



June 9, 2025

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

RE: Zoning By-law Amendment file 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 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.

Background:

- County comments, dated May 21, 2025, related to consent file B2-25 and zoning by-law amendment C9-25

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

Staff understand that provisional consent was granted for the related consent file B2-25 and that a zoning by-law amendment is required to implement the consent. County staff were unable to support the related consent application B2-25 as lot creation for an institutional use on agricultural land is not contemplated in the policy framework. Comments to this effect were previously submitted for files B2-25 and C9-25 and were dated May 21, 2025. The comments below are provided as further clarification and in addition to those already provided.

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. Lot creation in the agricultural land use type is generally discouraged and may only be permitted for agricultural uses, agricultural-related uses, surplus farmhouse severance, infrastructure, and conservation lots in accordance with section 5.2.3 of the Plan and section 4.3.3.1 of the PPS 2024.

Staff note that the split land use policies identified in section 5.2.3 in the County OP do not apply to this proposal. Where a non-farm sized consent is proposed to create a new lot on a split land use type property, the consent may only be supported if the entirety of the agricultural land use type remains intact. These policies could be contemplated, if for example, the proposal contemplated a severance along the lands identified as Secondary Settlement Area and Agriculture, with the entirety of the agricultural designation remaining intact.

1. The OMAFA *Guidelines on Permitted Uses* document indicates that churches, schools and cemeteries that serve communities reliant on horse-drawn vehicles as a primary means of transportation may be considered as limited non-residential uses on prime agricultural lands. The County OP builds on this to identify that institutional uses serving those segments of the population whose primary means of transportation is via horse and buggy and active transportation are permitted on *existing lots* in the agricultural designation, subject to policy 5.2.2(4)(b). Unlike lot creation for surplus farm dwelling or an agriculturally

related use, further lot creation for an institutional use on agricultural land is not contemplated in the policy framework. Nonetheless, staff suggest that these policy tests for establishing a non-agricultural uses identified in 5.2.2(4)(b) of the County OP and section 4.3.5 in the PPS 2024, be considered in support of the proposed rezoning.

Areas identified as secondary settlement are existing communities within the County which may have significant populations and/or a wide range of uses and amenities. Permitted uses include residential uses, bed and breakfast establishments, commercial and dry industrial uses, and public, recreational and institutional uses to support the surrounding agricultural community. The PPS also directs growth to settlement areas, including rural settlement areas and identifies that an appropriate range and mix of housing be accommodated in rural settlements.

2. While County staff would see merit in rezoning the portion of the lands designated Agricultural to prohibit future residential use, staff are concerned that applying the site-specific zone to the portion of the lands within the settlement area may not be suitable and may not meet the intent of the County OP or the PPS. Staff acknowledge that the County OP identifies an existing exception and constraints within the settlement of Holstein; however, the broader secondary settlement area designation policies permit growth and development beyond what is generally permitted within the Agricultural designation. Staff recommend that a more appropriate zoning be applied to the retained lands within the settlement area boundary, such as a deferred development zone or similar. Additional comments should be received from municipal staff.

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
548 877 0853
Cassondra.dillman@grey.ca
www.grey.ca