had a previous *D-4 study* completed. These existing D-4 Studies will be utilized to assess the potential impacts to a proposed *development*. In most cases, the *D-4 study* has identified a reduced area around the site that requires further study if *development* is proposed within the identified area. A further *D-4 study* or it successor document may be required to assess the potential impacts of the *abandoned landfill site* to the proposed *development*.    3. Previously Identified Site – these *abandoned landfill sites* have either been determined to have no risk, were proven to not exist, or there was a lack of information to locate a site. Although the locations of these sites are still shown on Appendix A, no further study is required for *development* proposed either within or adjacent to these locations.” | A change in terminology was made to reflect the existing terminology used under Appendix A of the County Official Plan from “cleared sites” to “previously identified sites”. |
| 33 | 9.11(3)(c) | A new subsection (3)(c) is hereby added as follows and the remaining subsections are re-lettered accordingly:   1. “Minimizing greenhouse gas emissions and/or increasing readiness to respond to climate change;” | Further changes in response to the Climate Change Action Plan. |
| 34 | 9.16(i) | Subsection (i) is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:   1. “To promote energy efficiency, greenhouse gas emission reductions, climate change readiness, and sound environmental design;” | Further changes in response to the Climate Change Action Plan. |
| 35 | 9.17 | Section 9.17 is hereby modified by adding the following two sentences to the end of paragraph four of this section. The remainder of this section shall remain unmodified.  “Where applications are submitted to the County or a local municipality, the applicant will be required to demonstrate proof of ownership of the lands, or delegated authority to act on behalf of the owner. Municipalities may determine appropriate methods for determining proof of ownership and/or delegated authority.” | Added clarification to with respect to demonstrating ownership of the subject lands and/or delegated authority before filing an application. |
| 36 | 9.18 | Section 9.18 is hereby modified by deleting the definition for “bonus zoning” and adding the following definitions:  *“CAMPGROUND* means the use of land for the provision of overnight or short-term temporary accommodation for trailers, motor homes, yurts, geodesic domes, and tents, but not long-term, permanent accommodation such as mobile homes, and includes services and facilities normally incidental and subordinate to such a use including washroom and bathing facilities, indoor and/or outdoor recreational areas, and an entrance kiosk.  *DECOMMISSIONED LIVESTOCK BARN*means a *livestock barn* that has been formally rezoned for uses other than housing livestock (such as dry storage, or an on-farm diversified use); and which has had animal stalls and feeding troughs removed.  EMPLOYEE HOUSING means housing intended for employees that is affordable and attainable relative to their household size and income and, restricted to employee occupancy. Employee housing may be subject to eligibility, occupancy, rent, term or other restrictions.  *FARM CLUSTER* means the grouping of farm related buildings and farm dwelling(s) in an arrangement which maximizes the agricultural area and potential of the farm lot.  *GARDEN SUITE* means a one-unit detached residential structure containing bathroom and kitchen facilities that is ancillary to an existing residential structure and that is designed to be portable.  *TINY HOME* is defined as a small, private and self-contained residential unit with living and dining areas; kitchen and bathroom facilities, a sleeping area, and is intended for year-round use. They are generally between 17.5 m2 and 37m2 in total floor area (or in accordance with Ontario Building Code criteria).” | Deleted the bonus zoning definition in relation to changes to the *Planning Act*.  Provides a definition for employee housing, further to the policies in section 4.2.10.  The other five definitions were added to clarify policies from other sections of the plan. |
| 37 | 7 | Section 7 is hereby modified by adding a new paragraph at the end of this section. The remainder of this section shall remain unmodified.  “The County, local municipalities and/or conservation authorities having jurisdiction within Grey, may choose to develop and use offsetting policies or procedures (also called biodiversity offsetting). Offsetting policies or procedures may contemplate impacts to a natural feature, where avoidance is not feasible, with the requirement for the reestablishment or rehabilitation of a similar natural feature elsewhere on or off-site. Offsetting policies or procedures may also include the collection of monies to be used by County, local municipalities, conservation authorities, and/or *conservation organizations* for the reestablishment or rehabilitation of natural features or land acquisition for the protection of natural features.” | In recognition of a recently approved policy by the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority, and some practises already used under the *Endangered Species Act*, this new paragraph would allow for the creation and use of offsetting policies. |
| 38 | 9.5(6) and (7) | Subsection 9.5(6) is hereby modified by adding the following wording onto the end of this subsection:  “, without the need for amendment to this Plan.”  Section 9.5 is hereby further modified by adding a new subsection (7) as follows:   1. “Where changes to the *Planning Act* and/or internal County or municipal procedures, result in the further delegation of approvals from councils or committees to staff, no further amendments will be needed to this Plan. The County supports any efforts to streamline the development approvals process in this regard. Any sections of this Plan that refer to approvals being made by councils or committees, such as, but not limited to, sections 9.6, 9.7, 9.8, 9.9, 9.10, 9.11, 9.12 and 9.13, shall be interpreted to mean approvals by councils or committees, or any delegated authorities such as staff.” | Providing flexibility for delegate approvals to streamline the development process, where legislated authority exists for such delegation. |
| 39 | 4.1(4) | Section 4.1 is hereby modified by adding a new subsection (4) as follows. The remaining subsections are renumbered accordingly.   1. “Encouraging municipalities to pre-zone lands for *intensification* and densities that support the creation of new affordable rental or owned housing;” | Providing further support for affordable housing as discussed with the County’s Affordable Housing Taskforce. |
| 40 | 4.2(h) | A new subsection (h) is hereby added to section 4.2 as follows:   1. “The use of land-banking and/or housing first disposal of surplus lands policies, whereby lands deemed surplus to County or local municipal needs could be added to a land bank (i.e. an inventory of available lands) and then may be offered for affordable housing development first, prior to the consideration of other uses. County or municipal land banks or inventories may be established for affordable housing needs, to offer low or no-cost lands for such development. These tools could be used in conjunction with incentives through Community Improvement Plans, as per section 9.16 of this Plan.” | Providing further support for affordable housing as discussed with the County’s Affordable Housing Taskforce. |
| 41 | 4.2.9 | A new section 4.2.9 of the Plan is hereby added as follows:  "4.2.9 Cohousing  The County supports the creation of new cohousing opportunities, whether in a single building, or through a series of dwellings or units with shared facilities. As the County’s population grows and the demographics shift, cohousing is an opportunity to support the physical and mental health of our communities.  In some cohousing opportunities residents may own their individual homes, which are clustered around common space or buildings with shared amenities. These amenities may include a common kitchen and dining areas, workshops, guest rooms, home offices, living space, gyms, laundry, etc. Other cohousing opportunities may be individual units within a single building which contain common use or amenity spaces.  Cohousing may be established through a plan of condominium, rental, life or land-lease development types.  Cohousing opportunities will be permitted within all settlement area land use types of this Plan.” | Providing further support for affordable housing as discussed with the County’s Affordable Housing Taskforce. |
| 42 | 9.13 | A new subsection (3) is hereby added to section 9.14 as follows:   1. “Municipalities are encouraged to consider *Development* Charges exemptions or deferrals that promote new affordable or rental housing.” | Providing further support for affordable housing as discussed with the County’s Affordable Housing Taskforce. |
| 43 | A-1 | Schedule A – Amended the Inland Lakes and Shoreline boundaries to encompass a marina and two existing developed residential lots. | A mapping change to recognize existing development. |
| 44 | A-2 | Schedule A – Amended the Inland Lakes and Shoreline boundaries to encompass existing residential development along the south side of Country Drive and east and west of Eagle Point Drive | A mapping change to recognize existing development. |
| 45 | A-3 | Schedule A – Added a Space Extensive Industrial and Commercial designation to encompass the Chapmans Distribution Centre on Highway 10. | A mapping change to recognize existing development. |
| 46 | A-4 | Schedule A – Added a Space Extensive Industrial and Commercial designation to encompass an existing industrial development (formerly InterForest). | A mapping change to recognize existing development. |
| 47 | A-5 | Schedule A – Added two Future Secondary Plan overlays to reflect Town of Hanover’s study areas from their comprehensive review. | A mapping change to recognize the work completed by the Town of Hanover in the comprehensive review. |
| 48 | A-6 | Schedule B – Amended the Mineral Resource Extraction and Aggregate Resource Area designations to reflect current licensed boundaries. | Changes to the Mineral Resource Extraction and Aggregate Resource Area designations on County-owned lands in Durham. |
| 49 | A-7 | Schedule B – Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development (Highland Estates). | Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development where new extraction development would be incompatible. |
| 50 | A-8 | Schedule B – Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development (Forest Creek Estates). | Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development where new extraction development would be incompatible. |
| 51 | A-9 | Schedule B – Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development (Connell Lake). | Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development where new extraction development would be incompatible. |
| 52 | A-10 | Schedule B – Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development (Harris Estates and Hoffman Subdivsion). | Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development where new extraction development would be incompatible. |
| 53 | A-11 | Schedule B – Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development (McCullough Lake). | Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development where new extraction development would be incompatible. |
| 54 | A-12 | Schedule B – Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development. | Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development where new extraction development would be incompatible. |
| 55 | A-13 | Schedule B – Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development. | Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development where new extraction development would be incompatible. |
| 56 | A-14 | Schedule B – Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development. | Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development where new extraction development would be incompatible. |
| 57 | A-15 | Schedule B – Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development (Plumeville). | Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation from an existing residential development where new extraction development would be incompatible. |
| 58 | A-16 | Schedule B – Updated a Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. | Changes to the Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. |
| 59 | A-17 | Schedule B – Added a Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. | Added a Mineral Resource Extraction designation based on a newly licensed pit. |
| 60 | A-18 | Schedule B – Updated a Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. | Changes to the Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. |
| 61 | A-19 | Schedule B – Updated a Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. | Changes to the Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. |
| 62 | A-20 | Schedule B – Updated a Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. | Changes to the Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. |
| 63 | A-21 | Schedule B – Updated a Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. | Changes to the Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. |
| 64 | A-22 | Schedule B – Added a Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. | Added a Mineral Resource Extraction designation based on a newly licensed pit. |
| 65 | A-23 | Schedule B – Removed a Mineral Resource Extraction designation based on the pit being closed and rehabilitated. | Removed Mineral Resource Extraction designation where a pit was rehabilitated. |
| 66 | A-24 | Schedule B – Added a Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. | Changes to the Mineral Resource Extraction designation to match the licensed boundary. |
| 67 | A-25 | Schedule B – Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation based on previously approved official plan amendment 128. | Removed an Aggregate Resource Area designation based on a previously approved demonstration that extraction was not feasible in this location. |
| 68 | A-26 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 69 | A-27 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 70 | A-28 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 71 | A-29 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 72 | A-30 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 73 | A-31 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 74 | A-32 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 75 | A-33 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 76 | A-34 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 77 | A-35 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 78 | A-36 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 79 | A-37 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 80 | A-38 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 81 | A-39 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 82 | A-40 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 83 | A-41 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 84 | A-42 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 85 | A-43 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 86 | A-44 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 87 | A-45 | Appendix E – Removed bedrock or shale resources from a settlement area. | Removed bedrock or shale resources mapping as it would not be feasible to extract in a settlement area. |
| 88 | 3.4.2 | A new subsection (5) is hereby added as follows:   1. “Notwithstanding policies of section 3.4.2 of this Plan, municipalities may permit adjustments of settlement boundaries outside a comprehensive review provided: 2. There would be no net increase in land within the settlement area; 3. The adjustment would support the municipality’s ability to meet intensification and redevelopment targets established by the municipality; 4. Agricultural policies are addressed as per section 5 of this Plan, and 5. The settlement area to which lands would be added is appropriately serviced and there is sufficient reserve infrastructure capacity to service the lands.” | In the 2020 update to the PPS a new section 1.1.3.9 was added. This modification would amend the County Plan for the purposes of consistency with that section of the PPS. |
| 89 | 3.4.3 | A new paragraph is added at the end of this section as follows:  “The County will work with member municipalities in Grey, as well as neighbouring municipalities outside of Grey, to coordinate growth and future expansion opportunities between municipalities. Where municipal boundary adjustments are recommended to achieve the growth allocation targets, opportunities for mutually beneficial, or win-win agreements will be explored where feasible.” | Based on the direction from County Council through staff report [Addendum to PDR-CW-17-20](https://docs.grey.ca/share/public?nodeRef=workspace://SpacesStore/37226212-2a43-41cf-9f86-66720e617c16), County staff have added some wording to this section to explore win-win opportunities. |
| 90 | Table 8 | Table 8 of the County Official Plan is hereby deleted and replaced by the following:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Land Use Type** | **Minimum Property Size** | **On-farm diversified Use Maximum Size** | | Agricultural | 10 hectares | The lesser of;   * 2% of the total size of the property, or * A maximum combined area of the use of 1 hectare | | Special Agricultural | 10 hectares | The lesser of;   * 2% of the total size of the property, or * A maximum combined area of the use of 1 hectare | | Rural | No minimum land size | The lesser of;   * 2% of the total size of the property, or * A maximum combined area of the use of 1 hectare | | County staff are proposing to slightly extend the on-farm diversified use policies to smaller farm sizes to further extend the viability of smaller farm parcels. This change was requested by farmers with support from a planning consultant. |
| 91 | 5.2.2(18) | In subsection (f) the final word “and” is hereby deleted, and added to the end of subsection (g).  A new subsection (h) is hereby added as follows:   1. “The owner of the lands on which the on-farm diversified use is proposed shall be a ‘bona fide farmer’. For the purposes of this policy, the ‘bona fide farmer’ must have a farm business registration number. A ‘bona fide farmer’ is defined to include a limited company, sole proprietorship, incorporated company, numbered company, partnership, and other similar ownership forms. Notwithstanding subsection (h) the requirement to be a bona fide farmer shall not apply to bed and breakfasts and/or home rural occupations within the dwelling, or for on-farm diversified uses in the Rural land use type.” | A new criterion has been added to require a farm business registration number prior to allowing for an on-farm diversified use. This criterion is proposed in concert with the changes through modifications 89 and 90, to ensure that although smaller sized on-farm diversified uses are being considered, there is still a requirement that the lands be farmed. This criterion is also consistent with the criteria the County applies to surplus farm dwelling severances. |
| 92 | 5.4.2 | A new subsection (12) is hereby added as follows:   1. “Notwithstanding section 5.2.2(18)(h) of this Plan, on-farm diversified uses in the Rural land use type can be considered on lands where the owner is not a bona fide farmer.” | This policy will allow for slightly greater flexibility for on-farm diversified uses in Rural land use type, versus those on-farm uses in the Agricultural and Special Agricultural land use types. |
| 93 | 7.14 | A new section 7.14 entitled ‘Dark Sky Protection’ is hereby added as follows:  “Grey County recognizes the value in preventing all forms of pollution. People live in, or come to, Grey County to enjoy the natural environment, whether as permanent/seasonal residents or as visitors. Light pollution has been rapidly increasing over the last many years. Preventing an increase in light pollution, and where possible reducing light pollution levels, is important as it places an additional strain on our ecosystem. Light pollution can have negative impacts on the health and welfare of wildlife. Light pollution can also negatively impact human health, our economy (i.e. increased energy costs and wasted energy can mean increased money being spent), tourism, and culture. Over-lighting of public and private space is an inefficient use of energy causing unnecessary greenhouse gases, and further adding to climate change. Unlike other forms of pollution, light pollution does not have residual effects once the pollution is abated at its source. Through the policies of this section of the Plan, in addition to measures taken at the municipal level, the County aims to minimize the impacts of light pollution to preserve dark skies.  The following policies and principles support the preservation of dark skies and limiting light pollution.   1. Municipalities are encouraged to consider passing light abatement by-laws, as per section 128 of the Municipal Act, R.S.O. 2001, or any successor thereto. 2. The County and member municipalities are encouraged to adopt dark sky policies in their official plans and in their engineering standards for streetlights, signage, and municipal facilities. 3. Site plan control guidelines may include a requirement for an outdoor lighting plan to ensure dark sky friendly lighting is used. 4. The County and member municipalities may require as a condition of draft approval, or through wording in a subdivision or condominium agreement, the use of dark sky friendly lighting, or light abatement provisions, to limit the potential for light pollution. 5. Lighting plans may be required as part of a complete application, in accordance with section 9.17 of this Plan. 6. Sign by-laws should consider limiting the use of lit-signage or billboards that may have a deleterious impact on dark skies. 7. This Plan recognizes the use of lighting for public safety purposes and encourages the use of lighting which both provides for safety and limits light pollution. 8. Where lighting on signage is required, the County encourages the use of solar panels as a means of powering that lighting.   Nothing within this section is intended limit lighting required in accordance with any Federal or Provincial standards, including but not limited to navigation, telecommunication towers, etc. Federal or Provincially regulated projects are encouraged to use lighting which minimizes impacts on dark skies, while still meeting Federal or Provincial standards.” | The County heard from a number of individuals requesting better dark sky protection. While the County Official Plan is not an enforcement mechanism, these policies provide for greater guidance on dark sky protection through infrastructure, design standards, and at individual site level. |
| 94 | 9.13(h) | Subsection 9.13(h) is hereby deleted and replaced by the following:   1. “Compliance with the Dark Skies policies of section 7.14 of this Plan.” | Now that the County will have a dark skies section of the Plan, this former subsection which referenced dark skies will now provide a cross reference back to section 7.14. |
| 95 | 9.11(4) | Subsection (4) is hereby amended by adding the words “dark sky friendly” between the words “circulation” and “lighting” in this section. | This addition reinforces the notion that site plan control is a tool by which dark sky friendly lighting can be implemented, as per modification # 93. |
| 96 | 9.17 | Section 9.17 is hereby modified by adding the words “, Site Plan,” into the left column of the table between the words “Consent” and “Zoning By-law Amendment”.  The Table in this section is hereby further modified by adding the words “lighting plans” and “affordable or attainable housing report” as potential study requirements for following application types:   * Consent, Site Plan, and Zoning By-law Amendment * Local Official Plan Amendment * Plan of Subdivision – Plan of Condominium * County Official Plan Amendment. | This addition reinforces proposed policy 7.14(4) in modification # 93, and adds in complete applications for site plans, as per recent changes to the *Planning Act*. |
| 97 | Throughout the Plan and on the Land Use Schedules | Any references in the Plan or on the land use schedules to “Inland Lakes and Shoreline”, “Recreational Resort Area”, “Sunset Strip Area” and “Industrial Business Park” are hereby deleted and replaced by the following:  “Inland Lakes and Shoreline Settlement Area”, “Recreational Resort Settlement Area”, “Sunset Strip Settlement Area” and “Industrial Business Park Settlement Area” | This modification helps clarify any confusion with respect to whether the Inland Lakes and Shoreline, Recreational Resort Area, Sunset Strip Area, and Industrial Business Park land use types are designated settlement areas. Recolour Grey already defined each of these land use types as settlement areas, but there was still some confusion amongst readers of the Plan, so this will help further clarify that they are in fact settlement areas. |
| 98 | 3.5(7), (8), & (9) | New subsections (7), (8), and (9) are hereby added to the Plan as follows:  “(7) The County recognizes the need for additional apartment buildings and/or mixed-use development with residential dwellings above commercial or office development within Primary Settlement Areas. The lot densities described in subsection (5) above represent minimum targets only. In most cases mixed use development or apartment buildings will far exceed the County’s 25 units per net hectare minimum density requirement. Density policies within this Plan shall not limit such development from exceeding those minimum requirements.  (8) The County does not support residential zones within the Primary Settlement Area which only allow for single detached dwellings as the only residential use in a zone. In addition to single detached dwellings, municipal zoning by-laws shall permit additional residential units and other forms of housing such as semi-detached, townhouses, rowhouses, etc. When updating municipal zoning by-laws municipalities shall provide residential zones that provide a mix of residential unit types.  (9) Municipalities may choose to distinguish between minimum residential densities for infill development versus greenfield development densities. Where it is not specified otherwise in a municipal official plan, it will be assumed that the minimum development densities in Section 3.5(5) of this Plan shall apply to both greenfield and infill development.” | Subsection (7) of this modification clarifies any confusion with respect to the fact that new apartment buildings often far exceed the County’s minimum density requirements.  Subsection (8) of this modification clarifies that fully serviced settlement areas need to have a range of residential unit types, and that zones allowing for only single detached dwellings will not be supported.  Subsection (9) gives municipalities the ability to distinguish between greenfield and infill development densities. |
| 99 | A-49 | Schedule A Map 2 and Secondary Schedule 2q are hereby deleted and replaced with a revised version showing the updated settlement area boundaries of Dundalk as revised by the Ministers Zoning Order and the newly adopted Southgate Official Plan. | This modification reflects the Provincial changes made to the settlement area boundary of Dundalk, which have also recently been adopted in the Township Official Plan. |
| 100 | 5.2.2(5)(m) | A new subsection (m) is added, as follows:   1. *“MDS* I setback is not required for any unoccupied *livestock barns* when:    * the building has been deemed by a municipal building official, with input from a professional engineer or a consultant knowledgeable about *livestock facilities* where appropriate, as being not structurally sound nor reasonably capable of housing livestock; or    * the portion of the lot on which the unoccupied *livestock barn* is zoned such that livestock facilities are not permitted;    * or the floor area of the unoccupied livestock barn is under 100 m2 .” | To add additional strengthening and direction towards barn-preservation policies. This policy has been extracted from the MDS Guidelines provincial document. |
| 101 | 3.3 | The title of Table 5 is hereby modified by inserting the words “Primary and Secondary” between the words “County’s” and “Settlement” | Clarifying that Table 5 is not referring to all settlement areas, but rather just the Primary and Secondary Settlement Areas. |
| 102 | 8.2(a)  11th Bullet | A new 11th bullet is added to section 8.2(a) as follows:   * + - “collaborating with local municipalities to support the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure as needed;” | To provide clarify that the complete transportation system will include the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure. |
| 103 | 8.10(3) | Subsection 8.10(3) is hereby modified by inserting the words “organics handling,” between the words “waste reduction,” and “waste transfer stations,”. | To encourage the provision of organics handling in addition to other forms of waste reduction and diversion. |
| 104 | 8.10(10) | A new subsection (10) is added as follows:  “The County encourages the collection of landfill gas for capture and utilization technology.” | Providing support for the collection of menthane to be for energy generation or other purposes. |
| 105 | A-47 | Schedule B – Removed a Mineral Resource Extraction designation based on the pit being closed and rehabilitated. | A license was removed, and the site was rehabilitated at 152149 Southgate Sideroad 15. |
| 106 | A-46 | Schedule B – Added two Mineral Resource Extraction designations to match the licensed boundaries. | Added two Mineral Resource Extraction designations based on newly licensed pits. |
| 107 | 5.4.3(1) | The following sentence is added at the end of section 5.4.3(1):  “A surplus farm dwelling severance may be considered under this land use type provided it conforms with the rural lot density provisions and with section 5.2.3(1)(b).” | Provide consideration for new non-farm size lot creation in the *Aggregate Resource Area, Bedrock Resource Area,* and *Shale Resource Area.* |
| 108 | Section 7 | The following paragraphs are added at the end Section 7 – Background:  “The County, local municipalities and/or conservation authorities having jurisdiction within Grey, may choose to develop and use ecological/ecosystem offsetting (also called biodiversity offsetting) policies or procedures for private land development proposals and/or public infrastructure undertakings. Consideration for offsetting may only be applicable where it is consistent with the appropriate legislation, regulations and supporting policies and guidelines (Provincial Policy Statement, Provincial Plans, Official Plans, Forest Management Plans, Forest Management By-laws, Tree-Cutting By-laws, etc.).  Offsetting must follow the mitigation hierarchy of Avoid, Minimize, Mitigate, then Offset. It should only be applied after a detailed analysis has determined that avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of loss is not possible or feasible. This tool shall not replace or negate the requirements of other legislation applicable to impacts to species or ecosystems at the municipal, regional, provincial, or federal levels. Protection, and ideally restoration and improvements of existing natural systems remains the primary goal of natural heritage systems planning (as per Section 2.1 of the PPS).  Offsetting policies or procedures should target an ecological (net) gain. Where determined to not be feasible, they should ensure no-net-loss and fully replace the same level of lost ecosystem structure and function in proximity to where the loss occurs.  Where other compensation or offsetting programs exist (i.e., tree cutting by-laws that speak to tree replacement planting or funds), efforts shall be made to coordinate the separate processes to limit duplication. All programs of this nature should offer a comprehensive approach to restoring unavoidable losses.” | This addition offers some direction around development and using ecological/ecosystem offsetting policies or procedures. |
| 109 | 9.13.1 | Section 9.13.1 is hereby modified by adding the following paragraph between the second last and last paragraphs of this section:  “Notwithstanding the provisions of this section 9.13.1, the County may deem a draft plan of subdivision or condominium not to have lapsed, provided the following three criteria can be met:   1. the draft plan has lapsed less than five years ago, 2. the draft plan has not previously been deemed not to have lapsed under this subsection, and 3. no agreements of purchase and sale have been entered into for the sale of lands within the draft approved plan of subdivision or condominium.   The County will request an opinion from the member municipality where the draft plan of subdivision or condominium is located, prior to considering deeming the draft plan not to have lapsed.” | Adding in new abilities to deem a draft plan of subdivision or condominium not to have lapsed based on recent changes to 51(33) of the *Planning Act* via Bill 109. |
| 110 | 6. Niagara Escarpment Plan | Section 6 is hereby deleted and replaced with the following. Subsections 6.1 – 6.3 shall remain unaltered.  “The lands under the jurisdiction of the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) are outlined on Schedule A. The Niagara Escarpment Plan must be referred to for determination as to whether or not lands are affected by the various *land use type*s and policies under that planning document. In the event of a conflict between the policies of this Plan and the policies of the Niagara Escarpment Plan, those of the Escarpment Plan will prevail.  This Plan provides *land use type*s and policies for lands designated Escarpment Recreation Area, Urban Area and Minor Urban Centres in the Niagara Escarpment Plan. There are other designations under the Niagara Escarpment Plan that will be collectively reflected as part of the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area. Areas of Development Control within the NEP shall be determined by Niagara Escarpment Commission planning staff. The following policies identify how the appropriate *County* Official Plan policies apply in absence of local official plans and/or secondary plans for these areas.” | Clarifying the role of the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the mapping shown in the County Plan. |
| 111 | 4.2.10 | A new section 4.2.10 is hereby added to the Plan as follows:  “Employees, whether part time or full time, shall have the opportunity to access affordable and livable employee housing. Recolour Grey promotes a diverse range of housing types, densities, and tenures to support the needs of the County’s range of housing needs. This diverse range includes purpose-built employee housing where occupancy may be restricted to at least one of its occupants being employed by the business. Employee housing may be owned and operated by a specific employer, or it may be privately operated (i.e. not owned by the employer). Full and part time employees are included in these provisions.   1. Employee housing will be a permitted use in land use types with full municipal services, including Primary Settlement Areas and Recreational Resort Settlement Area, that are in proximity to major employers and business centres. 2. By-laws and development agreements may be used to ensure occupancy and use is for employee housing. 3. Municipalities are encouraged to amend their zoning by-laws to include provisions for employee housing.” | Provide consideration for employee housing in the Primary Settlement Area and Recreational Resort Area. |
| 112 | A-48 | Updated Schedule A and Secondary Schedule 3l to reflect the property boundaries of the future Rockwood Terrance redevelopment lands in Durham. | Made a minor tweak to the Primary Settlement Area boundaries to match the property boundaries for the County-owned lands. |
| 113 | 3.8(1) and (6) | Section 3.8(1) is hereby modified by deleting the phrase “including second units as per Section 4.1.5” and replacing it with the following: “including additional residential units as per section 4.2.5 and employee housing as per section 4.2.10”  Section 3.8 is hereby further modified by adding a new subsection (6) as follows:  “(6) The County does not support residential zones within the Recreational Resort Settlement Area which only allow for single detached dwellings as the only residential use in a zone. In addition to single detached dwellings, municipal zoning by-laws shall permit additional residential units and other forms of housing such as semi-detached, townhouses, rowhouses, etc. When updating municipal zoning by-laws municipalities shall provide residential zones that provide a mix of residential unit types.” | Clarifying that employee housing is a permitted use in the Recreational Resort Area.  Subsection (6) of this modification clarifies that fully serviced settlement areas need to have a range of residential unit types, and that zones allowing for only single detached dwellings will not be supported. |
| 114 | 9.18 | The definition for “net hectare” in section 9.18 of the Plan is hereby modified by inserting the words “additional residential units,” between the words “excluding” and “roads,”. | Clarifying that additional residential units are not included in the density per net hectare calculation. |
| 115 | 8.9.4(2) and (3) | Subsections (2) and (3) are hereby deleted and replaced by the following:   1. “The County encourages that fibre be installed for all new developments where fibre is available in order to connect to the overall fibre network being developed through the Accelerated High Speed Internet Program (or any successor thereto). 2. The County supports providing access to telecommunication providers to install fibre and/or conduit within the rights-of-way of County roads or the County CP Rail Trail corridor to support the Accelerated High Speed Internet Program (or any successor thereto). Fibre or conduit should be installed outside of the travelled portion of the road and trail where possible to avoid future conflicts and disruptions.” | Clarifying the County’s broadband policies based on lessons learned and the Accelerated High Speed Internet Program. |
| 116 | 8.9.1(18) | A new subsection (18) is added to the end of this section as follows:  “New lot creation less than 0.4 hectares in size on individual private services, or on partial services using private individual septic systems, shall only be considered with the successful completion of a nitrate study demonstrating that the lot can be serviced in accordance with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) D-5 Series Guidelines, or any successor thereto.  Municipalities may choose to require a nitrate study for additional residential units on lots less than 0.4 hectares in size.” | Clarifying what is required for smaller lot creation on private septic systems, based on recent comments from municipal planners. The option is provided to municipalities to also require a nitrate study for new ARUs on lots less than 0.4 hectares in size. |
| 117 | 3.4.1(2) | A new subsection (2) is added as follows:  “Notwithstanding the policies of section 3.4.1(1) of this Plan, where a municipality has not yet completed their intensification strategy, it shall not prevent intensification projects from developing ahead of that strategy.” | Clarifying that intensification can still proceed prior to the completion of a municipal intensification strategy. |
| 118 | A-50 | Updated Schedule A to correctly show the Mount Forest and Wellington County boundary. | The County Plan had incorrectly shown the neighbouring municipal/county boundaries, which are being corrected through this modification. |
| 119 | A-51 | Updated Schedule B to correctly show the Mount Forest and Wellington County boundary. | The County Plan had incorrectly shown the neighbouring municipal/county boundaries, which are being corrected through this modification. |
| 120 | A-52 | Updated Appendix A to correctly show the Mount Forest and Wellington County boundary, and to remove any mapped wellhead protection areas shown outside the Grey County boundaries. | The County Plan had incorrectly shown the neighbouring municipal/county boundaries, which are being corrected through this modification. |
| 121 | A-53 | Updated Appendix C to correctly show the Mount Forest and Wellington County boundary, and to remove any mapped treaty areas shown outside the Grey County boundaries. | The County Plan had incorrectly shown the neighbouring municipal/county boundaries, which are being corrected through this modification. |
| 122 | A-54 | Updated Appendix C to correctly show the Mount Forest and Wellington County boundary. | The County Plan had incorrectly shown the neighbouring municipal/county boundaries, which are being corrected through this modification. |