



Planning and Development

595 9th Avenue East, Owen Sound Ontario N4K 3E3
519-372-0219 / 1-800-567-GREY / Fax: 519-376-7970

December 7th, 2021

Ms. Elisha Milne
Administrative & Legislative Coordinator
Township of Southgate
185667 Grey County Road 9
Dundalk, ON, N0C 1B0
Sent via E-mail

Mr. Ron Davidson
Ron Davidson Land Use Planning
Consultant Inc.
265 Beattie Street
Owen Sound, ON, N4K 6X2
Sent via E-mail

RE: Comments on Township of Southgate New Official Plan

Dear Ms. Milne and Mr. Davidson,

County staff would like to commend the Township of Southgate and Mr. Davidson for all the work that has gone into the proposed new Township Official Plan. A lot of thought and effort has gone into this project, and County staff appreciate the ability to provide comments. What follows are some comments related to the provisions of the *Planning Act*, the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2020, and the County Official Plan. Additional general comments have also been included with respect to overall clarity and understanding of the Plan.

In making the below comments, County staff have focused on those areas where some clarification or change may be required. The below comments should not detract from the fact that there are countless policies that provide excellent direction for the Township moving forward. Although staff have not commented on all the 'well done' policy areas, we did wish to make it clear that the absence of these comments was only for brevity, and not because the policy efforts went unnoticed.

County staff would welcome the opportunity to discuss any comments further, once the Township and Mr. Davidson have had the time to review these comments.

ID	Section or Schedule	Comments
1	General & Section 1.4, 1.8, 7.13, and throughout	The County recently completed and updated Growth Management Strategy (GMS). The County has also recently proposed County Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 11 to implement the GMS and extend the growth horizon to 25 years as per the PPS 2020. Southgate may wish defer adoption of the Plan until after OPA 11 is finalized and the County Plan has been updated. In doing so, this would allow the Township

		<p>Plan to (a) consider the new growth projections, and (b) extend the horizon of the Township’s Official Plan to 25 years.</p> <p>As an alternative, the Township may also choose to note that their Official Plan is meant to align with the planning horizon of the County Official Plan without specifying a year. In this manner if the County Plan then gets amended to a planning horizon of 2046, then the Township would not then need to go through a separate amendment to extend its horizon.</p>
2	General	<p>It would appear there are some approved Township OPAs that have not been incorporated into the new draft Official Plan. While not every former OPA needs to be carried forward, County staff had the same issue when the County adopted Recolour Grey, and just wanted to flag it so as not to inadvertently exclude some of those approved OPAs.</p>
3	General & Section 3.9	<p>County staff would note changes to the <i>Planning Act</i>, PPS, and County Plan with respect to including Official Plan policies on climate change. It appears this is not only a Provincial requirement, but that there is significant local public interest in seeing such policies based on recent public consultations, including other new or updated official plans in the County. County staff would support any further initiatives, beyond what is already included in section 3.9 of the Plan, to address mitigation and adaptation to climate change. County staff also understand how difficult this can be at the Official Plan level, especially when moving from goals and objectives to actionable policy items (e.g. reviewing development through a climate lens). We would be happy to assist the Township in looking at any further policy direction, as well as the County’s work on the ‘Climate Change Action Plan’. Rather than including a series of comments on this matter throughout this document, County staff will raise it here as a general comment and defer the detailed comments and discussion to later in the process.</p>
4	General & Section 3.4	<p>The County supports any further policy direction on affordable and attainable housing. County staff realize that in order to support additional affordable and attainable housing, work is needed at all levels of government, including both the County and Township levels. County staff applaud the Township for the work that has been completed to date. As the Township continues to review the new Plan, the County would encourage any further housing policy in this direction that could aid in achieving more affordable and attainable housing (e.g. further updates to section 3.4 of the Plan, or recommending pre-zoning lands for increased density or rental housing). Rather than including a series of comments on this matter throughout this document, County staff will raise it here as a general comment and defer the detailed comments and discussion to later in the process.</p>
5	General & Section 3.7.1.2	<p>The second half of section 1.6.6.4 of the PPS reads as follows:</p>

		<p><i>“At the time of the official plan review or update, planning authorities should assess the long-term impacts of individual on-site sewage services and individual on-site water services on the environmental health and the character of rural settlement areas. Where planning is conducted by an upper-tier municipality, the upper-tier municipality should work with lower-tier municipalities at the time of the official plan review or update to assess the long-term impacts of individual on-site sewage services and individual on-site water services on the environmental health and the desired character of rural settlement areas and the feasibility of other forms of servicing set out in policies 1.6.6.2 and 1.6.6.3.”</i></p> <p>Although it may be outside of the Official Plan itself, County staff would be happy to work with the Township to address this policy, if that has not already been done.</p>
6	Table of Contents & Section 5	Schedule A to the Plan contains a Space Extensive Commercial Industrial designation, however there is no mention of such a designation in the table of contents or section 5 of the Plan. Policies should be added for this designation if there are any properties in the Township which have this designation.
7	Table of Contents	There are two small typos in the table of contents for the Swinton Park and Wilder Lake maps, which are inadvertently referred to as ‘May’ versus ‘Map’.
8	3.2(1)	Should Wilder Lake also be listed as a designated settlement area in this section?
9	3.4.1(1)	Section 1.4.1(a) of the 2020 PPS now requires a minimum of 15 years supply, versus the older standard of 10 years.
10	3.4.3(1)(a) and (b) and Definitions	Although the Township’s definitions of affordable rental and ownership units closely match the County’s own definitions, the Township may wish to further amend their definitions to better align with the 2020 PPS. More specifically, when referring to 30% of gross household income it is important to note that it’s for ‘low and moderate income households’. The County recently ran into a scenario where someone was attempting to categorize their housing as ‘affordable’ based on achieving less than 30% of the gross household income of their buyers (who had significant financial means), rather than based on ‘low and moderate income households’.
11	3.4.3(4)	Can the phrase ‘in the form of condominiums’ and the word ‘ownership’ be deleted from this subsection? This would denote the fact that condominiums are not necessarily needed for affordable housing, and that it could be owned or rental housing.
12	3.4.3(8)	Could this section also include parking standard reductions as an example of a means to further facilitate affordable and attainable housing?
13	3.4.4	County staff would like to chat further with the Township about their second dwelling unit policies, based on (a) changes to the <i>Planning</i>

		<i>Act</i> , and (b) proposed changes to the County Plan through OPA 11. These policies impact a number of policies throughout the Plan, not just section 3.4.4.
14	3.5(4), 5.4.1.2(1), and 5.4.1.2(4)(f)	The second sentence of section 3.5(4) would appear to conflict with other sections of the Plan such as section 5.4.1.2(4)(f) i.e. in one section it appears to say that a zoning amendment will be needed on a site-by-site basis, while the other section notes the Township zoning by-law will generally permit such uses as of right.
15	3.7.1.1	The Township may wish to consider section 8.9.1(17) of the County Plan and clearly state whether servicing capacity is being allocated at the draft approval stage, or if there are alternate approaches for how capacity gets allocated at a later stage.
16	3.7.2(1)	In the last sentence of this subsection, it appears the word 'to' is missing between the words 'is' and 'control'.
17	3.8(5)	County staff would note that 20 metre wide municipal road allowances are quite standard across the County. Staff would however note a recent subdivision in Southgate where 18.5 metre wide road allowances were contemplated. Should there be criteria in the Plan for when a less than 20 metre wide road allowance is considered? If so, perhaps this should also be considered in the context of subsection 3.8(8).
18	3.8(11)	Could the word 'potential' be added between the words 'County' and 'road' in the first sentence of this subsection?
19	3.11	Should additional criteria be added to this section to outline the types of objectives to be achieved through a Community Improvement Plan e.g. affordable housing, downtown revitalization, brownfield clean-up, energy efficiency/green building, etc.
20	3.13.1(3)(b)	County staff would note that this policy would appear to be more restrictive than the requirements of the County Plan. While the Township is free to do so, County staff would appreciate the ability to speak with Township staff further on this proposed policy to clarify if it's meant to apply to both Aggregate Resource Areas and Mineral Resource Extraction designations, or just the latter versus the former.
21	3.13.2(1), 5.4.1.1, and 5.4.2.1	The Township may wish to move existing pits and quarries to Schedule B, such that the underlying Agricultural and Rural designations will remain on Schedule A. The permitted uses of the Agricultural and Rural designations could then be amended accordingly to permit pits and quarries where designated on Schedule B.
22	3.13.2(2) and 5.4.3.2(2)	This section would appear to conflict with section 5.6.2(3) of the County Plan which permits new or expanded pits in Aggregate Resource Areas without the need for a County or Municipal Official Plan Amendment. County staff would note that the County's Aggregate Resource Area mapping only applies to pits, and not to quarries. Section 5.4.3.2(2) may need to be amended as it applies to quarries.

23	5.2.1.2	<p>County staff are pleased to see some criteria for what constitutes a low, medium, and high-density residential development in Dundalk. Staff would suggest that it may also be useful to consider further breaking up the Neighbourhood Area designation into pockets of each of these three residential densities. Having designated medium and high-density lands may help avoid conflict when a residential developer is proposing higher density uses, in an area neighbours may believe should be low density. Recommendations for pre-zoning lands for density would also be supported here.</p> <p>Partnering with these density policies, it may also be worth looking at neighbourhood character or even standalone design guidelines (i.e. a document outside of the Official Plan) that offer guidance to new developers, while also preserving the character of Dundalk. This could be used not only in the Neighbourhood Area designation, but could also extend to other areas such as commercial designations.</p> <p>In the description of net density, the Township may also wish to clarify that second units are not included in the density calculation at the time of lot creation i.e. a dwelling with a potential for a basement apartment does not count as two units when calculating the density for a plan of subdivision.</p> <p>The Township should also consider more detailed intensification policies for redevelopment within Dundalk and to a lesser extent in the Village Community designation.</p>
24	5.2.1.2(4)	<p>The use of the term ‘special needs’ may be confusing in the context of the defined term in both the PPS and Southgate Plan, which notes that special needs go beyond economic needs.</p>
25	5.2.1.2(7)(f) and 5.2.2.1(2)	<p>Is this policy meant to allow mixed use development, or stand-alone medium and high-density residential development, in the Downtown Commercial designation? County staff would support mixed use development and some forms of residential development (e.g. an apartment building), but would suggest that other forms of development such as new single or semi-detached dwellings may not be desirable in the Downtown Commercial designation.</p>
26	5.2.1.2(9)(b)	<p>Should the word ‘open’ be replaced by the word ‘outdoor’ to be consistent with other usages in the Plan?</p>
27	5.2.1.2(10)(a) and 5.2.1.2(11)(a)	<p>Could such neighbourhood convenience commercial, daycare or institutional uses be considered as-of-right in the Township’s zoning by-law, without the need for a zoning amendment? Perhaps such uses could be subject to site plan control, but not need a site-specific zoning amendment. Particularly with some types of housing, such as a group home, it may be beneficial to support such uses as-of-right versus needing a zoning amendment.</p>

28	5.2.2.2(11)	The Township may also want to explore opportunities that would support co-parking or reduced parking arrangements where it can be demonstrated that suitable parking is available elsewhere or simply not needed.
29	5.2.3.1 and 5.2.4.1	The Township may wish to explore where stand-alone business and professional offices can be permitted throughout Dundalk. These uses would appear to be permitted in the Downtown Commercial designation, but maybe they could also fit in the Arterial Commercial designation or alongside light (non-noxious) industrial type uses. County staff would note that offices are permitted as an accessory industrial use, but there may also be the possibility for a non-accessory office, where it would not conflict with neighbouring industry.
30	5.2.4.2(7)	Should the word 'appropriate' be 'inappropriate' in this subsection? County staff are unclear as to whether this is meant to permit marijuana/cannabis facilities in both the Industrial and Agricultural/Rural designations, or in just the Agricultural/Rural designations? The Township may wish to defer to the Ministry's D-Series guidelines for siting such uses in Industrial areas.
31	5.2.5.1(1)	Should fairgrounds also be listed as a permitted use here?
32	5.2.5.2 and 5.5.3.2	Whether here or elsewhere in the Plan, the Township may wish to consider adding additional criteria on parkland and public space, and the types of parkland the Township will be looking to acquire and develop in the future. Within this criteria, frontage, location, physical features, and visibility may all be considered as they would pertain to contributing to usable and accessible parkland. Different classifications of park may also be pertinent to consider here.
33	5.3.2	Should the permitted uses in the Inland Lakes designation also include some limited commercial uses e.g. convenience commercial or a marina-style use? The numbering on the permitted uses and development policies of this section appear to be misnumbered. The Inland Lake policies should also state that any expansion to the Inland Lake policies will require the completion of a Lake Carrying Capacity Study.
34	Sections 5.4 and 5.5	County staff question whether policies for the countryside and natural environment are needed, or if they can simply defer to the County Official Plan in this regard. It does appear that large portions of these two sections are very similar to the County Plan. Alternatively, maybe only those policies which are more restrictive than the County Plan need to be included e.g. Rural density policies.
35	5.4.1.2(1)	Further consultation with the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs may be needed with respect to this subsection and whether or not a zoning amendment should be required for an agricultural use.

36	Table 1	There appears to be an extra bullet on the On-farm diversified use column between the words 'vacation' and 'suite'.
37	5.4.1.2(4)(a)	In looking at the size provisions, it is mentioned that the building(s) situated within this portion of the property shall not occupy more than 20% of the land devoted to the on-farm diversified use up to a maximum of 750 square metres. If looking at a 20 ha parcel, 2% of 20 ha = 4,000 square metres. 20% of 4,000 square metres = 800 square metres of potential building size. In this case, there would be no possibility for a landowner to ever meet the 20% threshold. The Township may wish to consider increasing their maximum building size to 800 square metres, or simply removing reference to the 20% criteria.
38	5.4.1.2(4)(e)	Will criteria for when an on-farm diversified use triggers Minimum Distance Separation formulae be included in the zoning by-law, or will this be at the discretion of Township staff?
39	5.4.1.2(4)(f)(ii) and (iii)	The Township may wish to consider caveating these distances with 'shall generally be' to cover off those instances where a variation to the 30 metres or 120 metres may make sense based on site-specific scenarios or conditions.
40	5.4.1.2(5)	County staff are curious as to where the 150 distance metre was derived from?
41	5.4.1.2(10)	Similar to comment # 13 above, County staff would note some proposed changes to the County Plan through OPA 11 which may warrant further discussion.
42	5.4.1.2(11)	Is this policy requiring an official plan amendment for new institutional uses in the Agricultural designation? County staff would suggest that there may be some instances, such as an institutional use serving the horse and buggy community, where such an official plan amendment may not be needed.
43	5.4.1.2(24) and (25)	Should the phrase 'Mineral Resource Extraction' instead read 'Aggregate Resource Area', since Mineral Resource Extraction is not currently shown on Schedule B?
44	5.4.1.3(3)(d)	This subsection should clarify that it only applies where the severed house would be on a separate property to the livestock facility following the severance, where prior to the severance they were on the same property.
45	5.4.1.3(5)	The Township may wish to add an exception for a public use here as well.
46	5.4.1.3(6), 5.4.2.2(4) and (5)	County staff would note some proposed changes to the similar sections of the County Plan through OPA 11 in this regard.
47	5.4.2.2(2)	The Township may wish to clarify that some of the uses permitted in 5.4.2.1 are not on-farm diversified uses and therefore do not need to meet the size criteria listed in this section.
48	5.4.2.4(2)	The Township may wish to consider pro-rated density policies in this subsection, if there are any original lots and concessions in the Township that are not 40 hectares in size.

49	5.4.3.2(14)	This subsection may wish to reference the requirement for an Agricultural Impact Assessment as noted earlier in this section.
50	5.4.2.2(4)(b)	Should this subsection also reference a floodplain assessment as a possible requirement here?
51	6.1.1	County staff would note that Schedule E shows petroleum wells, but they are not listed in this section and there appear to be no policies associated with these features. A similar comment also applies to waste water treatment facilities shown on Schedule E, but not in the policies of the Plan.
52	Table 2	County staff would note that the adjacent lands to an Earth Science Area of Natural and Scientific Interest is only 50 metres. Staff would further note that no such adjacent lands distance is applied to Linkages.
53	6.2(3)	The Township may also wish to add in the criteria for a Significant Woodland in a settlement area here as well (i.e. 4 ha or larger = significant).
54	6.6	The Township may wish to reference the Natural Heritage Information Centre here, with respect to more information on such species and habitat.
55	6.9(8)	County staff would note some proposed changes to the similar section of the County Plan through OPA 11 in this regard.
56	7.2.2.2(4)	The Township may also reference road widening here.
57	7.13(2)	In the first bullet in this section, it should be clarified that this test of need does not apply to pits and quarries.
58	7.14	The Township may wish to add some additional studies to this list such as a geotechnical study, floodplain assessment, visual impact study, shadow study, and a comprehensive review.
59	7.15	This section may wish to explicitly mention complete applications and the process to deem them complete.
60	8	The definition for 'bonus zoning' can be deleted based on changes to the <i>Planning Act</i> . There appears to be duplicate 'D-4 Study' and 'Home Occupations' definitions. Could the definition of 'Infrastructure' be amended to also include trails?
61	Schedule A Map 1	This schedule contains a reference to section 5.6.6, but that section does not appear to be included in the Plan. County staff would be interested in discussing the Special Policy Area provisions for these lands with the Township.
62	Schedule A Map 2	The settlement area of Dundalk has been expanded from what is shown in the County Plan. County and Township staff should meet to discuss a possible County Official Plan Amendment, should the Township wish to pursue this settlement area expansion.

		The Township may also choose to reassess some existing Industrial designations that are outside of the industrial park to determine if long-term these uses will stay Industrial, or if some should transition to another land use. Particularly those uses close to residential uses or the downtown may be best to assess in this regard. An Industrial transition designation or policy may also be appropriate here.
63	General	In accordance with the PPS and the County Plan, additional policies should be added which speak to the requirements for a comprehensive review for settlement area expansion.
64	General	Recent changes to section 39.2 the <i>Planning Act</i> may warrant some policy consideration if the Township wishes to pursue certain approval delegations to staff or a committee.
65	General	Recent changes to some Provincial Ministry names could also be updated throughout the Plan.

Please do not hesitate to contact County staff should you have any questions or concerns with respect to the above.

Yours truly,



Scott Taylor, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Planning Services
519-372-0219 ext. 1238
scott.taylor@grey.ca
www.grey.ca

Cc Clinton Stredwick, Township of Southgate (by email only)
Stephanie Lacey-Avon, County of Grey (by email only)