



May 21, 2025

Shavindra Fernando, Planning Assistant
185667 Grey County Road 9
Dundalk, ON N0C 1B0
sfernando@southgate.ca

**RE: Consent and Zoning By-law Amendment B2-25 and C9-25
Con 3 Pt Lot 42, Geographic Township of Egremont, Township of
Southgate
392015 Grey Road 109 (East of Rail Trail)
Roll: 420706000316100
Owner: Willard Martin
Agent: Mark Frey**

Dear Shavindra 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

The Purpose of application B2-25 is to sever the subject lands to create a lot containing an existing school. The severed lot would have 119.24 meters frontage on Southgate Sideroad 41, about 82 metres depth and 0.977 hectares lot area. The retained lot is irregularly shaped farmland and woodlot with about 150.3 meters frontage on Southgate Sideroad 41, 1352 meters depth along Southgate Road 12, and 33.6-hectares lot area. The Effect of proposed consent application B2-25 is to create a lot containing the school, parking, trees and accessory buildings, while retaining a the 33.6-hectare farm parcel.

The Purpose of application C9-25 is to rezone a proposed 0.977 lot containing an existing school to be severed from the subject lands (File B2-25) to Community Facility. Rezoning would also prevent future residential development on the proposed retained farmland and woodlot. Any other zoning requirements would be met. The Effect of proposed rezoning would be to address any potential conditions of consent file B2-25

including rezoning the existing school to Community Facility and the retained farmland and woodlot parcel to prevent future residential development.

Documents submitted with the application and reviewed by staff:

- Notice of Public Hearing, file B2-25, dated May 9, 2025
- Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting, file C9-25, dated May 9, 2025
- C9-25 application and sketch; B2-25 application and sketch

The subject lands (~34 ha) are identified as the following in the County Official Plan:

- Schedule A: *Land Use Types* – Secondary Settlement Area, Agriculture, and Hazard Lands
- Schedule B: *High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resources* – Aggregate Resources Area
- Appendix B: *Constraint Mapping* – Other wetlands
- Appendix D: *Functional Road Classification* – Frontage on Southgate Rd 12 and Southgate SRD 41

Comments

Schedule A of the County OP designates the subject lands as Secondary Settlement Area, Agricultural and Hazard Lands. Staff note that the rear, western portion of the lands are designated Secondary Settlement Area (~4 ha), while the proposed severance is within the area designated Agricultural. As such, Section 5.2.3 – Agriculture Consent policies, states that:

1) A consent for one new lot may be permitted provided the original farm parcel is a minimum of 40 hectares. The options for consent would be:

a) One lot 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....

[Or]

b) New residential lots are not permitted in the Agricultural land use type. Where a house is deemed surplus to a farm operation as a result of farm consolidation, a lot may be severed provided that:

1. The County Official Plan (OP) contemplates lot creation in the agricultural designation in the two specific circumstances noted above, provided that the parcel is a minimum of 40 hectares. The subject lands are approximately 34 hectares in size, of which approximately 30 hectares are designated Agriculture

and Hazard Lands, and, as such, would be considered an existing undersized agricultural lot: a 'farm sized' lot in the agricultural designation, per the OP, is 40 hectares. As the subject lands are not a minimum of 40 hectares, policy 5.2.3.1) cannot be met, and County staff are unable to support the proposed severance.

Section 5.2.1. of the OP lists the permitted uses in the agricultural designation:

1) Permitted uses in the Agricultural land use type include:

g) Institutional uses on existing lots, serving those segments of the population whose primary means of transportation is via horse and buggy and active transportation, subject to policy 5.2.2(4)(b);

Policy 5.2.2(4)(b) states that:

4) Non-agricultural uses are discouraged in the prime agricultural areas, and may only be permitted for: ...

b) Limited non-residential uses, provided that all of the following are demonstrated:

- 1. The land does not comprise a Special Agricultural land use type;*
- 2. The proposed use complies with Provincial MDS;*
- 3. There is an identified need within the planning horizon for additional land to be designated to accommodate the proposed use; and*
- 4. Alternative locations have been evaluated, and*
 - i) There are no reasonable alternative locations which avoid prime agricultural areas; and*
 - ii) There are no reasonable alternative locations in prime agricultural areas with lower priority agricultural lands.*

2. Staff acknowledge that the existing institutional use (being a school) is a permitted use on the existing lot of record as a limited non-residential use. Further lot creation for an institutional use on agricultural land is not contemplated in the policy framework.

3. Staff note that the County OP policies mimic those in the PPS 2024. Further to the above, the PPS 2024 discourages lot creation in prime agricultural areas and section 4.3.3.1 identifies four instances in which lot creation could be permitted: a) Agricultural uses ...; b) Agriculture-related uses ...; c) One new residential lot per farm consolidation for a residence surplus to an agricultural operation ...; d) infrastructure It is unclear how the proposal is consistent with the above noted policy.

4. Schedule B of the OP identifies the subject lands as within the aggregate resource area. As the proposal is outside of this identified area, staff have no concerns in this regard.

County Ecology staff have reviewed the proposal and provided the following comments:

5. The property contains and/or is adjacent to potential 'Habitat of Threatened or Endangered Species', 'Other Identified Wetlands', 'Significant Woodlands', 'Significant Wildlife Habitat', potential 'Fish Habitat', a 'Pond' and a 'Stream'. Additionally, the property is considered a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area and an area that influences Highly Vulnerable Aquifers. County staff have reviewed the proposal and understand that no development is proposed for the retained parcel at this time; however, should development occur in the future, there appears to be a sufficient developable area outside of the above-mentioned features. As such, it is County staff's opinion that if future development is limited to an area outside of the features, the potential impact to natural heritage would be negligible, and the requirements for an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) can be waived.

County ecology staff have no concerns with the application. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the above, please reach out to ecology@grey.ca.

Summary

The subject application does not conform to the agricultural consent policies (Section 5.2.3) in the County Official Plan. As such, County Planning staff are unable to support consent application B2-25 or zoning by-law amendment application C9-25, as proposed. Staff note that the purpose of application C9-25 is to implement consent application B2-25.

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,

████████████████████
Intermediate Planner
548 877 0853

████████████████████
www.grey.ca