## County of Grey – Proposed Official Plan Amendment 11 Table with Modifications and Rationale

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Number** | **Section or Schedule #** | **Proposed Modification** | **Rationale** |
| 1 | Various sections throughout the Plan | Any references to a ‘20-year’ planning horizon or growth supply is 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 | 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. Housing growth has been outpacing population growth which is an outcome of our aging population as well as some of the housing being associated with seasonal growth (i.e. second homes/cottages). The growth which has been occurring in the *County* has been unevenly distributed among the nine local municipalities.  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 anything 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 encourage 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 *County* must determine how much each local municipality will grow within the planning framework and timelines, and identify where this growth should occur. *Land use type*s in the Plan identify where growth should go and what needs to be considered before growth can happen in those areas. It also means that the *County* must identify targets for how much we should intensify and redevelop (growing inward and upward) within the Settlement Area *Land use type*s.  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 Provincial Policy Statement requires the *County* to work with local municipalities to identify, coordinate, and allocate population, housing, and employment projections. The Growth Management Strategy identified the growth projections for each local municipality which are identified in Tables 1 to 3 below.  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. **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** |   Based on the growth projections at this time for the *County* as a whole, it would appear that we have enough Settlement Area *Land use type*s identified (mapped) to accommodate the anticipated growth. There are however, specific settlement areas that are either currently or may experience land shortage in the near future e.g. Hanover, Dundalk, Markdale and others. On-going monitoring and consideration needs to be given to addressing these issues. 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. Boundary adjustments to any Community *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 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 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 most hamlets. 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 growth. Two other *land use type*s include Recreational Resort Areas and Inland Lakes and Shoreline areas which may experience a larger percentage of our seasonal growth. Two additional Settlement Area *land use types* include the Sunset Strip Area and the Industrial Business Park.” | 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 ‘second units’ or ‘secondary suites (i.e. 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, * 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. “For the City of Owen Sound and the Town of Hanover, a minimum residential *development* density of 25 units per *net hectare* will be achieved for new *development*. For all other Primary *Settlement Areas*, a minimum residential *development* density of 20 units per *net hectare* will be achieved for new *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 the City of Owen Sound and the Town of Hanover, or less than 20 units per *net hectare* for all other 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* for the City of Owen Sound and the Town of Hanover, or less than 20 units per *net hectare* for all other 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 is appropriate lands and servicing available.  Within defined settlement areas, the County would encourage Tiny Homes to be considered *additional residential units*, whereby they should be permanent, built structures, ideally connected to available municipal servicing. 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 can own the unit and enter into a private land-lease agreement with a property owner.  *County* planning staff encourage local municipalities to defer to *Ontario Building Code (OBC)* requirements for minimum gross floor area coverage.  In keeping with Official Plan goals and opportunities of developing complete communities (Section 1.4.1) and *complete streets* (Section 8.2), minimum lot size standards should be updated, alongside zoning to allow for more compact *development*. This will facilitate cohesive community design, where people’s needs are easily accessible and convenient. *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. |
| 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.   * 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. 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. *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. |
| 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.” | Further clarity around the relationship between garden suite policies and ARU policies. |
| 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) is 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 the following phase after the term ‘wine tasting)’  “\*a *campground* shall not be recognized as an OFDU” | Campgrounds are permitted as per Section 5.4.2(9), under the rural land use type. OFDU 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) | Subsections (5) and (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*.”   Note the current plan inadvertently has two subsection (5)’s. It is only the second subsection (5) that is deleted through this amendment. | These policy sections were duplicates from section 5.6. |
| 17 | 5.2.2(12) | Subsection (12) is hereby modified by adding the following clause after the end of this subsection.  “Notwithstanding the above, *home rural occupations* may be permitted in the *Rural land use type* on lots less than 20 hectares in size, which exceed the size limitations in Table 8, where permitted in municipal zoning by-laws, or where adequate justification has been provided in support of a zoning amendment.” | Clarified the home rural occupation policies on Rural lots under 20 hectares. |
| 18 | 5.2.2(13) | Subsection (13) 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(18) | Subsection (18) 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) and (8) 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.”* | 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. |
| 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 it 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 modified by deleting the words ‘a zoning by-law’ and replacing it with ‘an official plan’. This subsection is further modified by deleting the words ‘or new non-farm sized lot creation’. The revised first sentence of this subsection shall read as follows:   1. “In *Aggregate Resource Area*s shown on Schedule B, new *non-agricultural uses* that require an official plan amendment on existing lots of record, which would prevent or hinder new extraction operations, and may only be permitted if:” | 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, compatible and 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, provided reasoning is provided to:  * 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, 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 also 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 is in the process of creating 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.  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 the work completed regarding the 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 is described 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. 2. The *County* will maintain ownership of the rail corridor right-of-way and will generally not permit any new encroachments, easements or encumbrances on the rail right-of way that may compromise 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 for extension of water and sewer services will be considered as well as the extension of *utilities* (e.g. broadband/fibre).   Efforts by the County shall be encouraged to identify and legalize existing encumbrances along the rail trail corridor right-of-way by way of a survey, agreement and/or other with the respective landowner(s).  Where a new encumbrance is being proposed and/or requested, the following order of priority shall be implemented when determining these request types:   * Investigate alternate locations for access (utility and/or laneway) that avoid the rail trail corridor; * Laneway access for agricultural purposes only (this does not include agricultural related and on-farm diversified uses) * Where parcels of land are bisected by the rail trail, development on the parcel with frontage along an open and maintained roadway shall be given first consideration; 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.), consideration will be given to the parcel of land requiring access from the rail trail;   Should an encumbrance 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 regional government, and any other agency having jurisdiction; * A survey, plan preparation and registration of the easement; * 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.  Developments that have alternate access points other than the rail trail should be prioritized and considered, as this will minimize issues related to the proposed function and use of the trail.   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 early results of 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 early results of 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.  *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.” | Deleted the bonus zoning definition in relation to changes to the *Planning Act*.  The other four 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 Country Drive and 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. | 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. | 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. | 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. | 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. | 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. | 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. |