



Outlook

Briarwood meeting follow up

From Cassandra Dillman <Cassandra.Dillman@grey.ca>

Date Fri 6/27/2025 11:07 AM

To Victoria Mance <vmance@southgate.ca>

Cc Natalie Mechalko <Natalie.Mechalko@grey.ca>; Becky Hillyer <Becky.Hillyer@grey.ca>

Good morning, Victoria,

Further to our meeting yesterday regarding the recent LOPA and ZBLA application for the Briarwood development in Dundalk, County staff can offer a few preliminary comments to assist municipal staff in their review. Staff note that at this time a County application has not been received and that the LOPA and ZBLA applications have not been formally circulated under the *Planning Act*. These preliminary comments are provided at the request of municipal staff and should not be considered formal application review comments or County requirements for a complete application.

- The PJR mentions that a draft plan of condominium is required to permit the proposed development and that it will be submitted at a later date. Typically, County staff suggest that condominium or subdivision applications are submitted and reviewed concurrently with any associated *Planning Act* applications. The County is the approval authority for plans of subdivisions, part lot control, plans of condominium and condominium exemption. County staff will defer to municipal staff on their preferred approach.
- Further to the above, it is unclear how the proposed plan of condominium will operate on the subject lands, particularly as one of the proposed apartment buildings is intended for rental and that there is a significant portion of the property that will not be developed (i.e. will a future condominium association manage the vacant lands and the rental building? Will the undeveloped portion of the property ultimately become a separately conveyable parcel? Is a plan of subdivision also required? Etc.) Staff request further information be provided as it relates to the future condominium application, including a draft plan of condominium, to assist in the review of the applications.
- Staff acknowledge that the submitted PJR address Section 2.8 of the PPS; however, it appears to be silent regarding policy 2.8.1.3 and lands within 300 metres of employment areas. Staff suggest that further justification be provided to ensure that any potential impacts on the long-term viability of the employment uses is avoided and/or minimized and mitigated.
- Staff understand that the intent of the Future Development designation in the Southgate Official Plan is to restrict development in order not to jeopardize the orderly development of this area. The Future Development designation is also intended to apply until such a time that it is demonstrated that there is need for the additional land. Staff understand that there are a number of active and planned residential proposals in Dundalk. Municipal staff may wish to consider requesting a market analysis to further support the proposed Official Plan Amendment application and the proposed residential development.
- Per Section 7.2 of the County OP, development and site alteration is not permitted within the floodway portion of a floodplain, and buildings and structures are not generally permitted in the Hazard designation. Advice and approval from the regulating Conservation Authority, in addition to an EIS, is required when development and site alteration is proposed in the Hazard Lands designation. Staff note that pre-submission

consultation comments strongly suggested that GRCA staff be consulted prior to formal application submission and as part of developing TOR for any required studies (i.e. EIS and floodplain analysis). Staff also recommended that the consultant contact County ecology staff to determine a TOR for the EIS. Staff understand that neither GRCA nor County ecology staff were consulted prior to the completion of the EIS dated May 2025. Further clarification should be obtained.

- Staff note that a Stage 3 Archeological Assessment is required. Has this assessment been completed? If so, kindly submit the report. It is also unclear if any local first Nations and/or Metis communities have been consulted during this work.
- Staff note that the D6 assessment has classified the nearby Lystek operation as a Class II facility. This property abuts the subject lands, and the recommended minimum separation distance of 70 meters can not be met. As a result, the measurements from the property line (Lystek) to the closest sensitive activity (the proposed residential complex) has been used (approx.. 620m separation). Staff understand that when separation distance is provided partially or entirely on-site, a site-specific zone exception could be put in place to ensure that any future changes comply with the D6 guidelines. It is also unclear is if the vacant lands within the eco-park have been considered. Staff note that the study also indicates that no odor was observed at the Lystek during a site visit in February 2024. Further comments related to the D6 study should be received from municipal staff.

County ecology staff have also completed a preliminary review of the proposal and EIS submitted to support the application. County ecology offer the following comments to municipal staff at this stage:

- During pre-con, County staff indicated development should be restricted to the portion of the parcel that fronts on Ida Street, west of the wetland/hazard/stream area and an appropriate setback as identified within the EIS.
- A Terms of reference was not circulated to the appropriate authorities (Conservation Authority, County staff) to scope the EIS
- Further details should be provided as to why the wetland adjacent to the proposed development is not part of the Melancthon Wetland Complex, such as details around absence of hydrological connectivity and distance threshold, based on the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System
- The EIS proposes removal of 1.1 ha of wetland and watercourse realignment - the County may consider compensation where the mitigation hierarchy of avoid, minimize and mitigate has been followed. The EIS should provide commentary on why compensation is the most appropriate option based on the mitigation hierarchy, which is premised on ecological considerations.
- The EIS should provide further details on potential impacts as a result of SWM infrastructure.
- Water balance information should be integrated within the EIS to fully determine potential impacts and appropriate mitigation for wetlands as a result of proposed dewatering

The County staff reserve the right to request further information based on public or agency comments and/or detailed technical review after the applications have been formally circulated.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if you would like to discuss any of the above further.

Kind regards,
Cassandra

Cassandra Dillman, *BES, MSc. (She/Her)*
Intermediate Planner
County of Grey

595 9th Ave E
Owen Sound, ON N4K 3E3
Phone: +1-548-877-0853
cassandra.dillman@grey.ca
<https://www.grey.ca>
<https://www.visitgrey.ca>
<https://www.greyroots.com>

