

September 3, 2025

Shavi Fernando, Planning Assistant
sfernando@southgate.ca

RE: Zoning By-law Amendment C17-24 – Barnes – 2nd Submission
271 Main Street, Dundalk
Township of Southgate
Roll: 420711000119700
Agent: MHBC Planning

Dear Shavi Fernando,

This correspondence is in response to the above noted application. We have had an opportunity to review the application in relation to the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) and the County of Grey Official Plan (OP). We offer the following comments.

Proposal Summary

A proposed zoning by-law amendment to permit a 20-unit townhouse style condominium development.

A summary of the changes made in this second submission

- Decreased density from 24 units to 20 units
- The proposed units are now standard townhouse units and are no longer stacked townhouse units
- The buildings have been separated into a total of 4 buildings, each consisting of 5 units
- Increased interior side yard setbacks to provide backyard amenity space and second storey balconies
- The inclusion of a Tot Lot amenity area.

Documents submitted with the application and reviewed by staff:

- Civil drawing prepared by Crozier, dated June 25, 2025
- Comment Response Matrix, Cover letter, Planning Addendum Letter, and Draft Zoning Bu-law Amendment prepared by MHBC, dated July 30, 2025

- Elevation Rendering
- FSR and SWM Report, prepared by Crozier, dated June 2025
- Photometrics Plan, prepared by Crozier, dated May 2, 2025
- Salt Management Plan Memo, prepared by Crozier, dated June 25, 2025
- Site Plan (drawing A1.01), prepared by Orchard Design Studio Inc., dated July 2, 2025
- Traffic Opinion Letter update, prepared by Crozier, dated June 25, 2025

The subject lands (~.26 ha) are identified as the following in the County Official Plan:

- Schedule A: *Land Use Types* – Primary Settlement Area
- Appendix A: *Constraint Mapping* – Well Head Protection Area D
- Appendix D: *Functional Road Classification* – ~ 41 m of frontage on Main Street E (County Road 9)

Comments

The proposal represents a form of residential intensification generally supported by the County's policies and aligns with development appropriate to a Primary Settlement Area. The County OP supports intensification in all areas within settlement areas including the redevelopment of sites and encouraging intensification along arterial roads. Further, new residential developments are promoted at densities which efficiently use available servicing (subject to Section 8.9) and are appropriate to site conditions and existing patterns of development. Additional comments should be received from Township staff in this regard.

County staff have responded and added to the proponents submitted comment response matrix below.

Comment number	1st Submission Comment, July 2024	Proponent Response	2nd Submission Comment, September 3, 2025
9	It is noted that an application for site plan approval will be required following any approval of the subject zoning application. After which, the applicant intends to request that the County of Grey consider an exemption to the standard Plan of Condominium process under the Planning Act.	Acknowledged.	Noted.
10	The Official Plans would support residential development in this area. As per policy 3.5(5), a minimum density of 20 units per net hectare is required for new development. The Township Official Plan policies in Section 5.2.1.2(5) are more restrictive than the County's OP and would require a minimum density of 25 units per net hectare. In this case, the proposed density would be approximately 91 units per net hectare, which would significantly exceed the minimum density requirements of both OP's.	Acknowledged. The revised proposal provides a density of 77 units per hectare, which exceeds the County's and Township's minimum density requirements.	Noted.
11	Generally, staff encourage development to exceed the development density threshold as outlined in the County Official Plan, to promote the efficient use of land and infrastructure, and to guide more walkable, transit-oriented development. The Official Plans also provide general guidance around supporting a variety of housing types within designated settlement areas. It is noted that there is a particular need for entry-level housing that is attainable to first-time home buyers, and the proposed development may have the potential to contribute towards this housing type.	Acknowledged. The proposal is for condominium townhouses, which will provide an additional housing type to the community of Dundalk and will also provide more attainable housing opportunities for the Township. Given the condominium nature, exterior maintenance will be handled by the condominium corporation.	Noted.
12	While there are no 'Hazard Lands' indicated on the subject lands, the completed hydrogeological report indicates a highwater table across the site. The report provides design recommendations with regards to how to the development might proceed in a safe and appropriate way. The report indicates that site dewatering will likely be required at a construction stage. Furthermore, footings/foundations within 0.6 meters of the seasonally high groundwater table will require subdrains, which the report recommends	The buildings will be slab on grade. Ground water will not be directed to County Roads. Post development surface flow will not exceed pre development flows to the County Road.	Acknowledged.

	directing to outlet to municipal storm services. It is noted that the subject lands front onto Grey Road 9. As a general County policy, post-development flows shall not exceed pre-development flows onto the County's Road (including stormwater systems). County staff would request further information from the applicant and consultant team to ensure that the proposed development would not result in increased groundwater being directed onto the County's Road. Should this be problematic for the proposed design, the developer may wish to consider slab-on-grade units, if feasible.		
13	The subject lands are located within a 'Wellhead Protection Area-D,' per Appendix A of the County's Official Plan. Generally, further detailed comments should be received from the Risk Management Official to determine if further considerations with the use or design should be addressed to protect municipal water reserves. Furthermore, the hydrogeological study indicates that the site should consider winter deicing methods that reduce the quantities of salt that enter into municipal water reserves. In that respect, the County would support the completion of a Salt Management Plan at a Site Plan Application stage as part of this development.	Salt Management Plan (Crozier, dated 25 June 2025) provided as part of the submission package.	Acknowledged. Additional comments should be received from municipal staff, and the local RMO, if required.
14	County staff have reviewed the completed Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Reports. Staff would recommend that further input on these studies be provided by the Saugeen Ojibway Nation, and other Indigenous partners who may have interest in reviewing and providing comments on this report	SON provided written sign-off for the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Report on 6 February 2024.	Acknowledged.
15	1. The proposed driveway widths are 5.75 meters, which have direct frontage onto the private 6-meter internal roadway. While this length is appropriate for smaller personal vehicles, many common varieties of pick-up trucks are greater than 6 meters in length. Staff have concerns about vehicles overhanging onto the	Noted. From the back of curb to garage, length is 6.05 m. See Site Plan A1.01 (Orchard Design, dated 25 June 2025).	Acknowledged.

	small private road, and whether this will impede the movement of other vehicles (including waste management and emergency services), and pedestrian safety across the site;		
16	2. It is recommended that some of the units be designed to be accessible to mobility users, noting the County's priorities around Age-Friendly community planning;	The proposed townhouse dwelling units are suitable for the site. They will be age-friendly in the aspect that little to no maintenance will be required from purchasers, as the condominium corporation will handle this. The site is also in a strategic location that represents infill development and is in a walkable location as the site is in proximity to the downtown area. Future purchasers could opt-in to accessible upgrades/features to the units; however, given the multi-storey nature of the development, the development is not inherently accessible.	Staff understand that the units will be multi-storey, and as such, will not be inherently accessible. Staff appreciate that the proposal offers a different type of housing that may be attractive to a variety of purchasers (i.e. those looking to downsize, young families, first time homebuyers, and working professionals). The location of the infill development is also within walking distance to community amenities and services (i.e. the grocery store, park, and community swimming pool are across the street and downtown is an approximately 300m walkable distance). Staff also acknowledge that the second submission site plan identifies a deep collection waste system, which can be more age friendly. Nonetheless, it is important to note that Grey County has adopted an approach to age-friendly community planning that involves all ages, not solely seniors, and would encourage the proponents to consider design elements that accommodate the needs of children and to support aging in place. For example, flexible and adaptable units with features that afford layout changes to fit the evolving needs of residents over time (i.e. separate built-in wall oven and cooktop with unobstructed space underneath, zero threshold shower, space for side-by-side washer dryer units, etc.) and ensuring that a variety of users can safely maneuver the parking area (i.e. placing children in car seats, vehicles not encroaching into the private road, etc.).
17	3. The County's OP encourages consideration of climate change mitigation measures through site design. This might include opportunities for semi-permeable pavement to reduce post-development run-off, heat pumps, solar panels, EV charging stations, etc.	These matters will be addressed through the future Site Plan Control process.	Noted.

18	4. The County's OP recommends that all new developments integrate Dark Sky compliant lighting fixtures, in order to limit the impacts of light pollution	Addressed, please see the photometrics plans (Crozier, 2 May 2025) provided.	Acknowledged. Staff would also encourage this item to be reviewed by way of the future site plan agreement.
19	5. Snow storage may still be a concern on the proposed site plan (particularly for individual driveway clearing), given the very limited area between the units for snow storage capacity	All snow is to be hauled off site. Approximately 88% of the driveways are to be covered by the overhang of the building.	<p>Staff acknowledged that the intent is to haul all snow off site. Operationally, however, staff are concerned that this may be challenging for future homeowners (i.e. snow will need to be removed from behind parked cars and from the front steps of each unit – where will this snow be placed?). Staff note that the Salt Management Plan indicates that snow will be aggregated on site and removed following snow events. The temporary snow storage locations should be indicated as such on the site plan.</p> <p>Staff encourage the inclusion of temporary snow storage location(s) and would also encourage that a notation be included on the approved site plan drawings indicating that all snow is to be hauled off site. In addition, it will be important for the future landscaping plan to consider the impacts of both snow and salt management and ensure plantings are native and salt tolerant.</p> <p>Further to above, staff appreciate that the units have weather protected access to each unit.</p>
NEW			<p>Staff understand that relief is requested from both the minimum play space and minimum amenity area provisions of the Township Zoning By-law. Further, the site plan indicates that each unit will have access to a backyard and a balcony as private outdoor amenity areas, as well as a 60m2 common amenity area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is unclear where the common amenity area is located. Further clarification is needed. - The site plan indicates the balcony location in relation to the rear yard area, but each yard is not dimensioned. Is the intent that each condo unit will also own the rear yard associated with the unit? Please provide

			<p>additional clarity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will the units have access to the rear yard through the garage? <p>Staff also note that the proposed amendment indicates a 1m planting strip, but it is unclear where this will be located (i.e. does the 1m planting encroach into each rear yard, effectively making each yard 3.11m by 4.7m?). Please provide additional clarity.</p>
NEW			<p>Drawing C102 indicates that there will be a retaining wall along the 3 of the property lines with a maximum height of 2 meters. Staff understand that a 1.8m privacy fence will be in addition to the retaining wall. Staff encourage the completion of a cross-section elevation drawing to better understand the relationship between the proposed development and the adjacent residential uses.</p>

Transportation Services comments:

20	Road widening is not required	Acknowledged	No further comment.
21	Following any approval of the subject application, the applicant shall apply to the County of Grey for an entrance permit, to permit a new entrance onto the County Road, if required. This may be listed as a condition of Site Plan Approval;	Acknowledged.	No further comment.
22	The Drainage Plan appears to be adequate	Acknowledged.	No further comment.
23	Traffic Letter appears to be adequate	Acknowledged.	No further comment.
24	County Transportation staff share the above-noted concerns regarding any groundwater being diverted to the County's Road and would request further information in that respect	Please see response to comment 12 above.	No further comment.
25	At a pre-submission stage, County staff indicated support for an exemption to the County's centreline setback	Acknowledged.	No further comment.

Ecology staff comments:

26	Natural Heritage Comments: The property contains and/or is adjacent to fish habitat. It is Grey County staffs understanding that the proposed development will be located within adjacent to the features on previously disturbed lands. As such, it is Grey County Staffs opinion that the potential impact to natural heritage would be negligible and the requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIS) can be waived.	Acknowledged.	No further comment.
27	Natural Heritage Comments: Grey County Staff have reviewed the stormwater management plan, including the erosion and sediment control plan submitted by Crozier (April, 2024) and find it acceptable.	Acknowledged. A revised plan accompanies this submission (Crozier, 25 June 2025) which has been updated solely to address comments provided by other agencies.	Grey County staff have reviewed the updated plan and have no concerns.
28	Natural Heritage Comments: It is Grey County Staffs understanding that the property contains protection areas that are subject to policies of the Source Water Protection Act. As such, the Risk Management Official of Drinking Water Source Protection should be tagged for comments on this application. The property does lie within an area designated as a significant groundwater recharge area that may influence highly vulnerable aquifers, as such, low-impact development and infrastructure is recommended	Implementation of LID features was evaluated, however due to site constraints and high groundwater use of LID features was deemed unfeasible.	Acknowledged.
29	County staff would note that we are conceptually supportive of the proposed use, in order to facilitate an opportunity for attainable housing creation. That said, County staff have some further questions regarding the quantity of flows that will be directed to the County's Road (including through site dewatering), as well as some general questions about site design, as noted above. County staff would request additional follow-up with the applicants prior to a formal decision on this application.	Acknowledged. Following this 2nd submission, Crozier will arrange a meeting to discuss the proposed design with the County. Flows discharging from the proposed site will not exceed the capacity of the existing Main Street infrastructure. (refer to FRSWM (Crozier, dated 25 June 2025) for quantity of flows in post development).	Understood. Please contact Cassandra.dillman@grey.ca to arrange a meeting.

The County requests notice of any decision rendered with respect to this file.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me.

Yours Truly,

Cassondra Dillman
Intermediate Planner

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

www.grey.ca