1. CALL TO ORDER
   1.1 Councillor Risk

2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

3. SCHEDULED DELEGATIONS
   3.1 No scheduled delegations

4. MOTIONS OF WHICH NOTICE PREVIOUSLY GIVEN
   4.1 Notice

   RESOLVE, That the following motion(s) be added to an agenda for discussion:

5. ADMINISTRATION (Mullin)

6. FINANCE (Mullin)

7. PLANNING (Fawcett)
   7.1 PL.10.67 - Z36.2010 - Deeming By-law - Lot 2 and 3, Plan 851 (the Former Township of Artemesia)

   RESOLVE That the Committee of the Whole receive Planning Report PL.10.67 and forward the By-law to Council for the appropriate readings at this time.

   (Reference: Z36.2010 - Rogers, Lot 2 & Lot 3, Plan 851 Artemesia)

   7.2 County of Grey Planning & Community Development Committee Meeting - August 12, 2010 - 38-2010

   (Reference: Council 2010-09-13)

   7.3 Grey Bruce Public Health Unit correspondence to Province regarding municipal input on the decision process for siting and setback distances of wind turbines - 40-2010

   (Reference: Council 2010-09-13)

   7.4 Ratepayer opposition to MAQ Aggregates - 45-2010

8. PUBLIC WORKS AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (McQueen)

9. PUBLIC UTILITIES (Clarke)
   9.1 GSCA - Resolution regarding the implemention of Drinking Water Source Protection Plans - 33-2010

   (Reference: Council 2010-09-13)

10. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE (Risk)
    10.1 Markdale Complex Board - Minutes of 2010-09-01

        Maxwell Community Centre - September 13, 2010
10. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE (Risk)

RESOLVE, That the Committee of the Whole receive the following Board and Committee Minutes for information purposes:

Markdale Complex Board - September 1, 2010
Maxwell Community Centre - September 13, 2010

10.2 Kinplex Update - Report from CAO

11. PROTECTION (Silverton)

93-96

11.1 Ratepayer concern - Blue Mountain/Euphrasia Townline high speed of truck traffic 29-2010

(Reference: Council 2010-09-13)

97

11.2 Ratepayer concern South Line B - high speed of trucks - 35-2010

(Reference: Council 2010-09-13)

12. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (Halliday)

13. MEETING DATES

13.1 Dates
2010-09-27 10:00 a.m. Council
2010-09-28 9:30 a.m. Police Services Board
2010-10-04 10:00 a.m. Committee of the Whole (Clarke) - AG Services
2010-10-07 4:00 p.m. Council - AG Services
2010-10-18 10:00 a.m. Committee of the Whole (Fawcett) - AG Services
2010-10-22 10:00 a.m. Council

14. CLOSED SESSION

14.1 Closed Session
RESOLVE, That Committee of the Whole go into a closed session to discuss an item which relates to:

- Personal matters about an identifiable individual including municipal or local board employees

Present:
Time: ______________

14.2 Open Session
RESOLVE, That Committee of the Whole return to Open Session.

Time: ______________

14.3 Confirmation of Action from Closed Session
RESOLVE, That Committee of the Whole confirms the actions of the Closed Session as follows:

15. ADJOURNMENT

15.1 Adjourn
RESOLVE, That Committee of the Whole adjourn until the Call of the Chair.

Time: _____________________
Municipality of Grey Highlands
Planning Report PL.10.67
September 20, 2010

Application Details:
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z36.2010

Location:
Lot 2 and Lot 3, Plan 851
The Former Township of Artemesia

Owners:
Steven Rogers

Grey Highlands Official Plan:
Inland Lakes and Shoreline

Purpose:
- To deem Lots 2 and 3 within Plan No. 851 to no longer be considered as a Registered Plan under the Planning Act.

Effect:
- To create one (1) parcel of land for the purposes of permitting the further development of Lot 2 in conjunction with the existing development on Lot 3.

Recommendation:
RESOLVE That Committee of the Whole accept Planning Report PL.10.67 and forward the By-law to Council for the appropriate readings at this time.

1.0 Planning Analysis:

Proposed Development:
Plan 851 is a Registered Plan within the meaning of the Planning Act. Therefore Lots 2 and 3 remain separate parcels of land, although they exist under common ownership. Any development on the subject parcel would further require conformance with the Municipality of Grey Highlands Comprehensive Zoning By-law on each parcel, specifically the requirement to meet the setback provisions for each parcel. In addition, the Applicant currently has the ability to convey a lot on the Plan without consent under the Planning Act. The Applicant has made an application for a deeming By-law to permit the contiguous development of the two (2) lots as a single parcel of land.

The subject property is zoned RS-5. On lands identified with Exception No. 5, the minimum rear yard setback for all buildings and structures shall be 30 metres. Based on the site plan provided, it appears that the addition does not meet this requirement. Please note that the further development on the subject lands will require the Removal of Holding Provision Application and EIS Checklist.

This consideration affects the landowner's intention to construct an addition to the existing dwelling located on Lot 3, that would cross over onto Lot 2, as depicted in the site plan attached. The proposal as it stands right now, without the lots deemed as one would presently be in contravention of the Municipality's Zoning By-law.

In order to ensure that the development remains as a single lot fabric a deeming by-law is required. If approved, this By-law will require registration on title through the Land Registry Office.

Planning Staff are satisfied that a deeming By-law is appropriate on the subject lands.
2.0 Considerations:
In reviewing the merits of this Application, Planning Staff reviewed the potential impacts of the proposal including, the implications of the land being separately conveyed once developed as a single tract of land. Requiring the lands to be deemed as a single parcel will require any future conveyance of the parcels to be obtained through the consent process under the Planning Act at which time the merits of such a proposal can be reviewed appropriately.

In addition, a legal opinion was obtained in respect to the affect of a deeming by-law on a subdivision agreement that is registered on title. The opinion obtained indicated that a deeming by-law specifically relates to lot lines and that an agreement registered on title would still be applicable after a deeming by-law is passed.

Planning Staff are satisfied that the deeming by-law will not adversely impact the balance of the lands subject to the Registered Plan.

Sheena Harrington, Jr. Planner

I concur with this report and recommendation

Dan Best
Chief Administrative Officer

2010/09/20
Date

Attachments:
1. Draft By-law and Schedule
2. Preliminary Site Plan June 9, 2010
THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF GREY HIGHLANDS

BY-LAW NUMBER 2010-XX

BEING a By-law to deem certain lands not to be within a registered plan under the Planning Act.

WHEREAS the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Grey Highlands deems it in the public interest to pass a By-law that subsection 50 (5) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, as amended, does not apply to land that is within such registered plan or plans of subdivision or parts of them as are designated in the by-law.

NOW THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF GREY HIGHLANDS ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. All lands contained within the boundaries of Registered Plan being comprised of the Municipality of Grey Highlands (formerly the Township of Artemesia), in the County of Grey, being Lot 2 and Lot 3, Plan 851 are hereby deemed not to be a registered plan for the purpose of Section 50(7) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, as amended and shown on Schedule 'A' attached hereto.

2. In accordance with the Provisions of the Planning Act, this By-law shall come into force and take effect on the final passing thereof by the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Grey Highlands and upon registration of this By-law in the Land Registry Office for the County of Grey.

Read a first and second time this day of , 2010.

Read a third time and finally passed this day of , 2010.

Mayor, Brian Mullin

Municipal Clerk, Debbie Robertson

Z36.2010 - Rogers - Lot 2 and Lot 3, Plan 851 (The Former Township of Artemesia)
SCHEDULE "A"
BY-LAW No. 2010-__
AMENDING BY-LAW No. 2004-50
MUNICIPALITY OF GREY HIGHLANDS
(FORMERLY IN THE TOWNSHIP OF ARTEMESIA)

DATE PASSED___________, 2010

SIGNED:  
BRIAN MULLIN, MAYOR  
DEBBIE ROBERTSON, CLERK

MUNICIPALITY OF GREY HIGHLANDS
(FORMERLY IN THE TOWNSHIP OF ARTEMESIA)

SCALE 1:30,000

KEY MAP

SCALE 1:2,000

LOT 33
PRIVATE CREST

SUBJECT PROPERTY

LANDS TO BE DEEMED AS ONE

Lake Eugenia
AGENDA
COUNTY OF GREY
PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
Thursday, August 12, 2010
Planning and Heritage Components

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

3. MINUTES OF MEETINGS
   a) Minutes of the joint Planning and Community Development and Social Services Committees dated August 3, 2010 (attached) and Phase 2 Housing Study Presentation (attached)

4. BUSINESS ARISING
   a) Minutes of Planning and Community Development Committee meeting dated July 20, 2010 as adopted by Grey County Council at the July 6, 2010 session.

5. FINANCIAL (Planning and Heritage)
   a) Expenditure Listings (attached)
   b) TD VISA Reports (attached)

6. DELEGATIONS
   a) 10:10 a.m. Brian Withers; President, Craigleith Woods Community Association – Regarding Concerns with the local Official Plan Amendment relating to the Terrasan development
   b) 10:30 a.m. Neil McCutcheon and Brian Davenport, Keppel Sarawak, and North Grey Plowmen’s Association – Regarding an update on the 2011 Canadian Plowing Championships

7. HUMAN RESOURCES UPDATE

8. IN CAMERA MATTERS

9. REPORTS – Planning
   a) Addendum to PDR-PCD-36-09 County Official Plan Amendment, Part Lots 45 and 46, Concession 3, (Geographic Township of Normanby) Municipality of West Grey, Applicant: Municipality of West Grey (attached)
   b) Addendum to PDR-PCD-13-10 Official Plan Amendment– Township of Southgate, Elio Leal (attached)
   c) Addendum to PDR-PCD-17-10 Official Plan Amendment , West Half Lot 9, Concession 5, Township of Southgate (Geographic Township of Egremont) Samuel Martin (attached)
   d) PDR-PCD-25-10 - Merit Report, County Official Plan Amendment - Harold Sutherland Construction (attached)
   e) PDR-PCD-26-10 Mid-Year Financial Analysis of Planning Budget (attached)
   f) PDR-PCD-27-10 Draft Decision on the 5-year Review of the County Official Plan (attached) and copy of the draft decision from the Province (attached); Appendix ‘A’ and Appendix ‘B’ (attached)
REPORTS – County Clerk
   a) CCR-PCD-59-10 Award Forestry Tenders (attached)
   b) By-law Enforcement Report – August (attached)

10. CORRESPONDENCE
   a) Planning correspondence up to August 9, 2010 (attached)
   b) AMCTO Letter to OMAFRA and Minister of Finance regarding wildlife damage compensation (attached); Minister OMAFRA Response dated July 15, 2010 (attached); OFA Expectations from the budget (attached)

11. OTHER BUSINESS
   a) Potential appeal – B11/2010 - Township of Chatsworth (Geographic Township of Sullivan) Part Lot 6, Concession 7, Applicant: Paul Long (verbal discussion)

12. NEXT MEETING DATES:
   Thursday, September 16, 2010 – Planning Component
   Tuesday, September 21, 2010 – Heritage Component

13. ADJOURNMENT
MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE
COUNTY OF GREY

SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
and
PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Tuesday, August 3, 2010

The Social Services and the Planning and Community Development Committees met on the above date at the County Administration Building in Owen Sound with the following members in attendance:

Present: Councillors Ellen Anderson, Kevin Eccles, David Fawcett, Don Lewis, Ruth Lovell-Stanners, Kathi Maskell, Duncan McKinlay, Brian Milne, Brian Mullin, Bob Pringle, Francis Richardson, Dan Sullivan and Warden Arlene Wright.

Regrets: Councillors Alan Barfoot, Dwight Burley, Howard Greig, and Mike Traynor

Staff Present: Lance Thurston, CAO, Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning; Rod Wyatt, Director of Housing; Anne Marie Shaw, Housing Administrator; Scott Taylor, Senior Planner and Alison Taylor, Recording Secretary

Chair Mullin called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m.

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were none.

PRESENTATION RE GREY COUNTY HOUSING STUDY PHASE 2 PROPOSAL

Grey County Housing Study - Andrew Sjogren, Consultant, Real Estate and Planning and Van Diep, Consultant, N Barry Lyon Consultants Ltd.

Mr. Wyatt introduced Mr. Sjogren and Ms Diep, Consultants, N Barry Lyon Consultants Ltd. and welcomed them to the meeting

Mr. Sjorgren presented an outline for Phase Two of the project. A handout reviewing the primary objectives of the study and a review of various tools and programs available, including:
- Community Improvement Plans (Bill 51)
- Municipal Facilities By-Law
- Bonus Zoning (Section 37)
- Development Charges, planning fee exemptions
- Property Tax Equalization
- Capital Reserve Fund
- Inclusionary Zoning
Discussion followed regarding the pros and cons of each of the options available.

Mr. Sjogren indicated the consultant’s recommendations would be based on information obtained and that report will be available to staff and Councillors for review prior to the presentation at County Council September 7, 2010.

MEETING SCHEDULE

Wednesday, August 11, 2010  Housing, Long Term Care  Lee Manor

ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Councillor McKinlay, the meeting adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

Brian Mullin, Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APT</td>
<td>Agric., Promotion &amp; Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABEL00002</td>
<td>KYLIE ABEL</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL00006</td>
<td>BELL MOBILITY</td>
<td>CELLULAR CHARGES JUL/10</td>
<td>$252.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUEMTN05</td>
<td>BLUE MOUNTAIN VILLAGE ASSOC.</td>
<td>2010 APPLE PIE TRAIL - DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>$2,544.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE0011</td>
<td>BRUCE COUNTY TOURISM</td>
<td>RIDE GREY-BRUCE POWERSPORTS LIVE</td>
<td>$1,399.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADIA66</td>
<td>CANADIAN GEOGRAPHIC</td>
<td>ADVERTISING JULY-AUG/10</td>
<td>$1,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANVAS001</td>
<td>CANVAS STUDIOS</td>
<td>DESIGN SERVICES</td>
<td>$1,755.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFPSFM001</td>
<td>CFPS-FM RADIO</td>
<td>SUMMER &amp; FALL RADIO AD</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHGB00001</td>
<td>CHGB-FM 97.7 THE BEACH</td>
<td>SUMMER &amp; FALL RADIO AD</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIXKF001</td>
<td>CIXK-FM RADIO</td>
<td>SUMMER &amp; FALL RADIO AD</td>
<td>$325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKYCFC001</td>
<td>CKYC-FM RADIO</td>
<td>SUMMER &amp; FALL RADIO AD</td>
<td>$325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOUR002</td>
<td>COLOUR PIX - THE ART MAP</td>
<td>THE ART MAP - BACK COVER AD SPACE</td>
<td>$975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORPORA03</td>
<td>CORPORATE EXPRESS</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES - BUSINESS CARDS, TONER</td>
<td>$95.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISCHER06</td>
<td>DENNIS FISCHER</td>
<td>COYOTE GRANT</td>
<td>$1,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBL000002</td>
<td>GBL - ESCARPMENT MAGAZINE INC.</td>
<td>ADVERTISING - SUMMER 2010</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREY00027</td>
<td>GREY SAUBLE CONSERVATION AUT</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT SERVICES MAY &amp; JUNE</td>
<td>$17,362.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARROWS01</td>
<td>HARROWSMITH COUNTRY LIFE</td>
<td>ADVERTISING JUN/10</td>
<td>$2,585.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE10001</td>
<td>HAVE1.COM</td>
<td>500 COUPON BOOKLETS</td>
<td>$475.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILL0002</td>
<td>MARY JANE HILLS</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$23.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONDA0001</td>
<td>HONDA CANADA FINANCE INC</td>
<td>HONDA LEASE PAYMENT JUL/10</td>
<td>$730.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSON14</td>
<td>SHELLEY JACKSON</td>
<td>AD DESIGNS</td>
<td>$290.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEELING01</td>
<td>W. D. KEELING PRINTERS LTD.</td>
<td>MOTORCYCLE BROCHURES - RTMP</td>
<td>$2,679.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRBY0001</td>
<td>KIRBY, ROBINSON &amp; TRESLAN</td>
<td>APR-JUN/10 BILLING</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS0001</td>
<td>LANDS &amp; FORESTS CONSULTING</td>
<td>TREE MARKING</td>
<td>$5,833.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUTGEN01</td>
<td>SAMUEL LUTGENDORF</td>
<td>SIGN - LAND RENTAL JUN/10-MAY/11</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACDONN02</td>
<td>CHARLENE MACDONNELL</td>
<td>SIGN - LAND RENTAL JUN/10-MAY/11</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLS03</td>
<td>GRANT NICHOLSON</td>
<td>WATERFALL BROCHURE</td>
<td>$785.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAHS001</td>
<td>NOAHS' INN</td>
<td>MEDIA TOUR LUNCH</td>
<td>$96.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUSNER02</td>
<td>AMANDA PAUSNER</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$29.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUROLAT01</td>
<td>PUROLATOR COURIER</td>
<td>COURIER CHARGES</td>
<td>$135.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGCREA01</td>
<td>RIG CREATIVE</td>
<td>VIDEO TRAINING DAY</td>
<td>$457.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGERS011</td>
<td>ROGERS PUBLISHING LIMITED</td>
<td>KIDSUMMER 2010 - TODAY'S PARENT</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAUGEEN10</td>
<td>SAUGEEN VALLEY CONSERVATION AUT</td>
<td>ALTER WATERCOURSE PERMIT</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLS01</td>
<td>SKILLSOFT CANADA LTD</td>
<td>ONLINE TRAINING</td>
<td>$135.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDVISA001</td>
<td>TD VISA</td>
<td>VISA EXPENSE JUN/10 (BREAKDOWN ATTACHED)</td>
<td>$1,991.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADUCT01</td>
<td>TRADUCTIONS ZIPZAP TRANSLATIO</td>
<td>GEORGIAN BAY WEB UPDATES</td>
<td>$77.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for Segment  APT  Agric., Promotion & Tourism  $48,635.79

Total for Segment  80  Agric., Promotion & Tourism  $48,635.79
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APIARIE01</td>
<td>FOSTER APIARIES</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRACTO1</td>
<td>ATTRACTIONS ONTARIO</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL JUL/10-JUN/11</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALDWIN02</td>
<td>BALDWIN SCHOOL SUPPLY LTD.</td>
<td>SUPPLIES FOR KIDS CAMP</td>
<td>$90.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLARD02</td>
<td>JOHN BALLARD</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL0006</td>
<td>BELL MOBILITY</td>
<td>CELLULAR CHARGES JUL/10</td>
<td>$95.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL0002</td>
<td>BELL CONFERENCING INC.</td>
<td>CONFERENCE CALL CHARGES</td>
<td>$41.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINDON001</td>
<td>JOHN BINDON ILLUSTRATION</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$19.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALDWIN02</td>
<td>BALDWIN SCHOOL SUPPLY LTD.</td>
<td>SUPPLIES FOR KIDS CAMP</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLARD02</td>
<td>JOHN BALLARD</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLARD02</td>
<td>JOHN BALLARD</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLARD02</td>
<td>JOHN BALLARD</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLARD02</td>
<td>JOHN BALLARD</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLARD02</td>
<td>JOHN BALLARD</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$159.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please direct any inquiries to Sarah Powell (sarah.powell@grey.ca) or Becky Twigger (becky.twigger@grey.ca)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA01</td>
<td>GEORGIAN BAY FIRE &amp; SAFETY LTD</td>
<td>FIRE EXTINGUISHER MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>$404.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREY00004</td>
<td>GREY BRUCE ELECTRIC SUPPLY INC</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREYROOT01</td>
<td>GREY ROOTS PETTY CASH</td>
<td>PETTY CASH JUN29-JUL16/10</td>
<td>$243.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUNBY0001</td>
<td>MERLE GUNBY</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAHN0001</td>
<td>CAROL HAHN</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$69.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE1001</td>
<td>HAVE1.COM</td>
<td>PRINTING 2 FOR 1 PASS TICKETS, RACK CARDS</td>
<td>$369.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME00006</td>
<td>HOME BUILDING CENTRE-SMITH &amp; H</td>
<td>BUILDING SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$496.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPSON001</td>
<td>KATHY HOPSON</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTERH01</td>
<td>HUNTER KAULAGE AND EXCAVATIN</td>
<td>WASH STONE &amp; TRUCKING</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HURON0001</td>
<td>HURON BAY CO-OP INC. - TEESWAT</td>
<td>LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$257.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDRO0001</td>
<td>HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.</td>
<td>HYDRO MAY19-JUN18/10</td>
<td>$142.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAVALYN01</td>
<td>LARA JAVALYN</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$14.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME004</td>
<td>PAUL JEROME</td>
<td>VOLUNTEER CRIMINAL RECORDS CHECK</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON13</td>
<td>BONITA JOHNSON-DEMATTEIS</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNST020</td>
<td>BASIL JOHNSTON</td>
<td>CONSULTANT FEES - GOOD PEOPLE EXHIBIT</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEMPERS01</td>
<td>VERONICA SIEBEN-KEMPERS</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$43.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTOYS01</td>
<td>K &amp; M TOYS CANADA CO.</td>
<td>INVENTORY FOR RESALE</td>
<td>$172.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRUEGER01</td>
<td>KRUEGER CUSTOM STEEL</td>
<td>METAL FOR BLACKSMITH SHOP</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEDGER001</td>
<td>LEDGEROCK LIMITED</td>
<td>SCHOOL HOUSE - CUT SLATE</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVING5005</td>
<td>LIVINGSTON EVENT LOGISTICS</td>
<td>BORDER CROSSING - JUMP TO JAPAN</td>
<td>$936.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACLEAN05</td>
<td>RUTH MACLEAN</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANSE001</td>
<td>BRIAN MANSE</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$240.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN004</td>
<td>SUSAN MARTIN</td>
<td>TRAVEL &amp; EMPLOYEE EXPENSES JUN-JUL/10</td>
<td>$128.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCBARTHU05</td>
<td>MCBARTHUR TIRE OWEN SOUND</td>
<td>TRACTOR TIRE REPAIR</td>
<td>$141.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCREYN001</td>
<td>DOREEN MCREYNOLDS</td>
<td>SCHOOL HOUSE OPENING CAKES</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAFORD21</td>
<td>MEAFORD MUSEUM</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERRILL01</td>
<td>CHUCK MERRILL</td>
<td>HORSEFEATHERS MUSIC JUN26/10</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLER013</td>
<td>MILLER WASTE SYSTEMS O/S DIVISI</td>
<td>WASTE REMOVAL</td>
<td>$253.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOREAU001</td>
<td>PIERRE MOREAU</td>
<td>HONOURARIUM-DRAGONS WOESHOP TRAVEL</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNTA010</td>
<td>MOUNTAIN LIFE PUBLISHING INC.</td>
<td>PRINT AD IN SUMMER ISSUE</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSSIO001</td>
<td>MUSSIO VENTURES LTD. - BACKROA</td>
<td>SOUTHWESTERN ON SPIRAL - 2ND</td>
<td>$179.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADJWOO3</td>
<td>WILMER NADJWON</td>
<td>GOOD PEOPLE EXHIBIT CARVING</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYLOR002</td>
<td>NAYLOR (CANADA) INC.</td>
<td>AD - SCHOOL BUS ONTARIO 2010</td>
<td>$339.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLS12</td>
<td>NICHOLSON DESIGN</td>
<td>PANELS FOR GOOD PEOPLE EXHIBIT</td>
<td>$1,929.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINGWAK01</td>
<td>NINGWAKWE LEARNING PRESS</td>
<td>BOOKS</td>
<td>$116.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOBLE009</td>
<td>KARIN NOBLE</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES APR28-JUN25/10</td>
<td>$631.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYMEYER01</td>
<td>LAURA NYMEY</td>
<td>EMPLOYEE EXPENSES JUN-JUL/10</td>
<td>$21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLIVER001</td>
<td>OLIVER'S BOILERS</td>
<td>STEAM ENGINE BOILER REPLACE &amp; MOUNT</td>
<td>$14,796.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMERS0001</td>
<td>OMERS</td>
<td>OMESS SERVICE PURCHASE</td>
<td>$672.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWEN00008</td>
<td>OWEN SOUND GLASS SERVICE</td>
<td>BUILDING MAINTENANCE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$234.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWEN00013</td>
<td>OWEN SOUND CITY BAND</td>
<td>SCHOOL HOUSE OPENING JULY1/10</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWEN0040</td>
<td>OWEN SOUND FOODLAND</td>
<td>SPECIAL EVENTS</td>
<td>$139.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWENSOU17</td>
<td>OWEN SOUND ATTACK HOCKEY CLU SOUVENIR PROGRAM</td>
<td>ADVERTISING</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPERPRO1</td>
<td>PAPER PRODUCTS PLUS INC.</td>
<td>CLEANING SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$312.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC000001</td>
<td>PCO SERVICES CORPORATION</td>
<td>PEST CONTROL JUN/10</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERRY0003</td>
<td>BONNIE PERRY</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$16.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITNEY005</td>
<td>PITNEY BOWES - ORANGEVILLE 2Z7</td>
<td>POSTAGE MACHINE LEASE AUG-OCT/10</td>
<td>$210.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTERO02</td>
<td>J.A. PORTER HOLDINGS (LUCKNOW)</td>
<td>SEPTIC SYSTEM SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$135.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE01</td>
<td>POSTAGE BY PHONE</td>
<td>POSTAGE REFILL JUL/10</td>
<td>$2,035.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESS01</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL FARRIER SUPPLY</td>
<td>BUILDING MAINTENANCE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$363.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUROLATOR01</td>
<td>PUROLATOR COURTIER</td>
<td>COURIER CHARGES</td>
<td>$93.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDYS001</td>
<td>RANDY'S LOCK-SAFE &amp; ALARM INC.</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$200.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDDELL01</td>
<td>RIDDELL CONTRACTING LTD</td>
<td>TUBES FOR SEED DRILL</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUSSEA01</td>
<td>PIERRE ROUSSEAU FINE HANDCRAFT</td>
<td>MOCK TREES, PLASTER &amp; PAINT</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL0002</td>
<td>THE RURAL VOICE</td>
<td>ADVERTISING - HERITAGE VILLAGE</td>
<td>$19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALATA001</td>
<td>SIM SALATA</td>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10</td>
<td>$92.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE01</td>
<td>SCIENCE FIRST</td>
<td>TELESCOPE REFRACTING TUBES &amp; KIT</td>
<td>$171.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT0002</td>
<td>SCOTTS INDUSTRIAL &amp; FARM SUPPL</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$15.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIEMENS01</td>
<td>SIEMENS BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES</td>
<td>BUILDING AUTOMATION CONTRACT JUL/10</td>
<td>$2,610.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNS0001</td>
<td>SIGNS - DESIGN - SALES</td>
<td></td>
<td>$243.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please direct any inquiries to Sarah Powell (sarah.powell@grey.ca)
or Becky Twigger (becky.twigger@grey.ca)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIMS0003</td>
<td>CHERYL SIMS - CARRY ON BEADWELL</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$58.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLS001</td>
<td>SKILLSOFT CANADA LTD</td>
<td>ONLINE TRAINING</td>
<td>$541.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARKS001</td>
<td>SUSAN SPARKS</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$69.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUIGENE01</td>
<td>SUI-GENERIS MARKETING INC.</td>
<td>EXPANDED BUSINESS LISTING AD</td>
<td>$112.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNTIME01</td>
<td>THE SUN TIMES</td>
<td>ADVERTISING CHARGES JUN/10</td>
<td>$1,143.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYDENHA06</td>
<td>SYDENHAM PROPERTY MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>CLEANING GREY ROOTS JUL/10</td>
<td>$3,810.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYDENHA07</td>
<td>SYDENHAM BRUCE TRAIL CLUB</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDVISA001</td>
<td>TD VISA</td>
<td>VISA EXPENSES JUN/10 (BREAKDOWN ATTACHED)</td>
<td>$923.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS003</td>
<td>RICHARD THOMAS COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>EDIT BASIL JOHNSTON TEXT</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMLINS01</td>
<td>WENDY TOMLINSON</td>
<td>EMPLOYEE EXPENSES MAY &amp; JUL/10</td>
<td>$172.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC000001</td>
<td>TSC STORES L.P.</td>
<td>SCHOOL HOUSE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$335.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCLE0001</td>
<td>UNCLE RICHARD'S MAPLE SYRUP</td>
<td>INVENTORY FOR RESALE</td>
<td>$119.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION0001</td>
<td>UNION GAS LIMITED (CHATHAM)</td>
<td>NATURAL GAS MAY18-JUN18/10</td>
<td>$99.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEITEND01</td>
<td>LISA ANN WEITENDORF</td>
<td>POLICE SAFETY CHECK</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELBECK01</td>
<td>WELBECK SAWMILL LTD</td>
<td>SCHOOL HOUSE &amp; BUILDING SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$736.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDE00001</td>
<td>WIDE-EYED PUBLISHING</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$14.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM14</td>
<td>MABEL BROWN WILLIAMSON</td>
<td>CONSIGNMENT SALES JUN/10</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILTON002</td>
<td>WILTON SANITATION INC.</td>
<td>PORTABLE RESTROOM RENTAL</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD00012</td>
<td>WOOD WYANT INC. - OTHER</td>
<td>CLEANING SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$922.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW001</td>
<td>YELLOW PAGES GROUP</td>
<td>DIRECTORY ADVERTISING</td>
<td>$329.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEHR00001</td>
<td>ZEHRS - WINNIPEG</td>
<td>VOLUNTEER TRAINING &amp; HERITAGE FAIR FOOD</td>
<td>$120.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for Segment  HER  Heritage  $90,304.53

Total for Segment  90  Heritage  $90,304.53
## THE COUNTY OF GREY
## EXPENDITURE LISTING
### (Net of GST Rebate)

### Planning

**Vendor** | **Vendor Name** | **Transaction Description** | **Total**
--- | --- | --- | ---
PLN | Planning | | 
BELL00006 | BELL MOBILITY | CELLULAR CHARGES JUL/10 | $161.96
BUCK00003 | MARCUS J. BUCK | CONSULTING SERVICE-Peer Review | $840.00
CANADA006 | CANADA POST CORP - OTTAWA | POSTAGE CHARGES JUN/10 | $22.60
CANADIA58 | CANADIAN RED CROSS-MISSISSAUG SFA/EFA/CPR COURSE PACKAGES | | $10.60
CORPORAO3 | CORPORATE EXPRESS | OFFICE SUPPLIES | $88.30
HEERSCHO1 | BARB HEERSCHAP | TRAVEL EXPENSES JUL/10 | $56.32
KING00008 | KING TRANSPORT INC. | COURIER CHARGES JUN/10 | $27.00
KIRBY0001 | KIRBY, ROBINSON & TRESLAN | APR-JUN/10 BILLING | $2,385.00
LEXISNE01 | LEXISNEXIS CANADA INC | 2011 PLANNING LEGION & COMMENTARY | $81.95
MORRISO13 | SARAH MORRISON | TRAVEL EXPENSES JUL/10 | $378.04
ONTARIO24 | ONT PROFESSIONAL PLANNERS INS | OPPI CONFERENCE-TAYLOR/MORRISON | $1,322.88
SCHERZE01 | RANDY SCHERZER | TRAVEL EXPENSES JUN/10 | $143.14
SKILLSO01 | SKILLSOFT CANADA LTD | ONLINE TRAINING | $203.14
STONE0001 | STONE TREE | RETIREMENT PARTY-J. MCDONALD | $768.09
TAYLOR024 | SCOTT TAYLOR | TRAVEL EXPENSES JUL/10 | $219.71

Total for Segment **PLN** | **Planning** | **$6,708.73**

Total for Segment | **60** | **Planning** | **$6,708.73**
## Heritage, Agriculture & Tourism

**Expenditure Listing - TD Visa - Supplementary Documentation**

Expenditure Listing for the Month of July - Based on June Visa Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARDHOLDER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NET GST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Plumstead</td>
<td>June Visa Charges</td>
<td>1,707.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuel for Tourism Vehicle &amp; Truck Rental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunches - RTMP and Georgian Bay Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWEA Conference Hotel and Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit for Grey County Coupon Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck Rental - TMAC Munch &amp; Mingle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel - TMAC Munch &amp; Mingle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book - Cultural Planning for Creative Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Pausner</td>
<td>June Visa Charges</td>
<td>249.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Hogan</td>
<td>June Visa Charges</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Agriculture, Promotion &amp; Tourism - Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,991.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Manser</td>
<td>June Visa Charges</td>
<td>672.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuel, Microbiological Analysis, School House Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meal &amp; Parking - OHS Award Ceremony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petal Furness</td>
<td>June Visa Charges</td>
<td>251.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer Tracking System Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DVD, Ink Supplies, Over Limit Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage - Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 923.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Page 10 of 72
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARDHOLDER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NET GST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randy Scherzer</td>
<td>June Visa Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning - Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Mullin & Members of Planning and Community Development Committee

FROM: Scott Taylor, Senior Planner

MEETING DATE: August 12th, 2010

PURPOSE: Official Plan Amendment Merit Report
Re-designation from “Mineral Resource Extraction” and “Hazard Lands” to “Rural” and “Hazard Lands”

FILE: 42-05-01-OPA-91

DESCRIPTION: Municipality of West Grey
Part Lots 45 & 46, Concession 3
(Geographic Township of Normanby)

APPLICANT: Municipality of West Grey
AGENT: Ron Davidson, Land Use Planning Consultant

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Planning and Community Development Committee supports the proposed County Official Plan Amendment to re-designate the lands described as Part Lots 45 & 46, Concession 3, (Geographic Township of Normanby) Municipality of West Grey from “Mineral Resource Extraction” and “Hazard Lands” to “Rural” and “Hazard Lands”;

AND THAT the Addendum to Planning Report PDR-PCD-36-09 is hereby adopted;

AND FURTHER THAT the appropriate by-law be prepared for consideration by County Council.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to formulate a recommendation to the Planning and Community Development Committee regarding the County Official Plan Amendment.
The County of Grey is in receipt of an application to amend the County of Grey Official Plan for the purpose of finalizing the rehabilitation of a gravel pit and then allowing for future uses to be permitted, as per the policies of the Rural designation.

OVERVIEW

The proposed amendment would re-designate the former municipal pit operation from the Mineral Resource Extraction designation to the Rural designation. The Hazard Lands which exist on-site would remain the same. A municipal zoning by-law amendment is also required before future uses can be permitted on the property.

The subject gravel pit is owned by the Municipality and has now been completely rehabilitated as per the rehabilitation plan. The topsoil and overburden that had been stockpiled has now been distributed over the extraction area, such that farm uses can continue. There are also some forested areas and a small pond on the property which will remain. As part of the rehabilitation the license will also be surrendered with the Ministry of Natural Resources.

The property is approximately 6 km south east of Ayton on the Baseline. The lands immediately surrounding those proposed for re-designation are predominantly treed, although there is also some farming and residential/recreational development in the area. Within the County Plan the lands in the area are designated as Rural and Hazard Lands, with some Agricultural lands to the north west.

The Township’s Planner, Ron Davidson, has submitted a planning report covering the relevant Provincial and County policies with respect to the Amendment and the rehabilitation of extractive operations.

A joint public meeting between the Municipality and the County was held for the County Official Plan Amendment as well as the Zoning By-law Amendment on December 14, 2009.

AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED

Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA)

In a letter dated December 10, 2009 the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority states that they have no objection to the approval of the proposed official plan amendment provided the Hazard Lands designation and Natural Environment zone remain in force and effect and that any prospective purchasers are provided with a copy of SVCA’s letter.

Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)

In a letter dated July 30, 2010 the MNR states that they are satisfied with the rehabilitation which has taken place on-site.

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

At the public meeting one member of the public had a question with respect to the timeframes for the applications. The same person subsequently submitted a letter asking
to be notified of all future meetings and decisions.

**ANALYSIS OF PLANNING ISSUES**

Planning authorities must have regard to matters of Provincial interest, the criteria of the *Planning Act* and be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. Within Grey County they must also make decisions that conform to the goals and intent of the County of Grey Official Plan and any approved Municipal Official Plans.

*Provincial Legislation – The Planning Act*

Section 1.1 of the *Planning Act* outlines the purposes of the Act. The purposes of the Act promote sustainable economic development in a healthy natural environment within a land use planning system, led by provincial policy and matters of provincial interest. Section 2 of the *Planning Act* outlines matters of Provincial Interest, which decision makers must be consistent with when carrying out their responsibilities under the Act. The most relevant matters of provincial interest to this application are: (b) the protection of the agricultural resources of the Province; (c) the conservation and management of natural resources and the mineral resource base; and (p) the appropriate location of growth and development.

(b) The subject property is surrounded by Rural and Hazard Lands, and as such will be returned to the Rural and Hazard Lands designations. The property has been rehabilitated and all of the topsoil and overburden has been redistributed across the site. Although the property does not qualify as prime agricultural lands, portions of the property can still be used for farm purposes, and other portions remain treed.

(c) The subject property has had the aggregate removed and will now be utilized for farm or other rural land use purposes.

(p) The Ministry of Natural Resources and the Conservation Authority have both given consent to the rehabilitation work which has been done on-site. Based on agency review, the property would now be capable of permitting rural land uses as per the policies of the Rural designation.

*Provincial Policy Statement*

Section 2.5.3.1 of the PPS speaks to the rehabilitation of aggregate extraction areas. The rehabilitation has taken into account neighbouring land uses, and would appear to be compatible. The most likely future use for the property would be as a hobby farm.

Section 1.1.4.1 of the PPS permits a variety of resource based uses in rural areas, all types of farming, as well as limited residential uses.

The Hazard Lands on-site are not proposed to be re-designated; therefore any site alteration on-site will need to be in accordance with Section 3.1 of the PPS.

*County of Grey Official Plan*

The property is designated as Mineral Resource Extraction and Hazard Lands according to
Schedule A of the County Official Plan. As was noted above, the property is being re-designated back to Rural and Hazard Lands in accordance with neighbouring land use designations. Section 2.7.3(5) of the County Official Plan states that when an extractive area has been depleted and is rehabilitated in accordance with the license, an Official Plan Amendment will be required for any use not permitted in Section 2.7.2. As mentioned previously, the Ministry of Natural Resources has confirmed that final rehabilitation has been completed and that the license is being surrendered. The confirmation from the Ministry of Natural Resources satisfies the requirements of the County Official Plan.

Within the County Official Plan Section 6.3 sets out the criteria for amending the County Plan. The supporting material has sufficiently demonstrated how the proposed amendment meets with the goals and intent of the County Official Plan.

**FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL/ IT CONSIDERATIONS**

At this point there are no financial, staffing, legal or IT considerations beyond those normally encountered in processing a County Official Plan Amendment.

Following a decision on the amendment, should the decision be appealed, there could be increased financial or legal costs/needs.

**SUMMARY**

Application has been made for an Official Plan Amendment to amend the County of Grey Official Plan for the purpose of finalizing the rehabilitation of a gravel pit to allow for future uses to be permitted, as per the policies of the Rural designation.

The supporting material and comments from the circulated agencies supported the principle of the development. The Planning Department is of the opinion the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and maintains the intent and direction of the County of Grey Official Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Taylor, Senior Planner
Addendum to PDR-PCD-13-10  
Date: August 12, 2010

C O R P O R A T I O N  O F  T H E  
C O U N T Y  O F  G R E Y

COMMITTEE REPORT
Addendum to PDR-PCD-13-10

TO: Chair Mullin & Members of Planning and Community Development Committee

FROM: Scott Taylor, Senior Planner

MEETING DATE: August 12th, 2010

PURPOSE: Addendum to Official Plan Amendment Merit Report  
Re-designation from “Rural” and “Hazard Lands” to “Rural with Exceptions” and “Hazard Lands”

FILE: 42-07-09-OPA-90

DESCRIPTION: Township of Southgate  
Part Lot 229 & Lot 230, Concession 4, South and West of the Toronto Sydenham Road (Geographic Township of Proton)

APPLICANT: 1652235 Ontario Limited c/o Elio Leal

AGENT: Cuesta Planning Consultants

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Planning and Community Development Committee supports the proposed County Official Plan Amendment to re-designate the lands described as Part Lot 229 and Lot 230, Concession 4 SWTSR, (Geographic Township of Proton) Township of Southgate from “Rural” and “Hazard Lands” to “Rural with Exceptions” and “Hazard Lands”;  
AND THAT the Addendum to Planning Report PDR-PCD-13-10 is hereby adopted;  
AND FURTHER THAT the appropriate by-law be prepared for consideration by County Council.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The County of Grey is in receipt of an application to amend the County of Grey Official Plan for the purpose of permitting the establishment of a “Running of the Bulls” event up to four times each year. The bull running event would be entirely contained within a ring with a series of bleachers around the ring, and parking in the surrounding pastured fields.

The purpose of this report is to formulate a recommendation to the Planning and Community Development Committee regarding the County Official Plan Amendment.
OVERVIEW

The proposed amendment would re-designate approximately 5.3 hectares of the 39.5 hectare property, with an Exception to the Rural designation to allow for the Running of the Bulls event and associated uses. The development would occur on the south easterly portion of the property, which gains access off of Grey Road 9; however an access is also being proposed off of Southgate Sideroad 71. Development on the site would generally occur around the existing farm cluster, with some existing pasture lands to be utilized as parking. The subject property is predominantly farmed with a forested portion along the north eastern boundary. The anticipated size of the events would include a capacity of up to 1,500 spectators. Bulls which are used in the event are currently being raised on-site and would not be killed or intentionally injured as part of the event. Portable toilets and temporary food vendors would be used to service the event. Each event would be a day in duration, with most of the activities occurring in the mid-late afternoon. There will be no on-site camping associated with the events.

The subject development also requires a Zoning By-law Amendment from the Township of Southgate, which has been submitted to the Township.

The property is approximately 1.5 km south west of Dundalk on Grey Road 9. The lands immediately surrounding those proposed for re-designation are predominantly farmed or forested, with some pockets of wetlands. There are some strip non-farm lots off Grey Road 9, surrounding the outer fringe of Dundalk. Within the County Plan the lands in the area are designated as Rural and Hazard Lands, with the Urban Fringe designation approximately 1 km to the north east. There is also a warm water stream identified on the property across Grey Road 9 to the east.

Cuesta Planning Consultants have submitted a Planning Report and Addendum in support of the proposal. In addition a Traffic Impact Assessment has also been submitted.

A joint public meeting between the Township and the County was held for the County Official Plan Amendment and Township Zoning By-law Amendment on July 7, 2010.

AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED

Historic Saugeen Métis

In a letter dated April 20, 2010 the Historic Saugeen Métis stated that they have no further interest in this matter at this time. They further noted that should any archaeological finds be discovered during this project or any unforeseen events occur that have the potential to cause minor or catastrophic impact on the environment within the traditional harvesting territory used by the Historic Saugeen Métis, immediate contact should be initiated.

County of Grey Transportation & Public Safety (TAPS)

In a letter dated June 24, 2010, the County of Grey Transportation and Public Safety department notes the following:

"The County of Grey Transportation & Public Safety Department agrees with the following three (3) recommendations in the Traffic Impact Study;"
1. A right turn taper lane be constructed for the westbound Grey Road 9 approach to the main site access;
2. A second site access be installed to Southgate Sideroad 71;
3. An on-site and off-site Traffic Control Plan be prepared as part of the Site Development Plan.

The additional recommendations are added by Grey County;

4. The right turn taper and entrance shall be constructed as per the attached plan. (Ministry of Transportation Ontario CSAS-31). This will include widening the main access to 8m.
5. Upgrade the existing driveway to ensure a minimum 7.5m width from the property line on Grey Road 9 to the temporary parking area. This will ensure that traffic will be free to move into the parking areas.
6. The Traffic Control Plan as prepared in recommendation 3 shall include a provision to keep Grey Road 9 clear and/or clear the road of any dirt, mud or stone, etc. Provisions should be made to employ a qualified traffic control person as required.”

Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA)

In a letter dated June 28, 2010 the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority states that they have no objection to the approval of the proposed official plan amendment provided the existing Hazard Lands designation remains in force and effect. The SVCA further notes that the subject property also contains a portion of land which is covered under their regulated area as per Ontario Regulation No. 169/06.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing (MMAH)

In an email dated July 7, 2010 the Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing states that they have no specific issues at this time.

Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)

In an email dated July 29, 2010, OMAFRA notes that 'because the event is temporary and only to be held four times a year, that it would be similar to a fairground, and as such Minimum Distance Separation formulae 1 would not have to be applied.'

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

There were no written comments received from the public. No verbal comments from the public were made at the public meeting.

ANALYSIS OF PLANNING ISSUES

Planning authorities must have regard to matters of Provincial interest, the criteria of the Planning Act and be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. Within Grey County they must also make decisions that conform to the goals and intent of the County of Grey Official Plan and any approved Municipal Official Plans.
Provincial Legislation – The Planning Act

Section 1.1 of the Planning Act outlines the purposes of the Act. The purposes of the Act promote sustainable economic development in a healthy natural environment within a land use planning system, led by provincial policy and matters of provincial interest. Section 2 of the Planning Act outlines matters of Provincial Interest, which decision makers must be consistent with when carrying out their responsibilities under the Act. The most relevant matters of provincial interest to this application are: (b) the protection of the agricultural resources of the Province; (o) the protection of public health and safety; and (p) the appropriate location of growth and development.

(b) The subject property is primarily designated as Rural, with some Hazard Lands to the north-east, in the County Official Plan. Although the property is not mapped as prime agricultural lands, the majority of the property is farmed, and will continue to be farmed, should the proposed Official Plan Amendment be approved. The development on-site, with the exception of the temporary parking facilities, is located within the farm cluster and will not remove lands from farm production. The parking areas should also be able to be retained as pasture lands for the greater part of the year.

(o) With any rodeo style event there are inherent risks to the participants. In this case the activities will be contained within a ring, and the bulls will be tethered and not running free. Food and water will be brought into the site via vendors. Washroom facilities will be available through portable toilets, which is common for a temporary event of this nature. Spectators will generally be limited to the bleachers, vendor booths and portable toilet areas. The Township will have the ability to impose site plan control on the property to address any specific matters with respect to public safety.

(p) The subject property is a farm property and the bulls are being raised and housed there. As a result there is some rationale for this event to occur in a rural area. The majority of the year the property would be operated as a farm and have no additional impact on neighbours. Four times a year, when the event is being hosted, there would be additional traffic and noise in the area. The property is however on a County Road, which is meant for carrying heavier traffic volumes and in close proximity to a Provincial Highway, for regional traffic. There are other farms in the area, which would appear to be compatible with the proposed development.

Provincial Policy Statement

Section 1.1.4.1 of the PPS permits farming, resource use and resource-based recreational activities within rural areas in municipalities. While a rodeo-style event would not strictly be a resource-based recreational use, it could be considered a recreational event which is secondary to the main farm use. The proposed use has also been deemed not to be in conflict with Minimum Distance Separation formulae.

The PPS also requires development in rural areas to be appropriate to the level of infrastructure available. As noted above the property is located on a County Road and servicing for the event would be done via temporary means.
The Hazard Lands on-site are not proposed to be re-designated and there are no proposed activities related to the Running of the Bulls event on this portion of the property. The SVCA has also commented on the application and have no concerns provided the existing Hazard Land boundaries remain in force and effect. As such, the proposal would not appear to be in conflict with Section 3.1 of the PPS.

**County of Grey Official Plan**

Section 2.3 of the County Plan, contemplates similar types of permitted uses as Section 1.1.4.1 of the PPS. A County Official Plan Amendment was triggered based on the scale and frequency of the event, which is beyond what is normally considered in the Rural designation. The County Plan does allow for recreational development and a number of secondary uses in the Rural designation, which are meant to supplement farm income, including small scale commercial / industrial and bed and breakfasts.

Under Section 5.2 of the County Plan, development adjacent to County Roads must be referred to the Transportation and Public Safety department to determine if the use and siting are adequate. The applicant has agreed to all of the conditions of the Transportation and Public Safety department with respect to Grey Road 9.

Within the County Official Plan Section 6.3 sets out the criteria for amending the County Plan. The supporting studies have sufficiently demonstrated how the proposed amendment meets with the goals and intent of the County Official Plan.

**FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL/ IT CONSIDERATIONS**

At this point there are no financial, staffing, legal or IT considerations beyond those normally encountered in processing a County Official Plan Amendment. The County has collected an application and fee for the amendment.

Following a decision on the amendment, should the decision be appealed, there could be increased financial or legal costs/needs.

**SUMMARY**

Application has been made for an Official Plan Amendment to amend the County of Grey Official Plan for the purpose of permitting the establishment of a “Running of the Bulls” event up to four times each year.

The supporting material and comments from the circulated agencies supported the principle of the development. The Planning Department is of the opinion the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and maintains the intent and direction of the County of Grey Official Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Taylor, Senior Planner
CORPORATION OF THE COUNTY OF GREY

COMMITTEE REPORT
Addendum to PDR-PCD-17-10

TO: Chair Mullin & Members of Planning and Community Development Committee
FROM: Sarah Morrison, Planner
MEETING DATE: August 12th, 2010
PURPOSE: Addendum to Official Plan Amendment Merit Report
Re-designation from “Agricultural with Exceptions” to a new “Agricultural with Exceptions”
FILE: 42-07-06-OPA-97
DESCRIPTION: Township of Southgate
West Half of Lot 9, Concession 5
(Geographic Township of Egremont)
APPLICANT: Samuel and Edna Martin
AGENT: Cuesta Planning Consultants Inc.

RECOMMENDATION
That the Planning and Community Development Committee supports the proposed Amendment to the County of Grey Official Plan to re-designate the subject lands from “Agricultural with Exceptions” to a new “Agricultural with Exceptions” for the lands described as West Half of Lot 9, Concession 5, (Geographic Township of Egremont) Township of Southgate.

And that the Addendum to Planning Report PDR-PCD-17-10 is hereby adopted;

And further, that the appropriate by-law be prepared for consideration by County Council, which would rescind County Official Plan Amendment #35 and replace it with a new Official Plan Amendment.
PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to formulate a recommendation to the Planning and Community Development Committee regarding the County Official Plan Amendment.

The County of Grey has received an application to amend the County Official Plan to allow for an expansion to an existing farm machinery repair and metal works shop in the Township of Southgate.

OVERVIEW

In May of 2003 the County passed Official Plan Amendment # 35 to allow for a 324 m$^2$ agriculturally related machine shop on the subject lands. Based on the success of the shop, the proponent is now seeking to approximately double the size of the machine shop building on-site. The principle of the use of the shop is not changing, just the size. The proposed Amendment would rescind OPA # 35, and replace it with a new site-specific exception to the Agricultural designation to allow for the shop expansion. There is also a portion of the property which is designated as “Hazard Lands”; however no development or re-designation is being proposed for this area of the property.

The subject property is approximately 20 hectares in area and is legally described as the West Half of Lot 9, Concession 5, geographic Township of Egremont, in the Township of Southgate. Currently the property contains the machine shop, a house, a shed, a barn, a grainery and three greenhouses. The area being proposed for expansion is already cleared and within the farm cluster. As such, the expansion of the shop would not remove any active agricultural lands from production. The subject property is bisected by the South Saugeen River; however the proposed development site is over 300 metres from the banks of the River.

The subject property is approximately 5 kilometers north east of Mount Forest on Southgate Road 04. Highway 89 runs east-west approximately 1 km south of the subject lands. Within the area is a mix of farm and non-farm land uses including a few other small scale commercial / industrial operations. To the south-west of the property there is also a sand and gravel pit off of the Provincial Highway. Within the immediate area the majority of lands are designated as Agricultural in the County Plan.

Cuesta Planning Consultants Inc. have submitted a Planning Justification Report in support of the proposed Amendment. No other reports or studies were deemed necessary at the time of pre-submission consultation.

A joint public meeting between the Township and the County was held for the County Official Plan Amendment and the Zoning By-law Amendment on July 7, 2010.

AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED

Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA)

In a letter dated July 2, 2010 the SVCA noted that they have no objection to the approval of the Official Plan Amendment and in summary there are no Natural Hazards of Significant Natural Heritage features affected by this proposal.
PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

There were no written comments received from the public. No verbal comments from the public were made at the public meeting.

ANALYSIS OF PLANNING ISSUES

New development within the County must have regard for matter of Provincial Interest under the Planning Act, be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), and conform to the County and Municipal Official Plans. Where Amendments are required it must be demonstrated that the proposal meets with the goals and objectives of the Official Plan.

Provincial Legislation

Section 2 of the Planning Act sets out matters of Provincial Interest, which all land use decisions shall have regard for. Subsections (b) the protection of the agricultural resources of the Province, and (p) the appropriate location of growth and development are most pertinent to the subject Amendment.

(b) The subject property is within the Agricultural with Exceptions and Hazard Lands designations of the County Plan. The effect of the applications would be to permit the expansion of an existing farm machinery repair and metal works shop. The proposed expansion falls within a gravel surface, and no lands would be taken out of active agricultural production.

(p) The proposal is for an expansion of an existing use, therefore it has been servicing the needs of its surrounding agricultural and rural community for a number of years. It is a use that is compatible with the surrounding agricultural and rural communities.

Provincial Policy Statement

Section 2.3 of the PPS provides for the permission of secondary and agriculturally-related uses in prime agricultural areas. Provided said uses are small scale and directly related to the farm operation they can be considered within agricultural areas.

County Official Plan

As noted above the proposed Amendment would not be changing the principle use of the farm machinery repair and metal works shop on the property; rather it would be increasing the size.

Section 2.1.2 (1) outlines permitted uses including small scale commercial or industrial uses that are directly supportive and related to the agricultural operation and required in close proximity to the farm operations in the area.

Section 6.3 of the County Plan contemplates amendments to the Plan, provided the criteria of the relevant sections of the Plan can be addressed. In this case the County has approved OPA 66 which adopted the Township of Southgate’s Official Plan which allowed for an increase in the size of small scale industrial operations. This amendment, however, did not rescind OPA 35 which was site specific and did not reflect the changes within OPA 66, and therefore the need for this amendment is brought forward.
The proposed amendment would appear to meet with the goals and intent of the County Plan. In order to avoid duplication of amendments, staff would recommend that County Official Plan Amendment # 35 be rescinded and replaced by this Official Plan Amendment.

FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL/ IT CONSIDERATIONS

At this time there are no expected financial, staffing or legal considerations beyond those normally encountered in processing an Official Plan Amendment application. The County has received an Amendment application fee and peer review deposit with the file.

Following a decision on the amendment, should the decision be appealed, there could be increased financial or legal costs/needs.

SUMMARY

An application has been received to amend the County Official Plan to allow for the expansion to an existing farm machinery repair and metal works shop.

The supporting material and comments from the circulated agencies supported the principle of the development. The Planning Department is of the opinion the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and maintains the intent and direction of the County of Grey Official Plan.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah Morrison, Planner
TO: Chair Mullin & Members of Planning and Community Development Committee

FROM: Scott Taylor, Senior Planner

MEETING DATE: August 12th, 2010

PURPOSE: Official Plan Amendment Merit Report
Re-designation from “Rural” and “Hazard Lands” to “Mineral Resource Extraction” and “Hazard Lands”

FILE: 42-05-22-OPA-99

DESCRIPTION: Municipality of West Grey
Part Lots 16 & 17, Concession 2 NDR and Part Lots 17 – 20, Concession 1 NDR
(Geographic Township of Glenelg)

APPLICANT: Harold Sutherland Construction Limited

AGENT: Ron Davidson, Land Use Planning Consultant Inc.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Planning and Community Development Committee accepts Planning Report PDR-PCD-25-10 as presented and recommends this proposal proceed to a Public Meeting to consider the Amendment to the County of Grey Official Plan to re-designate the subject lands from “Rural” and Hazard Lands” to “Mineral Resource Extraction” and “Hazard Lands” for the lands described as Part Lots 16 & 17, Concession 2 NDR and Part Lots 17 – 20, Concession 1 NDR, (Geographic Township of Glenelg) Municipality of West Grey, provided the Municipality of West Grey is prepared to hold a joint public meeting in consideration of the necessary local amendment requirements.
PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The County of Grey is in receipt of an application to amend the County of Grey Official Plan for the purpose of permitting a sand and gravel pit on the subject lands.

The purpose of this report is to formulate a recommendation to the Planning and Community Development Committee to determine if merit exists to support the above-noted amendment in principle and to establish if the County should proceed with the holding of a public meeting and formal review of the application.

OVERVIEW

The proposed amendment would re-designate 44.4 hectares of land described as Part Lots 16 & 17, Concession 2 NDR and Part Lots 17 – 20, Concession 1 NDR, (Geographic Township of Glenelg), Municipality of West Grey from the Rural and Hazard Lands designations to the Mineral Resource Extraction and Hazard Lands designations. The sand and gravel pit operation also requires a Zoning By-law Amendment from the Municipality of West Grey.

The applicant has applied for a Class “A”, Category 3 License under the Aggregate Resources Act. The subject license application would permit a maximum of 100,000 tonnes annually and extraction would remain a minimum of 1.5 metres above the water table. Approximately 44.4 hectares of the subject properties will be licensed; however only 30.3 hectares are proposed for extraction. The primary haul route for the pit will be south on Baptist Church Road to Grey Road 4, where it will travel east or west depending on the construction project.

The property is approximately 8 km east of Durham on the north side of Grey Road 4, extending north to Northline Road. The entrance for the pit operation would be on Baptist Church Road. The subject properties contain a mixture of farmed and forested lands. Although there are some farm and non-farm buildings on the properties, these buildings are outside of the proposed licensed areas.

The lands immediately surrounding those proposed for re-designation are currently generally used for farming, forestry or natural purposes. While many of the surrounding lands appear to still be held in large acreages, there are also a number of non-farm sized residential lots in the area along County Road 4. To the south-east of the subject site there is also a very large licensed extractive operation, which is not currently in operation. A former Municipal landfill site is also situated to the east of the subject properties. Within the County Plan the lands in the area are designated as Rural and Hazard Lands, with some Mineral Resource Extraction lands to the west and to the south-east.

Ron Davidson Land Use Planning Consultant Inc. submitted a Planning Report in support of the proposal. In addition, the applicant has also submitted a Natural Environment Technical Report Level 2, a Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment, a Hydrogeological
Assessment, an Acoustic Assessment Report, a Letter of Opinion Pertaining to the Landfill Site, site plans/materials related to the license application and copies of agency correspondence received thus far.

The Consultant has also indicated that a Traffic Impact Study was not completed due to the relatively small annual extraction rate of the proposed pit.

**ANALYSIS OF PLANNING ISSUES**

Planning authorities must have regard to matters of Provincial interest, the criteria of the *Planning Act* and be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS-2005). Within Grey County they must also make decisions that conform to the County of Grey Official Plan and make decisions that represent good land use planning.

*Provincial Interest – Legislation, Policy, Guidelines*

Section 2.5 of the PPS is intended to provide for the establishment of aggregate extraction operations in an appropriate fashion. Similarly section 1.1.4.1 of the PPS allows for resource use within rural areas in municipalities.

Section 2.1 of the PPS speaks to development within proximity to natural heritage features on or adjacent to the property; while section 3.2 addresses development in proximity to human made hazards.

The applicant has submitted a Planning Report which is aimed at addressing the PPS and matters of Provincial Interest. The subject property is currently designated as Rural and as such would not be considered a prime agricultural area, as per the PPS. The proposed rehabilitation plan would see the properties progressively rehabilitated over the lifespan of the pit. The supporting technical reports make recommendations for protecting matters of provincial interest and mitigating other potential impacts of the pit operation, including impacts on the natural environment. We will be circulating these documents to the appropriate review agencies to obtain comments on the specific matters contained within.

*County of Grey Official Plan*

All development must conform to the purposes and policies of the County of Grey Official Plan.

There is a specific process, outlined in Sections 2.7.4 and 6.3 of the County Plan, to establish new pit operations via Official Plan Amendment. The submitted material gives justification for the development and will be circulated to the appropriate agencies as indicated above.

As per the requirements of the County Plan, the Planning Justification Report and submitted material identify mitigation measures which should be implemented to minimize
impacts on neighbouring land uses. The reports make recommendations and conclude
that they will not be negatively impacted beyond the standards set out in Provincial
guidelines.

**FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL / IT CONSIDERATIONS**

At this point there are no financial, staffing, legal or IT considerations beyond those
normally encountered in processing a County Official Plan Amendment. The County has
collected an application and fee for the amendment.

Following a decision on the amendment, should the decision be appealed, there could be
increased financial or legal costs/needs; however such a decision will not be made until
after processing the file.

**SUMMARY**

Application has been made for an amendment to the County of Grey Official Plan. The
amendment would facilitate the establishment of a new sand and gravel pit operation. The
supporting Planning Justification Report provided justification for the proposal. Once the
material has been circulated for review by our commenting agencies and once we receive
comments from the public through the public meeting we will be able to offer a planning
opinion on matters involving:

- consistency with the requirements of the *Planning Act* and Provincial Policy
  Statement; and,
- conformity to the purposes and policies of the County of Grey Official Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Taylor, Senior Planner
TO: Chair Mullin and Members of the Planning and Community Development Committee

FROM: Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning

MEETING DATE: August 12, 2010

PURPOSE: The purpose of this report is to provide the County’s Planning and Community Development Committee with an overview of the mid-year financial analysis of the Planning Department Budget

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Report PDR-PCD-26-10 regarding the analysis of the Financial Statements of the Planning Department be received as presented.

BACKGROUND

The financial statements as of June 30, 2010 for Planning and Development – Operating and Capital have been reviewed to provide an overview to the Committee on the status of the 2010 budget. The purpose of this review is to determine if there are any significant anomalies in the numbers and if so, how these anomalies will be addressed prior to year-end. This report will be provided to the Director of Finance as background information for a report to the Finance and Personnel Committee in August.

The Planning and Development 2010 budget provided for total expenditures for all Operating and Capital of $896,117 with an expectation of $352,700 in revenue, of which $310,500 is to come from reserves. As is the County’s normal practice, those funds would not be transferred from reserves until year end or until the related expenditure is made. The three main items to be paid out of reserves are the Housing Study, the Orthophotos and the Digital Elevation Model. The Housing Study budget is currently on target and it is anticipated that the Study will be completed within budget. With respect to the orthophotos, the County is currently waiting for the Ministry of Natural Resources to provide...
a final agreement which will provide the terms and conditions for delivery and use of the orthophotos. Until this agreement has been signed and product has been delivered, payment for the orthophotos will not be required. With respect to the Digital Elevation Model, this was not captured as part of the SWOOP project due to a lack of participation amongst the SWOOP partners. As such, the funds allocated to this project will remain in the Planning Reserve.

As of June 30, 2010 revenue under Acct’s 54021 (App Fees Official Plans) and 54024 (App Fees Subdivisions) have currently exceeded the year to date (YTD) totals. The application fees for subdivisions were budgeted to be $30,000 and this line item currently sits at $35,625. The County also received a recent subdivision proposal with an application fee of over $22,000. Therefore at this point in time the revenues for application fees will exceed the anticipated budgeted amount. At year end, it will be recommended that these funds be transferred to the Planning Reserves.

Operating
On the Planning (General) Operating side of the Budget, the majority of the Expenditures are below or at the YTD Budget amount. Certain expenditures, which are one time purchases for the year (e.g. computers and association/membership fees) have been expensed and therefore the YTD Actual lines in the budget summary exceeds the YTD Budget lines. However no further purchases are intended for these areas.

Capital
The majority of expenditures in this area will relate to future studies and reports as a result of the 5-year review of the Official Plan and legal expenses. To date there have been no expenses incurred to date. County staff anticipate expenditures in these areas in the near future as the Province has issued a draft decision for approval of OPA #80. This is an area where, if expenses do not exceed the budgeted amounts, those funds will not be transferred from reserves.

FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL/IT CONSIDERATIONS

There are no staffing, legal or IT considerations related to this report. Based on the YTD amounts, it is anticipated that the Planning Budget will come within budget at year end, or have a slight surplus. The financial statements will continue to be monitored and should an anomaly arise a subsequent report will be brought forward.

Respectfully submitted

Randy Scherzer,
Director of Planning & Development
CORPORATION OF THE
COUNTY OF GREY

COMMITTEE REPORT
PDR-PCD-27-10

TO: Chair Mullin and Members of the Planning and Community Development Committee
FROM: Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning
MEETING DATE: August 12, 2010
PURPOSE: The purpose of this report is to provide the County’s Planning and Community Development Committee with an overview of the draft decision for Official Plan Amendment No. 80 (5 Year Review) issued by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

RECOMMENDATION

WHEREAS County Council adopted Official Plan Amendment No. 80 on March 3, 2009;
AND WHEREAS the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing has issued a draft decision which includes modifications to Official Plan Amendment No. 80 adopted by County Council;
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the County Planning and Community Development Committee receives Report PDR-PCD-27-10 for information purposes;
AND THAT the Ministry be notified that the County Planning and Community Development Committee concurs with the proposed modifications subject to the recommended revisions to Modifications 19, 34, 39, 53 & 56 identified in this Report, and subject to a final determination regarding the settlement area changes for Chatsworth and Dundalk.
**OVERVIEW**

County Council adopted Official Plan Amendment No. 80 (OPA#80) on March 3, 2009. OPA#80 proposes a number of amendments to the current Official Plan including policy revisions as well as revisions to the schedules and appendices. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) circulated the adopted OPA#80 to the provincial ministries, the Niagara Escarpment Commission, the conservation authorities and the Saugeen Ojibway Nation for review and comment. After much dialogue between the partner ministries, agencies and County staff, MMAH issued a draft decision on OPA#80 dated July 30, 2010 (see attachment). The proposed modifications reference the modifications numbers adopted by County Council and therefore it may be necessary to refer back to the adopted OPA#80 which can be found on the County website at the following location:


Before a final decision is made, MMAH has indicated that they wish to advise the County of the modifications and to obtain the concurrence and input of Council in advance of the final decision. MMAH indicates that the proposed modifications are to implement the PPS and other modifications are for clarification/interpretation purposes.

**Modification Summary and Comments**

Many of the modifications proposed by MMAH are minor changes to the wording of the policies and therefore these modifications have not been summarized below. The following highlights some of the key modifications being proposed by MMAH:

**Modification No. 4 & 51**

Modification No. 4 makes changes to the permitted uses for the Agricultural designation. The main change proposed to this section is that the term ‘small scale’ has been replaced with ‘agriculture-related uses’. Modification No. 51 modifies the definition for ‘agriculture-related uses’ by removing the word ‘or’ and replacing it with an ‘and’. Essentially this change would require agriculture-related uses to be directly related to the farm operation and required in close proximity to farm operations. It should be noted that the definition for agriculture-related uses references small scale and the definition of small scale as adopted by County Council will remain unaltered. MMAH has indicated this change is necessary in order to be consistent with the PPS. It should be noted that the County's comments regarding the five year review of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) asks that the related policies be clarified in the PPS to allow for agriculture-related uses to be allowed to service farm operations in the area and not just THE farm operation. Based on the above, and the minor nature of the proposed amendments, County staff do not have concerns with the proposed modifications.
Modification No. 5
Modification No. 5 is with respect to conservation severances. MMAH is proposing to modify the adopted policies by removing conservation severances as a permitted use in the Agricultural designation and Special Agriculture designation, however conservation severances will still be permitted in the Rural designation. The policy adopted by OPA#80 already excluded conservation severances in the Special Agriculture designation. County staff do not have concerns with respect to this proposed modification.

Modifications No. 7 & 8
These modifications are related to wineries as a permitted use in the Special Agriculture designation. In the adopted version, the term “wineries” was included as a permitted use and a policy was added indicating “wineries shall only be permitted in accordance with detailed development criteria contained within the applicable local official plan”. In the draft decision, MMAH is proposing to delete the policy regarding the detailed development criteria in local official plans and to include the following policy under the Special Agriculture permitted uses section: “A winery shall only be permitted if it is secondary to the principal use(s) of the property and produces value-added agricultural products from the farm operation”. County staff do not have concerns with the proposed modification as a winery will still be a permitted use and the policy remains flexible enough to allow local municipalities to include further detailed development criteria in the local official plan.

Modification No. 21, 42 & 55
There are a number of modifications being proposed which relate to the adopted servicing policies. Most of these policies add clarification to the adopted policies which will assist in the interpretation of the policies. For example, policies were adopted by County Council with respect to a Settlement Capability Study which is a study that would be required to consider development beyond 5 lots on private services in Secondary Settlement Areas. Part of Modification No. 21 and Modification No. 55 propose to add wording indicating that the Settlement Capability Study “shall assess the entire settlement area and shall address the cumulative effects of new development on the natural environment and the surrounding land uses”. County staff are of the opinion that this sentence captures the original intent of the Settlement Capability Study and therefore staff do not have concerns with the proposed modifications. Similarly, Section 5.3.2(11)(b) as adopted by Council indicates that partial services shall only be permitted “within Settlement Areas, to allow for development on partial services”. Modification 42 proposes to clarify the wording to read that partial services shall be permitted “within Settlement Areas, to allow for development where partial services exist”. County staff do not have concerns with the proposed modifications as the proposed wording maintains the original intent of the adopted policy.

Modification 16
The policies adopted in OPA#80 included intensification targets for each municipality. During discussions with Ministry staff, it was indicated that an overall intensification target needs to be established for the County as a whole. As such, County staff took the average of the local municipal intensification targets adopted by County Council and determined that an overall intensification target for new growth would equal approximately 15%.
Modification 16 proposes to add the overall intensification target to be 15% and therefore County staff do not have any concerns with the proposed modification.

Modifications 28, 29 & 30
A number of aggregate policy changes were adopted by County Council as part of OPA#80. The intent of the adopted aggregate policies was to ensure that the study requirements for aggregate applications were consistent with the requirements of the provincial standards. For the most part, the draft decision proposes to keep the majority of the aggregate policies intact. Proposed Modifications 28, 29 & 30 clarify this intent and propose minor modifications to the adopted policies. For example, with respect to the adopted policies regarding the study requirements for asphalt plants and concrete batching plants, MMAH is proposing to add that “noise, odour and dust studies be provided to satisfy the Ministry of the Environment’s standards”. County staff are satisfied with the proposed modifications.

Modification 34
Section 2.8.3(3) as adopted by County Council states that “development and site alteration in the Provincially Significant Wetlands designation or the adjacent lands requires the approval of the appropriate Conservation Authority”. The proposed modification would delete this section and replace it with the following: “changes to the Provincially Significant Wetlands designation or the adjacent lands requires the approval of the appropriate Conservation Authority”. The changes are being proposed by MMAH as a result of the provincially significant wetlands and the adjacent lands being part of the regulated areas administered by the Conservation Authority. The Provincial Policy Statement indicates that the Ministry of Natural Resources is responsible for identifying provincially significant wetlands. As such, County staff recommends that the wording proposed by MMAH be slightly modified by deleting the words “the approval of” and replacing it with “consultation with” so that the section reads as follows: “changes to the Provincially Significant Wetlands designation or the adjacent lands requires consultation with the appropriate Conservation Authority”.

Modifications 39 & 47
Saugeen Ojibway Nations (SON) provided comments to the MMAH requesting modifications to OPA#80. Modifications 39 & 47 are being proposed by MMAH to address the concerns raised by SON. A policy was adopted by County Council indicating that the County may undertake an Archaeological Management Plan. Modification#39 proposes to add wording to the policy indicating that the County will consult with First Nations and Metis when developing the Terms of Reference for the Archaeological Master Plan. County staff do not have any concerns with the proposed modification. However, County staff recommend that the term “Archaeological Master Plan” be changed to “Archaeological Management Plan” to be consistent with the terminology used in Section 3(11) as adopted by County Council.

County Council adopted Section 6.13(8) which indicates that consultation with First Nations shall be required for applications to be approved by the County. Section 6.13(8) also
indicates that the County will work with First Nations to develop a consultation protocol. Modification#47 adds more detail as to when consultation will be required with First Nations. A map has been provided by First Nations which identifies the traditional territory of SON. MMAH is proposing to add this map as Appendix C, however the proposed policy indicates that Appendix C would not constitute part of the Official Plan. The proposed policy states that “SON shall be consulted for those lands identified in Appendix C and in accordance with any consultation protocol developed in consultation with the Saugeen Ojibway Nation”. The proposed modification also proposes to add the following: “The Saugeen Ojibway Nation is preparing a study of traditional interior routes, former settlements and land uses” and that “this Study shall be taken into consideration when it is available”. County staff are satisfied with the proposed modifications.

Modification 40
County Council adopted a number of policies with respect to alternative and renewable energy systems. As a result of the Green Energy Act removing the abilities to have policies in official plans regarding alternative and renewable energy systems, MMAH is proposing to delete the adopted policies. County staff do not have concerns with the proposed modification.

Modification 53
Modification#53 proposes to make a minor edit to the definition of Natural Heritage Features in order to be consistent with the wording found throughout the rest of the Official Plan. However, County staff recommends that revisions be made to the modification in order to make the wording more consistent with the existing terminology. County staff recommends that the second “significant wetlands” reference in the definition be deleted and replaced with “other identified wetlands” which is consistent with the terminology used in the Official Plan.

Modification#56
Modification#56 proposes to add the wording from the “Adjacent Lands” definition adopted by County Council and include it within Section 2.8.1 of the County Official Plan. Although County staff do not have any concerns with the proposed modification, County staff suggest that the reference to “Other Wetlands” be changed to “Other Identified Wetlands” to be consistent with the terminology used throughout the Plan. County staff also recommends that the same wording be changed in the definition of “adjacent lands” which would be a revision to Modification#293.

Settlement Area Expansions
MMAH has reviewed the five Comprehensive Reviews for settlement area expansions, as well as the Town of Hanover’s request for an expansion. At this time, MMAH is considering the approval of expansions to Durham and Markdale in their Draft Decision. Chatsworth and Dundalk are also being considered for expansion, subject to some specific issues being resolved prior to a final decision. At this time expansions to Hanover and Springmount are not being considered for approval, and any expansions would warrant a
future County Official Plan Amendment. It should be noted that based on the most recent changes to the Planning Act, it appears that there is no appeal mechanism for refusing or failing to adopt/approve an amendment which alters all or any part of the boundary of an area of settlement in a municipality or to establish a new area of settlement in a municipality. However it is unclear as to whether or not a person or public body could appeal a modification made by an approval authority to a settlement area boundary. Additional details are provided below for each of the settlement areas discussed above.

**Durham**

After further review, and consultation with the Ontario Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA), MMAH has recommended approval for the expansion to Durham, as shown on Secondary Schedule 3l. MMAH has accepted the boundaries proposed by the Municipality of West Grey in their revised Comprehensive Review dated March 8, 2010, which were reduced from what was initially adopted in OPA 80. It should be noted however, that under Modification # 19 by MMAH, a secondary plan will be required prior to new development in the expansion area. County staff would recommend that the wording of this modification be amended to reference a secondary plan, a Municipality of West Grey Official Plan, or an updated Town of Durham Official Plan, be prepared prior to new development in the expansion area.

**Markdale**

The expansion area for Markdale, shown on Secondary Schedule 2f, has been modified slightly from what the Municipality of Grey Highlands proposed in their March 2010 Comprehensive Review, and the County’s adopted OPA 80 (see Appendix A). A small section of land, approximately 6 hectares, in the north-west of the proposed expansion area has been removed, based on a Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) conflict to a barn on the south side of Highway 10. Based on initial concerns by OMAFRA, further MDS calculations were completed by Municipal Staff. The updated calculations resulted in the identification of a MDS arc from the neighbouring barn, which extends into the proposed expansion area. In order to be consistent with Provincial Policy, MMAH have proposed to shrink the expansion area along an existing tree-line, so that the expansion area remains outside of the MDS setback.

In order to be consistent with the requirements MMAH has proposed for Durham, County staff would recommend a modification to the draft decision which requires an amendment to the Municipality of Grey Highlands Official Plan, prior to development being considered in the expansion lands. It should be noted that whether this modification is included by MMAH or not, the Municipality of Grey Highlands would still need to update their Official Plan to include policy and revised land use designations for the expansion lands.

**Chatsworth**

Chatsworth is slightly different than the other settlement areas seeking expansion. Although the boundaries of the Village of Chatsworth are proposed to expand into areas not previously within the settlement area, the Township is also proposing to remove lands equal to that which it is expanding by. As such, the Village of Chatsworth will not be
gaining any additional development land, rather it will be realigning growth areas to locations which are suitable for such purposes. The proposal by the Township would see a net balance between lands being removed and those to be added.

MMAH has reviewed the documentation provided by the Township and is generally satisfied; however OMAFRA has identified some MDS issues with proposed expansion areas 6 & 7 (See Appendix B). Based on OMAFRA’s MDS concerns Township staff have now provided the Province with additional MDS calculations and information. The Province has not yet had an opportunity to review this additional material, which is why the existing Chatsworth boundaries are being shown in the Draft Decision on Secondary Schedule 3a.

Based on the MDS information which has now been supplied to the Province, County staff would speculate that proposed expansion areas 6 & 7 will be modified out of the settlement area boundaries. However, expansion area 8 should remain in the settlement area, as the Province appears to have no concerns with these lands. If this scenario were to occur the way County staff speculate, then the Village of Chatsworth would actually be facing a net reduction in lands within the settlement area boundaries i.e. areas 1-5 are being removed, while only area 8 is being added. If Township Council and staff are supportive of this approach, then County staff would speculate that such an approach would be acceptable to the Province. However, one further option may be to look at including additional lands within the settlement area boundaries, to compensate for the removal of areas 6 & 7, and thereby achieving a net balance between those lands which are being removed versus those lands which are being added. County staff would not recommend adding any new lands which were not previously considered under OPA 80, as further work would need to be done as well as further public consultation. However, what may be an option is to consider not removing some of area 2 along the north and south side of Sideroad 1, as well as potentially adding in the remainder of the Township owned property at the south end of area 8. The Province may be able to consider such an approach as area 2 is already within the settlement area boundaries, and the Township property was initially entirely included in the adopted OPA 80.

County staff would generally defer to the wishes of Township Council as to what modifications are acceptable to the Village boundaries, should areas 6 & 7 not be included based on MDS concerns. The only recommendation County staff would make to the Province would be to ensure that the remainder of the draft approved Taylor subdivision lands are included in the Secondary Settlement Area boundaries. Currently based on the ‘blob-like’ Hamlet boundaries a very small portion of the subdivision actually extends into the Rural designation.

**Dundalk**

Similar to Chatsworth, the Province appears willing to approve a partial expansion to the Village of Dundalk; however the size of that expansion remains undetermined at this point. Unlike Chatsworth however, an expansion to Dundalk is not proposed as a net balance, rather it would be a net expansion. In their revised Comprehensive Review, dated March 2010, the Township of Southgate significantly reduced the proposed expansion area, from
what was adopted in OPA 80. As part of the justification in their report, the Township noted that approximately 27.5 hectares of land, which was previously thought to be developable, have now been deemed undevelopable based on updated mapping from the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA). MMAH is currently attempting to determine how much of this 27.5 hectares needs to be 'netted out' from development, and whether any those lands could be developable based on further study or engineering. MMAH is currently working with the GRCA and the Ministry of Natural Resources in order to resolve the matter. In discussions on the matter, County staff have made the Province aware of the importance of the Highway 10 corridor to the Township, and the Province will take this into consideration, should the boundaries be modified from what was included in the revised Comprehensive Review. At this point County staff would speculate that a portion of the Dundalk expansion area will be approved, but cannot speculate on exactly how many hectares will be approved. MMAH have noted, and GRCA staff have recommended, that should an expansion to Dundalk be approved, that a similar clause to Modification # 19 (relating to Durham) would need to be added requiring either a secondary plan or a comprehensive amendment to the Township of Southgate Official Plan.

**Springmount**

In the covering letter to the Draft Decision MMAH notes that an expansion to the boundaries of Springmount may be premature, based on the what the Township is considering in their upcoming Township Official Plan. Based on discussions with MMAH staff it would appear that the Ministry is not considering an expansion to the boundaries of Springmount at this time. Provincial staff have also identified further issues, outside of what is in the covering letter, including servicing and Ministry of the Environment (MOE) concerns which should be addressed as part of a future amendment process.

In this regard, it may be appropriate for the Township to continue working on their Township Official Plan, to further determine exactly what would be needed from an employment lands and servicing perspective across the entire Township. As the Township Plan nears an adoption date, the Township could consider coming forward with a stand-alone County Official Plan Amendment should an expansion be warranted. It should be noted the County would be the approval authority for the future Township Official Plan as well as a future County Official Plan Amendment, done outside of the Five Year Review process. A similar process was followed by the Township of Southgate in the approval of their Township Official Plan. After having prepared the background work and draft policy for the Southgate Official Plan, the Township realized there was a need to apply for a County Official Plan Amendment, in order to implement some unique policy and boundary changes in the Township Plan. County Official Plan Amendment # 66 was subsequently passed which facilitated the approval of the Southgate Official Plan.

**Hanover**

As explained in the covering letter, MMAH notes that they cannot consider a boundary expansion to the Town of Hanover at this time, based on what the County adopted in OPA 80, and based on further resolutions passed by County Council. Although a boundary expansion is not being considered by the Province, this would not prejudice the Town of Hanover.
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Hanover, or the Municipality of West Grey from coming forward with a County Official Plan Amendment for a boundary expansion in the future. Through the amendment process a comprehensive review would need to be prepared justifying the expansion based on Provincial and County policy.

**Other changes to Schedules**

There were a number changes made to the schedules and appendices adopted by County Council, most of which were recommended by County staff. The following highlights the changes made to the Schedules/Appendices:

- All Schedules and Appendices have been reduced from 36X48 to 24X36. This makes the schedules more manageable and reduces the use of paper and ink.
- The dates on all of the Schedules and Appendices have been changed to June 25, 2010. The Secondary Schedules are now dated April 2010 or June 2010.
- As a result of comments from the Niagara Escarpment Commission, the boundary of Balmy Beach on Schedule A Map 1 as well as Secondary Schedule 1e have been slightly altered to match the settlement area boundary identified in the Niagara Escarpment Plan.
- The Schedules and the Secondary Schedules would need to be updated to reflect MMAH’s final decision with respect to the settlement area expansions.
- The legends on Schedule A - Maps 1, 2 & 3 have been revised to reflect the changes as requested by the Niagara Escarpment Commission in order to be more consistent with the terminology used in the Niagara Escarpment Plan. The ‘Niagara Escarpment Plan Area’ is proposed to be called the ‘Niagara Escarpment Development Control Area’. The ‘Niagara Escarpment Area Boundary’ is proposed to be called ‘Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary’ and a footnote has been added indicating that “certain settlement areas within the Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary may be subject to Development Control”.
- Schedule A – Map 2 – a wetland boundary in the Silver Creek Wetland Complex has been adjusted to reflect changes supported by the Ministry of Natural Resources and to recognize the changes to this wetland complex as approved by County Council through Official Plan Amendment No. 85.
- Some minor Hazard Land boundary adjustments were made in the Township of Southgate on the lands known as the Hoffman subdivision. These boundaries are supported by the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority and are currently in the Township of Southgate Zoning By-law.
- Schedule B – Map 2 & Map 3 – two licensed pits/quarries were removed as requested by the Ministry of Natural Resources as a result of the aggregate licenses being surrendered.
- Appendix A – the legend for the wellhead protection areas has been revised to only show Zone A, B, C & D to be consistent with how these are being mapped by the Sourcewater Protection Authorities. It should be noted that the boundaries of the wellhead protection areas have not changed.
County staff support the above noted modifications to the schedules and appendices.

**FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL/ IT CONSIDERATIONS**
At this point there are no financial, staffing, legal or IT considerations with respect to this matter. Following a decision from the Ministry on OPA#80, there could be increased financial or legal costs/needs should the decision be appealed.

**SUMMARY**
County Council adopted Official Plan Amendment No. 80 (OPA#80) on March 3, 2009. OPA#80 proposes a number of amendments to the current Official Plan including policy revisions as well as revisions to the schedules and appendices. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) circulated the adopted OPA#80 to the provincial ministries, the Niagara Escarpment Commission, the conservation authorities and the Saugeen Ojibway Nation for review and comment. After much dialogue between the partner ministries, agencies and County staff, MMAH issued a draft decision on OPA#80. MMAH indicates that the proposed modifications are to implement the PPS and other modifications are for clarification/interpretation purposes. Other than the proposed revisions to Modifications 19,34, 39, 53 and 56 described in this Report, and subject to a final determination with respect to the settlement area changes for Dundalk and Chatsworth, County staff support the proposed modifications included in the draft decision.

Respectfully Submitted,
Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning
This map is for illustrative purposes only. Do not rely on this map as being a precise indicator of routes, location of features or surveying purposes. This map may contain cartographical errors or omissions.
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Mr. Randy Scherzer
Director of Planning and Development
County of Grey Planning Dept
595 9th Ave. East
Owen Sound, ON
N4K 3E3

Dear Mr. Scherzer,

Re: Official Plan Amendment No. 80 (5 Year Review)
Draft Decision
County of Grey

As you are aware, Council adopted Official Plan Amendment No. 80 for the County of Grey which was then circulated by this Ministry to Provincial Ministries and the Conservation Authorities for review and comment. The circulation and review of the document has been completed and we are now in a position to proceed to finalize a decision on this Plan pursuant to Section 26 and subsection 17 (34) of the Planning Act. However, before a decision is made, we wish to advise you of the modifications so that you may obtain the concurrence and input of Council in advance of such a decision.

The Official Plan Amendment is a forward-looking document and is thorough in its approach. We congratulate the County of Grey for undertaking this important initiative.

At this time, we would also like to thank you and your colleagues for working with us in preparing this draft decision. The opportunities to discuss the rationale for the proposed changes and to obtain the County’s planning staff response on each modification has been very beneficial. We certainly appreciate the time and effort that yourself, Mr. Scott Taylor, and former County Planning Director Ms. Janice McDonald have expended throughout the Official Plan review process. This has enabled staff to come to agreements on many of the modifications.

The Provincial review focused primarily on those matters of Provincial interest as they relate to land use planning, as set out in the Planning Act and the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 (PPS, 2005). In their review of the Official Plan Amendment No. 80, Provincial Ministries, the Niagara Escarpment Commission and local Conservation Authorities have considered matters of Provincial interest and where
possible, have recommended changes to bring the Official Plan into conformity with the PPS, 2005, where appropriate. Changes have also been recommended to avoid potential conflict with the Niagara Escarpment Plan.

The proposed modifications are attached for Council's consideration. Some of the modifications are to implement the PPS and other modifications are for clarification and/or to add information to enhance the interpretation of the Plan. One of the more discussed items relates to the proposed urban boundary expansions for Chatsworth, Dundalk, Durham, Hanover, Markdale and Springmount. We offer the following.

As stated in our previous letter dated September 23, 2009, Section 1.1.3.9 of the PPS permits planning authorities to expand the boundary of a settlement area at the time of a comprehensive review provided a number of policy requirements have been met. In 2007, the County of Grey retained Malone Given Parsons Ltd to prepare a Growth Management Strategy for the County's consideration. The Strategy was commissioned to identify areas in the County where a shortfall of available land for development may exist and to provide policy direction regarding growth. The Strategy concluded that Hanover, Owen Sound, The Blue Mountains, Meaford, Southgate, Chatsworth and Georgian Bluffs have a sufficient amount of land and/or residential units available to accommodate projected permanent residential growth to the year 2031. The Strategy also concluded that Durham (Municipality of West Grey) and Markdale (Municipality of Grey Highlands) have an insufficient amount of available land. Local municipalities were responsible for justifying the proposed urban boundary expansions by satisfying the policy requirements of Section 1.1.3.9 of the PPS.

Comprehensive reviews to justify the proposed urban boundary expansions were submitted by the local municipalities. Correspondence was also received from the City of Owen Sound expressing concerns regarding the proposed urban boundary expansion for Springmount. Further, the Ministry received a copy of County Council's resolution passed on June 1, 2010, which requested as follows "the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing give final approval with respect to the settlement area expansions given the information supplied by the municipalities to date". It is noteworthy the Town of Hanover requested an urban boundary expansion however, this request was not adopted by Council through Official Plan Amendment No. 80 (March 3, 2009 and reiterated at the February 2, 2010 Council meeting). As such, the Ministry is not in a position to consider an urban boundary expansion for the Town of Hanover at this time.

Based on the available information, the Ministry is considering approving urban boundary expansions for Durham and Markdale. However, as discussed, a modification to the proposed urban boundary expansion for Markdale is being proposed to resolve a minimum distance separation issue. A copy of the proposed revised boundary is attached for Council's consideration. Further, an urban boundary expansion for Township of Chatsworth is still being considered however, as you are aware the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) has identified concerns regarding the minimum distance separations. County planning staff has requested additional time to address these concerns. Similarly, an urban boundary expansion for Dundalk is still being considered. As you are aware, which
natural heritage features are to be netted out to calculate the amount of developable land remains an item of discussion.

Regarding the proposed urban boundary expansion for the settlement area of Springmount, the Ministry notes the Growth Management Strategy for the County suggests the Township of Georgian Bluffs has a sufficient amount of vacant designated employment land to meet projected demand. Further, on page 11 of the revised Comprehensive Review Report submitted by the Township, the Ministry notes the report states, “The original area to be added was larger, however through further review and keeping mind a twenty year time frame the boundaries as shown on OPA 80 were deemed acceptable. New information may come forward through the new Township Official Plan that suggest enlarged settlement area boundaries be reconsidered”. This statement appears to suggest the Township of Georgian Bluffs is still in the process of determining what additional land, if any, is needed. Finally, there are local issues between the Township of Georgian Bluffs and the City of Owen Sound regarding Springmount which remain unresolved.

We respectfully request that Grey County planning staff ask Council to consider the proposed modifications for Official Plan Amendment No. 80 at your earliest convenience. We are hopeful that after we receive Council’s response, we will be able to recommend approval of the Plan in a timely manner. If you require any clarification, or have any questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call at (519) 873-4695 or by email at: Dwayne.Evans@ontario.ca.

Yours truly,

Dwayne Evans, M.A., MCIP, RPP
Planner
Municipal Services Office – Western

cc. Amanda McLachlan, MNR (Midhurst)
    Bill Armstrong, MOE (London)
    Ragini Dayal, MCL (Toronto)
    Heather Doyle, MTO (St. Catharines)
    Ian Smyth, MTO (London)
    Carol Neumann, OMAFRA (Elora)
    Debbie Laidlaw, MNDM (Toronto)
    Fred Natolochny, GRCA (Cambridge)
    Chris Hibberd, NVCA (Utopia)
    Gary Senior, SVA (Hanover)
    Andrew Sorensen GSAC (Owen Sound)
    Lynne Richardson, NEC (Thornbury)
DRAFT DECISION

With respect to Grey County Official Plan Amendment #80
(County’s 5 Year Review)
Subsections 17(34) and 26 (1) of the Planning Act

I hereby approve Official Plan Amendment No. 80 to the Official Plan for the County of Grey, as adopted by By-law 4574-09, save and except for the provisions set out at the end of this decision, and subject to the following modifications:

1. Modification #17 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the tenth bullet point of Section 1.6.3 and replacing it with “To require the progressive rehabilitation of areas for aggregate extraction and to protect the quality and quantity of groundwater in and adjacent to areas undergoing mineral aggregate extraction using mitigative measures when required”.

2. Modification #20 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the phrase ‘heritage features’ in the fourth paragraph of Section 1.7 and replacing with ‘natural heritage features and areas’.

3. Modification #21 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the last sentence in Section 1.8 ‘The County and/or local municipalities may undertake a Housing Study in order to develop a comprehensive strategy to deal effectively with affordable housing’ and replacing with ‘The County will undertake a Housing Study in order to develop a comprehensive community strategy to deal effectively with housing issues throughout the County. The matter of affordability will be addressed and the findings and recommendations of the Study will incorporated in this Plan through an amendment.”

4. Modification #23 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the second sentence of Section 2.1.2(1) and replacing with “The uses permitted include all types and sizes of agricultural uses, the related buildings and structures, market gardening, nurseries, secondary uses, agriculture-related uses, forestry and reforestation, and/or gravel operations proposed with Aggregate Resources Areas identified on Schedule B, licensed aggregate operations identified as Mineral Resource Extraction on Schedule B, and wayside pits and quarries in accordance with Section 2.7.2 of this Plan.”

5. Modification #34 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by the addition of the following:

“(d) Severances for conservation purposes by an approved conservation organization shall not be permitted in the Agricultural and Special Agricultural designations and further, shall not result in the creation of a new building lot.”
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6. Modification #35 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby deleted in its entirety.

7. Modification #36 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the word 'wineries' from Section 2.2.2(1) and adding the following to Section 2.2.2:

"(3) A winery shall only be permitted if it is secondary to the principal use(s) of the property and produces value-added agricultural products from the farm operation."

8. Modification #38 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby deleted in its entirety.

9. Modification #39 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby deleted in its entirety.

10. Modification #41 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the word 'Provincial' between the word 'the' and 'Minimum' in the first sentence of Section 2.2.3(6). Further, Modification #41 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the phrase "proposed through building permit" between the words 'development' and 'on' in the second sentence of Section 2.2.3(6).

11. Modification #56 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the word 'Provincial' between the word 'the' and 'Minimum'. Further, Modification #56 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the phrase "proposed through building permit" between the words 'development' and 'on'.

12. Modification #57 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the following phrase in the second paragraph "(or any municipal procedure that achieves the same objective) and the regulatory requirements of the Ontario Building Code" and replacing it with the following: "or the Ontario Building Code, where applicable". Further, Modification #57 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the term "MOE Guideline B-7" and replacing it with "Ministry of the Environment Guidelines".

13. Modification #74 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the phrase "proposed through building permit" between the words 'development' and 'on' in the third sentence.

14. Modification #76 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the following paragraph from Section 2.5.1:

"From time to time the Niagara Escarpment amends, by regulation, the Niagara Escarpment Plan and removes areas from Development Control, in
those areas more detailed policies implemented through a local official plan or zoning by-law would apply to development proposals’.

15. Modification #83 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the comma between the words ‘reduced’ and ‘or’ in Section 2.5.3(2).

16. Modification #88 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting and replacing the first sentence of Section 2.6.2(1) with the following: 
“In order to support achieving the growth allocation targets established in Table 4, this Plan sets an overall intensification target for new growth at 15%. Table 7 establishes residential intensification targets for Primary Settlement Areas and Secondary Settlement Areas within local municipalities. Intensification is defined in Section 6.19 of this Plan.”

17. Modification #92 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting Section 2.6.2(5)(h) in its entirety and renumbering the subsequent sections and further, the phrase ‘as defined in Section 2.8 of this Plan’ is added in Section 2.6.2(5)(g) after the phrase ‘the Natural Environment’.

18. Modification #102 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the phrase ‘growth projected up to a maximum of 20 years within these communities’ and replacing with ‘the growth projected in Tables 1, 2 and 3 of this Plan.”

19. Modification #106 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by inserting a new Clause (8) which reads as follows:

“(8) Prior to any new development occurring on Part Lot 24, Concession 1, EGR (geographic Township of Glenelg), a secondary plan shall be completed. All new development north of Durham Road East in the settlement area of Durham (Municipality of West Grey) must adhere to the secondary plan requirements.”

20. Modifications #109 and #117 are hereby amended by inserting the following to Sections 2.6.4.3 and 2.6.5.3, respectively:

“(c) providing the development is within the existing settlement area”.

21. Modification #111 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the phrase ‘as defined in Section 2.8 of this Plan’ after the phrase ‘the natural environment’ and further, deleting the sentence “Section 2.8 of this Plan shall be used as the basis for this assessment,” in Section 2.6.4(5)(f). In addition, modification #111 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following sentence after the first sentence of Section 2.6.4 (5): "The Study shall assess the entire settlement area and shall address the cumulative effects of new development on the natural environment and surrounding land uses.”
22. Modification #121 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the phrase 'as defined in Section 2.8 of this Plan' after the phrase 'the natural environment' in Section 2.6.7.3 (b).

23. Modification #123 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by changing the reference to the subsection which reads "Buildings containing space extensive..." to subsection (g) and changing the reference to the subsequent sections accordingly. Further, Modification #123 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by the addition of the following to Section 2.9(3):

"(k) the establishment of a new or the expansion of a space extensive commercial area into the Agricultural designation or the Special Agriculture designation must demonstrate that there is a need for additional land to be designated to accommodate the proposed use; and there are no reasonable alternative locations outside of the Agricultural designation and the Special Agriculture designation".

24. Modification #128 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by the addition of the following to Section 2.10(3):

"(l) the establishment of a new or the expansion of a space extensive industrial area into the Agricultural designation or the Special Agriculture designation must demonstrate that there is a need for additional land to be designated to accommodate the proposed use; and there are no reasonable alternative locations outside of the Agricultural designation and the Special Agriculture designation".

25. Modification #132 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding following to Section 2.7.2:

"(3) Clauses (1) and (2) above do not apply to lands within the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area as shown on Schedule A-Maps 1, 2 and 3. The policies of the Niagara Escarpment Plan would apply."

26. Modification #137 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the phrase 'as defined in Section 2.8 of this Plan' after the phrase 'natural environment' in Section 2.7.3(7) (iii).

27. Modification #143 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following phrase after the words 'County Official Plan' in Section 2.7.4(1):

"except for those proposed within the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area as shown on Schedule A-Maps 1, 2 and 3".

28. Modification #137 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by addition of the following to Section 2.7.3 (7)"
“(iv) noise, odour and dust studies are provided which satisfy the Ministry of the Environment’s standards”. 

29. Modification #145 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the phrase “shall be provided where a sensitive receptor (e.g. residential dwelling is found within 150 metres of a proposed extraction area and/or processing facilities for a sand and gravel operation, or 500 metres of the proposed extraction area and/or processing facilities for a quarry operation) in Section 2.7.4.(3) (c) and replacing with “which satisfies the Ministry of the Environment’s standards”.

30. Modification #145 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the second, third and fourth sentences of Section 2.7.4 (3) (f) starting with “The Hydrogeological Study…” and ending with “will not occur”.

31. Modification #150 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“Provincially Significant Wetlands are taken from mapping provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources. Development and site alteration is not permitted within Provincially Significant Wetlands, as designated on Schedule A. No development or site alteration is permitted within the lands adjacent to Provincially Significant Wetlands, unless it has been demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Study that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions.”

32. Modification #152 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following sentence at the end of the paragraph: “The cumulative effects of new development on the natural environment as defined in Section 2.8 of this Plan, and surrounding land uses shall also be addressed”.

33. Modification #153 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the sentence “Limited mapping from the Ministry of Natural Resources showing areas of endangered or threatened species is available” in the ninth paragraph of Section 2.8.1 and replacing with:

“The Endangered Species Act, 2007, which came into effect on June 23, 2007 provides protection for significant endangered, threatened and extirpated species and habitat. The Act applies to all projects including infrastructure, development, maintenance, and Planning Act Applications. Limited mapping from the Ministry of Natural Resources showing areas of significant endangered or threatened species is available.”

34. Modification #163 hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following in Section 2.8.3:

“(3) Changes to the Provincially Significant Wetlands designation or the adjacent lands requires the approval of the appropriate Conservation Authority”.
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35. Modification #165 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the phrase 'or barn' in the first sentence and further, deleting and replacing the phrase 'trained municipal official or third party consultant' in the second sentence with 'qualified municipal official or qualified third party consultant.'

36. Modification #172 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the word 'buffer' and the second 'identified' from Section 2.8.6(7).

37. Modification #179 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph:

"The County may allow for the waiving of the requirement for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study when one or more the following applies:
(a) a development is subject to a duplicate or similar environmental assessment process;
(b) a development is minor in nature; or
(c) the site conditions for a development are such that the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study would serve no useful purpose for the protection of significant environmental features.

The County may seek outside independent advice as to whether: the proposed development is minor in nature; an Environmental Impact Study would serve any useful purpose; and/or the adequacy of a duplicate environmental assessment process".

38. Modifications #182 and #154 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 are hereby amended by adding the phrase "that relates specifically to natural heritage features and areas" after the phrase ‘in Section 2.8’ in Section 2.8.7 (6) and the last paragraph in Section 2.8.1.

39. Modification #194 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following sentence after the first sentence of Section 3(11): "The County will consult with First Nations and Metis when developing the Terms of Reference for the Archaeological Master Plan".

40. Modifications #204 to #213, inclusive, of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 are hereby deleted in their entirety. Further, all references to the term “alternative or renewable energy systems” shall be deleted from the Official Plan.

41. Modification #230 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended as follows:

(1) adding the following sentence to the end of the second paragraph of Section 5.3.2(1):
"Municipalities shall require the entering into of a responsibility agreement between the owner/operator and the municipality in order to ensure perpetual
maintenance of these systems in order to avoid adverse human health and environmental impacts."

(2) adding the phrase ‘as defined in Section 2.8 of this Plan’ after the phrase ‘natural environment’ in Section 5.3.2 (1);

(3) adding the phrase “of the appropriate approval authority” after the phrase “all regulatory requirements” in Section 5.3.2 (1).

42. Modification #238 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the phrase ‘to allow for development on partial services provided that’ in Section 5.3.2(11)(b)” and replacing with “to allow for development where partial services exist provided that”.

43. Modification #243 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the phrase “certain requirements” in Section 5.3.4.1(1) and replacing with “the requirements of Section 5.3.4.1(3)”.

44. Modification #246 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the word ‘to’ and adding the phrase “and obtain approval of” after the word ‘application’ in Section 5.4.2 (3).

45. Modification #261 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following after the last sentence in Section 6.4(1): “It is important to monitor and collect information to determine whether or not the policies in the Plan are being effective. The monitoring results will be summarized in an annual report to the Planning and Development Committee”.

46. Modification #282 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the phrase ‘as defined in Section 2.8 of this Plan’ after the phrase ‘natural environment’ in Section 6.12.1 (viii). Modification #282 is hereby further amended by adding the phrase “design measures such as LEED (Neighborhood) and Low Impact Development” after the word ‘efficiency’ in Section 6.12.1 (vii).

47. Modification #287 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph after the first paragraph in Section 6.12 (8): “The Saugeen Obijway Nation shall be consulted for those land identified in Appendix C and in accordance with any consultation protocol development in consultation with the Saugeen Obijway Nation. The Saugeen Obijway Nation is preparing a study of traditional interior routes, former settlements and land uses. This Study shall be taken into consideration, when it is available. Appendix C does not constitute part of this Official Plan”. Further, the phrase ‘and Metis’ is hereby added after the phrase ‘First Nations’ in all sections amended by Official Plan Amendment No. 80.

48. Modification #290 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following sentence at the end of Section 6.16.3: “The County may provide grants, loans or other assistance as County Council deems
appropriate for the purposes of carrying programs as described in lower tier municipal Community Improvement Plans”.

49. Modification #293 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following definitions to Section 6.19:

“Residence Surplus to a Farming Operation—shall mean an existing farm residence which meets the criteria of Section 2.1.4(1)(b) or Section 2.3.4(1) and is rendered surplus as a result of farm consolidation (the acquisition of additional farm parcels to be operated as one farm operation)”

“Qualified individual—shall mean an individual with qualifications and/or credentials related to a field of study and who is therefore appropriate for conducting a study and/or providing an expert opinion that has been required by the County. The qualifications and credentials of the qualified individual must be to the satisfaction of the County or review agencies, or where appropriate, are defined by relevant legislations, regulation and standards.”

“Underutilized Lot—shall mean a parcel of land which is currently, or was previously developed, but has the ability to permit a higher intensity of land uses.”

50. The definition for ‘Adjacent Lands’ in modification #293 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the phrase ‘cultural heritage feature or area’ and replacing with ‘protected heritage property’ and further, adding the phrase “, or protected heritage property” after the phrase ‘impact on the feature or area’.

51. The definition for ‘Agricultural-Related Uses’ in modification #293 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the word ‘or’ and replacing with ‘and’.

52. The definition for ‘Environmental Impact Study’ and ‘Conservation Organization’ in modification #293 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 are hereby amended by adding the phrase ‘as defined in Section 2.8 of this Plan’ after the phrase ‘natural environment’ in the first bullet point of Section 6.19. Further, the definition for ‘Environmental Impact Study’ is hereby amended by adding the following after the first sentence: “The purpose of the EIS is to assess whether or not the development as proposed can integrate into the natural environment and if not, whether or how it can be modified or, where necessary, mitigated to better fit into the natural environment as defined in Section 2.8 of this Plan.

53. The definition for ‘Natural Heritage Features and Areas’ in modification #293 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the word ‘other’ in front of the second ‘significant wetlands’ in the second line.
54. The definition for 'Negative Impacts' in modification #293 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the word 'individual' in the third sentence of the first paragraph in Section 6.19.

55. The definition for 'Settlement Capability Study' in modification # 293 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following sentence after the first sentence: "The Study shall assess the entire settlement area and shall address the cumulative effects of new development on the natural environment and surrounding land uses".

56. Modification #153 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by adding the following wording into Section 2.8.1 after the paragraph ending 'with advice from the Ministry of Natural Resources':

"For the purposes of Section 2.8 of this Plan, 'adjacent lands' means those lands, contiguous to a specific natural heritage feature or area, where it is likely that development or site alteration would have a negative impact on the feature or area. The adjacent lands widths listed below are approximate values to be used in this Plan unless different values are established by amendment to this Plan or in a local official plan supported by a technical study prepared by a qualified professional knowledgeable on natural resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature or Area</th>
<th>Adjacent Land Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Habitat of Threatened</td>
<td>50 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Endangered Species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Wetlands</td>
<td>120 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Wetlands</td>
<td>30 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Habitat</td>
<td>50 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Woodlands</td>
<td>50 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Valleylands</td>
<td>50 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Wildlife Habitat</td>
<td>50 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest</td>
<td>50 metres&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. Modification #190 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the last sentence of the first paragraph of Section 3.7 and adding a third paragraph as follows:"

"For the purposes of Section 3 of this Plan, 'adjacent lands' means those lands, contiguous to a specific protected heritage property, where it is likely that development or site alteration would have a negative impact on protected heritage property. The adjacent lands widths listed below are approximate values to be used in this Plan unless different values are established by amendment to this Plan or in a local official plan supported by a technical study prepared by a qualified professional knowledgeable on cultural heritage resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature or Area</th>
<th>Adjacent Land Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Heritage Property</td>
<td>50 metres&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
58. Modification #40 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the phrase “the 1st sentence as well as the word ‘If’ at the beginning of the 2nd sentence resulting in the capitalization of the word “Where” and replacing with the phrase “the 1st and 2nd sentence in Section 2.2.3 (5) is hereby deleted in its entirety”.

59. The definitions for ‘Floodling Hazard’ and ‘Floodproofing Standard’ in modification #293 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 are hereby amended by deleting the phrase “and large inland lakes” in Section 6.19.

60. The definition for ‘Hazard Lands’ in modification #293 of Official Plan Amendment No. 80 is hereby amended by deleting the sentence: “Along the shorelines of large inland lakes, this means the land, including that covered by water, between a defined offshore distance or depth and the furthest landward limit of the flooding hazard, erosion hazard or dynamic beach hazard limits.”

61. The following land use schedules of Official Plan Amendment # 80 are deleted in their entirety and replaced, as appropriate, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Scheduled Deleted</th>
<th>Land Use Schedule Inserted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule A: Land Use Designations Map 1 to 3 Dated: Feb 2009</td>
<td>Schedule A: Land Use Designations Map 1 to 3 Dated: June 25 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule B: High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resources Map 1 to 3 Dated: Feb 2009</td>
<td>Schedule B: High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resources Map 1 to 3 Dated: June 25 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schedule Land Use Designations: 1a to 1r Dated: Feb 2009</td>
<td>Secondary Schedule Land Use Map: 1a to 1r Dated: April 2010 (1 June 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schedules Land Use Designations: 3a to 3o Dated: Feb 2009</td>
<td>Secondary schedules Land Use Designations: 3a to 3o Dated: April 2010 (3a June 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A Constraint Mapping Map 1 to 3 Dated: Feb 2009</td>
<td>Appendix A Constraint Mapping Map 1 to 3 Dated: June 25 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B Constraint Mapping Map 1 to 3 Dated: Feb 2009</td>
<td>Appendix B Constraint Mapping Map 1 to 3 Dated: June 25 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attached ‘Traditional Territories of the Saugeen Ojibway Nations’ map is attached as Appendix C to the County of Grey Official Plan to fulfill modification #46.
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Dated at London this day of , 2010

Micheline Riopelle
Director, Municipal Services Office-Western
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
TO:   Chair Mullin and Members  
Planning and Community Development Committee  
FROM:  Heather Morrison, Deputy Clerk/Records Manager  
Mike Alguire, Purchasing and Materials Manager  
MEETING DATE: August 12, 2010  
PURPOSE:  To Award a Forestry Tenders RFT-CC-10-2010 and RFT-CC-11-2010  
RECOMMENDATION:  
THAT the following tenders for timber in Grey County Forests be accepted:  
   RFT-CC-10-2010 Collingwood Osprey Townline #7 – Dinsmore Logging for $28,255.00  
   RFT-CC-11-2010 Collingwood Landlocked #8- Dinsmore Logging for $25,255.00  
BACKGROUND  
The Tender Opening Committee met on Thursday August 5, 2010 at 2:15 p.m. to review bids received for the  
Collingwood Osprey Townline and Collingwood Landlocked Forest properties. In attendance were Mike  
Alguire, Purchasing and Materials Manager; Renate Cowan, Administrator, Lee Manor and Tim Dean,  
Environmental Services Manager. A representative from Dinsmore Logging was also in attendance.  
10-2010 Collingwood Osprey Townline Tract 7 (hardwood) -volume approximately 175 full cords  
11-2010 Collingwood Landlocked Tract 8 (hardwood)-volume approximately 214 full cords  
Six tenders were received for RFT-CC-10-2010 as follows:  
   Dinsmore Logging $28,255.00  
   Willard Hallman Lumber $17,375.00  
   Martin’s Logging and Skidding $21,600.00  
   Edgewood Lumber $17,376.00  
   Lake Huron Contracting $14,101.80  
   Dale Ottewell $17,387.80  
The recommended tender is from Dinsmore Logging in the amount of $28,255.00  
Three tenders were received for RFT-CC-11-2010 as follows:  
   Timber Horse Logging $19,010.00  
   Dinsmore Logging $25,255.00  
   Dale Ottewell $15,132.80
The recommended tender is from Dinsmore Logging in the amount of $25,255.00

FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL/IT CONSIDERATIONS

Revenue from this logging harvest is to be allocated to the 2010 budget.

It was noted that the recommended bids for both RFT-CC-10-2010 and RFT-CC-11-2010 are above the reserve estimates.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heather Morrison
Mike Alguire
July 2010 Grey County Up-Dates

1. **By Law Enforcement Officers Monthly Report.**

   We have received 108 applications for Permits this year and I have completed 147 site visits, including 18 for the months of July. The breakdown of this months site visits are as follows, 2 in West Grey, Chatsworth 4, Georgian Bluffs 2, Blue Mountains 1, Grey Highlands 6, Southgate 1 and Meaford 2.

2. **Forest Management Technician’s Report.**

   Dann Harris has started cutting in the Glen Rodin tract, going slowly with all the rain recently, operation looks good.
1. AMO news release – Ontario’s Environmental Commissioner delivers straight talk on Waste Diversion - July 27, 2010 (emailed)

**PASSED ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT**

Township of Georgian Bluffs  58-2010  
(Geographic Township of Derby)  
Part Lot 10, Concession 4  
To recognize legal non-conforming uses  
Arend Snoeijer (Snoeijer’s Gas Barn)

Township of Georgian Bluffs  60-2010  
(Geographic Township of Keppel)  
Part of Lot 4, Plan 799  
To allow residential development on the lands which do not have frontage on an “improved public street”  
Perry Dewberry

Township of Georgian Bluffs  63-2010  
(Geographic Township of Keppel)  
Part Lot 41, Concession 10  
To implement consent no. B6/2010  
Lisa Gilbert

Township of Georgian Bluffs  68-2010  
(Geographic Township of Keppel)  
Part Lot 26, Concession A  
To grant relief to allow one of the residential units to be a park model trailer  
Gail & Ken Acton

Municipality of Grey Highlands  2010-88  
(Geographic Village of Markdale)  
Lots 98 & 99, Concession 1, NETSR  
To rezone the subject lands to permit residential uses  
Markdale Country Club

Municipality of Grey Highlands  2010-90  
(Geographic Township of Artemesia)  
Part of Lots 36 & 37, Concession 7  
To permit a single detached dwelling unit, carport & residential accessory structure  
Coe/Atkinson
Municipality of West Grey 33-2010
(Geographic Twp. of Bentinck)
Part Lot 60, Concession 2, WGR
To implement consent no. B3/2010
Randy & Vicki McNabb

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Township of Georgian Bluffs – B6/2010
(Geographic Township of Keppel)
Lot 14, Concession 17
To create a new lot
Lisa Gilbert
Granted

Municipality of Grey Highlands – B13/2010
(Geographic Township of Euphrasia)
Part Lot 4, Concession 7
To create a newly enlarged parcel and retain a parcel
Michael O'Donohoe and Cheryl Gibbons
Granted

Municipality of Grey Highlands – B14/2010
(Geographic Township of Osprey)
Lot 18, Concession 7
To sever a lot and retain a lot
John & Kathryn Smith
Granted

Municipality of Meaford – A4/2010
(Geographic Township of St. Vincent)
Lot 9, Concession 2
To increase the permitted height for a proposed accessory building
H. Edward Ormsby
Granted

Municipality of Meaford – A5/2010
(Geographic Township of St. Vincent)
Lots 8 & 9, Plan 16R-1510
177 Cedar Ave.
To permit the construction of an accessory building on the lot
Bonnie Thomson
Granted
Municipality of Meaford – B4/2010
(Geographic Township of St. Vincent)
Part Lot 22, Concession 6
Lot addition
Anita, Beverly, Laurie & Glenford Carbert
Granted

Municipality of Meaford – B6/2010
(Geographic Town of Meaford)
Lot 447, Part Lots 448 & 449, Plan 309
To establish an easement
Doug & Vel Kirkpatrick
Granted

Plan 918, Part Lot 32
1126 3rd Ave. East
To erect signs on the subject single detached dwellings
Northridge Property Management Inc.
Granted

Town of The Blue Mountains – A5/2010
Lot 7, Plan 104
To construct an unenclosed porch projecting off of the front face of the existing dwelling
Doug Findlay & Denna Dolan
Granted

Town of The Blue Mountains – A6/2010
Part Lot 18, Concessions 1 & 2
Willow Creek at Blue Inc.
To allow for the phased registration of the development on the subject property
Willow Creek At Blue Inc.
Granted

Town of The Blue Mountains – B5/2010 & B6/2010
South Half Lot 2, Concession 8
To sever a new rural residential lot - B5/2010
To sever a new vacant rural residential lot – B6/2010
Adrian Op’t Hoog
Granted
NIAGARA ESCARPMENT COMMISSION

Township of Chatsworth – G/R/2010-2011/9052
(Geographic Township of Osprey)
Lot 29, Concession 14
To construct a 1 storey accessory building
Jim Hewitt
Approved

Township of Chatsworth – G/T/2010-2011/9073
(Geographic Township of Holland)
Lots 3 & 4, Concession 6
To undertake maintenance on a section of the Massie Road west of the Massie intersection
Township of Chatsworth
Approved

Township of Georgian Bluffs – G/F/2009-2010/9113
(Geographic Township of Derby)
Lot 12, Concession 2
To install a weir with a discharge pipe within a secondary concrete box culvert
Sydenham Sportsmen’s Association
Approved

Municipality of Grey Highlands – G/R/2010-2011/9035
(Geographic Township of Artemesia)
Lot 21, Concession 8
To construct a 1-1/2 storey total floor area accessory building with a garage below
Donald Jack
Approved

Municipality of Grey Highlands – G/R/2010-2011/9045
(Geographic Township of Artemesia)
Lot 21, Concession 8
To establish a home business within an existing dwelling
Donald Jack
Approved

Municipality of Grey Highlands - G/R/2010-2011/9052
(Geographic Township of Osprey)
Lot 29, Concession 14
To construct a 1 storey accessory building
Jim Hewitt
Approved
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Municipality of Grey Highlands – G/T/2010-2011/9066
(Geographic Township of Artemesia)
Lots 22 & 23, Concession 11
To construct a wide gravel laneway
Noreen Corcoran & Peter Foley
Approved

Municipality of Meaford – G/R/2010-2011/9034
(Geographic Township of Sydenham)
Lot 2, Concession 7
To establish a home business (Environmental and geomatics consultancy)
Emilie Sauks & Jody MacEachern
Approved

Municipality of Meaford – G/R/2010-2011/9063
(Geographic Township of St. Vincent)
Lot 1, Concession 5
To erect a single solar panel array to service the existing dwelling on an existing lot
Ken & Linda Dumais
Approved

Town of The Blue Mountains – G/R/2010-2011/9010
Part Lot 5, Concession 12
To construct a 1-1/2 storey with loft accessory building (garage with workshop/storage space)
Andrea Matrosovs
Approved

PASSED BY-LAW AMENDMENTS - 7
COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT - 11
NIAGARA ESCARPMENT COMMISSION - 10
Ontario’s Environmental Commissioner Delivers Straight Talk on Waste Diversion


“Ontario’s Environmental Commissioner has delivered a clear message that this is the right policy for the right time,” said Peter Hume, AMO President. “It is just plain common sense that producers – not property taxpayers – pay for handling this material – whether it be in the blue box or hazardous household waste.”

Waste that poses risks to our environment and to human health must be disposed of safely and responsibly. Tossing it in a garbage bag may be convenient, but it’s not very smart. Waste diversion makes far more sense. However, waste diversion only works when consumers and producers accept greater responsibility for the waste they create.

People used to think that Ontario’s Blue Box program was a strange idea. Today it is a simple and effective program that diverts more than two million tonnes of recyclable material each year. It could divert even more if industry had clear incentives to use recyclable material and consumers could get clear information about which products are better for the environment.

“The Government of Ontario deserves full credit for having the courage to show leadership on waste diversion as it is about change,” Hume said. “Holding industries accountable for the waste management costs related to their products and packaging is the most practical and effective means of reducing the amount of waste we create as a society. It is greener, cheaper and safer than digging and dumping. Ontario needs to be progressive, not regressive, in its approach to the environment.”

AMO believes that the costs of managing hazardous household products should not be borne by municipal property taxpayers. The association has long advocated for a program that will encourage a better designed product at the front end of the process, and more easily recyclable products at the end of the lifecycle. We also believe that consumers should have the power to make better informed purchasing choices.

As Ontario’s Environment Commissioner has pointed out, Ontario’s current waste diversion strategy has followed a decade worth of consultation.

“This issue is so critical that we are counting on all political parties to work together and support this strategy,” said Hume. “Given that it takes a full generation and a willing community to build a landfill site, there are serious consequences to abandoning Ontario’s waste diversion strategy.”

Ontario municipalities share the Environmental Commissioner’s opinion that the only practical way to reduce waste and recycle more is to hold people responsible for the waste they create. You make a mess you clean it up. It’s that simple.

AMO is a non-profit organization representing almost all of Ontario’s 444 municipal governments. AMO supports strong and effective municipal government in Ontario and promotes the value of municipal government as a vital and essential component of Ontario and Canada’s political system.

Backgrounder

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Brian Lambie, AMO Media Contact, 416-729-5425, Email: lambie@redbrick.ca
June 5th 2010

Honourable Carol Mitchell
Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
Public Archives Building
77 Grenville St., 11th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1B3

Honourable Dwight Duncan
Minister of Finance
7 Queen's Park Crescent, 7th floor
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1Y7

Dear Ministers Mitchell and Duncan:

RE: Compensation to Farmers for Wildlife Damage

I am writing on behalf of the Board of Directors and members of AMCTO - the Association of Municipal Managers, Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario - to indicate to you AMCTO’s interest in reform of the regulations concerning compensation to farmers for wildlife damage.

AMCTO is Canada’s largest municipal professional organization, having as members 2,200 managers and other professionals working in municipalities across Ontario. Our members fill many important roles in the municipal sector, including administering the Livestock Damage Program under the Livestock, Poultry and Honey Bee Protection Act. While this is a provincially funded program, our members administer it and want to be part of a program that is operating effectively. As you will know from the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, and as we will explain here, this program is not currently operating effectively.

We, of course, also have an interest in this program because of the economic impact on taxpayers in rural communities and because municipalities pay the expenses of livestock evaluators to assess claims for livestock damage.

Our members have, over many years, and recently with more frequency brought to our attention several weaknesses with this program. We have reviewed these concerns in some detail and reached out to both OMAFRA staff as well as the Ontario Federation of Agriculture (OFA) to discuss these issues.

Our conclusion is that the OFA has put before each of your ministries some very practical and effective means of addressing these weaknesses. Rather than propose anything else, we
fully endorse the OFA’s call for:

1. the payment schedule under the Livestock, Poultry and Honey Bee Protection Act to be revised to reflect current market values for livestock.
2. the Act to be revised to expand the species of wildlife listed as predators to include predatory birds such as ravens, crows, owls, hawks, eagles and cormorants as well as mammalian predators such as raccoons, fishers, foxes, weasels and cougars.
3. the list of eligible livestock to be expanded to include “non-traditional” species of livestock such as deer, elk, ostrich, emu, etc.
4. the provincial government to reimburse municipalities for the costs of the livestock valuator.

The policy issues are well explained in the OFA’s 2004 Wildlife Damage position paper and summarized in its 2010 Pre-Budget submission.

We also discussed with and support the OFA point in their position paper that: “the farmer is only compensated if the livestock valuer is able to see the carcass left by a predator. If the predator carries the animal off and the farmer cannot find it, the farmer receives no compensation. While it is difficult to address this situation, it serves to highlight another example of loss of income for farmers.” This issue has also been brought to our attention by several of our members.

Given the significant fiscal challenges facing your government, our belief is that, with a relatively small amount of additional resources, you can send an important signal to a significant constituency about your responsiveness and fairness as a government by addressing this issue. In the process, you’ll improve the ability of our members to help you administer an important provincial program.

We thank you for your time in considering our submission. We would appreciate being kept advised of its progress so that we can ensure our members are well informed and are ready to do their part to help implement any reforms in this policy.

Yours truly,

Christine Norris, CMO
President

c.c.
Honourable Jim Bradley, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Bette Jean Crews, President, Ontario Federation of Agriculture
Peter Hume, President, AMO
Memo

To: County Councils & Planning Departments
From: Bruce Pearse, LUC Chair
Date: August 4, 2010
Pages: One
Re: Provincial Policy Statement Review

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Land Use Council (LUC) is a non-partisan coalition of private sector associations launched in 2009 with a mandate to review government land use legislation and publish its effects, whether positive or negative, on Ontario municipalities and private citizens.

The 2005 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), summarized at [www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page1485.aspx](http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page1485.aspx) on the Internet, is currently under review. Typical land use subjects of municipal and taxpayer interest are listed under Table of Contents, Part V Policies. These are: 2.0 Resource Management; 2.1 Natural Heritage; 2.2 Water; 2.3 Agriculture; 2.4 Mining and 2.5 Cultural Heritage.

It’s expected Non-Government Organizations will present strong argument for PPS changes favorable to their agenda alone. Accordingly, a LUC contribution to the current Review is being considered to support less biased municipal planning concerns. To that end, our Board of Directors suggests each county council in Ontario may wish to make available a short list of local PPS recommendations for inclusion in a LUC outline submission to the Review.

We invite your municipality to participate with others in this opportunity for assembling and tabling a collective list of municipal concerns through the auspices of a public service coalition.

In view of the August 31 Review closing date, please e-mail a synopsis of local PPS reservations and suggestions to LUC Communications ([opera@bmts.com](mailto:opera@bmts.com)) at council’s earliest convenience.

A draft of LUC’s proposed PPS submission will be forwarded to all municipal respondents on or before August 16.
Ms. Christine Norris, CMO
President
Association of Municipal Managers, Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario
910-2680 Skymark Avenue
Mississauga, Ontario
L4W 5L6

Dear Ms. Norris:

Thank you for your letter of June 5, 2010, and for sharing your organization’s views regarding the program for compensating farmers for wildlife damage. I value your input and have made note of your support for changes to this program.

I am pleased to tell you that Bill 68, Open for Business Act, 2010, was introduced for First Reading on May 17, 2010. The proposed changes to the act would, if passed, allow the government to update wildlife compensation programs at a future date. This would enable the government to respond to the very real concerns of farmers, which we cannot do without the proposed changes to the act.

Please note that Bill 68 would not cut compensation to farmers for damage to livestock, poultry and honey bees by wildlife. The proposed amendments would not come into effect until proclamation, which means farmers will be protected under the current act until a new program is developed in consultation with stakeholders.

Ministry staff are reviewing current policies and programs in this area and examining options for improvement. As part of this review, staff will be meeting with key industry partners to discuss options that will best meet their needs. I have shared your letter with the appropriate ministry staff for their information.
Again, thank you for your letter.

Sincerely,

Carol Mitchell
Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs

c:  The Honourable Dwight Duncan
    Minister of Finance

    Mr. Clarence Haverson, Acting Director, Farm Finance Branch
    Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
Ontario Federation of Agriculture
Expectations from the budget

OFA Commentary 1110 By Keith Currie, Ontario Federation of Agriculture Executive Member
(taken from OFA Website August 6, 2010)

Ontario farmers will be paying close attention to what Finance Minister Duncan includes in his budget on March 25th.

We’re looking to the budget to enable necessary business risk management and other regulatory reform to support our farmers.

The OFA believes current government policies fail to adequately support Ontario farmers. We encourage the province to make a commitment to agriculture that our farmers can bank on immediately and in the long-term.

It has been proven in the past that an investment in agriculture is good for the entire economy, not just the farming sector. That’s because of the thousands of jobs in the agri-food industry – everything from processing and transportation to retailing.

OFA believes that the right economic stimulus package for agriculture should contain both government budgetary expenditures and a commitment from the government to work with the agricultural community to address government policies that negatively affect or impede agriculture.

The current instability in the Ontario agricultural economy emphasizes the urgent need for a Business Risk Management Program – a key element in the Ontario Agricultural Sustainability Coalition’s (OASC) list of needs. OFA believes it would not be acceptable to only improve the prospects of future farmers without providing help for current farmers to survive.

Public investment in agricultural research continues to be part of OFA’s request to government. This investment is essential to keeping our agricultural sector on the leading edge of agriculture’s future growth and success going forward.

Previous investment in agricultural research has made it possible for our industry to grow and partially keep pace with agriculture in other jurisdictions. OFA believes government investment in research of on-farm energy production initiatives would be money well spent considering the Ontario Government’s focus on green energy and sustainability.

OFA wants to remind the government that it plays a key role in developing and enforcing energy policy. Ontario agriculture needs the cooperation of the government to allow it to realize the maximum benefits from the energy produced by agriculture.

Changes are needed for the definition of “Farm Lands” in terms of Ontario’s Property Tax Assessment. OFA is calling on the government to clarify that the term “Farm Lands” is intended to include buildings.

Ontario farmers continue to experience increasing losses from wildlife damage. Media stories of a growing and more menacing coyote population throughout the province is a
strong indicator that some real action is needed by the government to bring this problem under control.

While improved wildlife control measures are needed, OFA wants the provincial government to update its schedule of compensation for livestock and poultry kills by wildlife. When farmers find animals killed by wildlife, government officials must understand that represents immediate and deepening income losses – both unsustainable for our farmers.

Ontario agriculture will be looking for government’s response to these issues in the next budget.
September 1, 2010

Honourable Brad Duguid, Minister of Energy
Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure
4th Floor, Hearst Block
900 Bay Street
Toronto ON M7A 2E1

Dear Minister Duguid:

Re: Green Energy and Wind Generated Power

The Grey Bruce Board of Health supports provincial efforts for green energy but would like to reduce the impact and stress that it is having on rural residents, particularly in regard to wind generated power. On August 20, 2010 at a regular meeting of the Board for the Grey Bruce Health Unit, the following motion was passed:

Moved by: Arlene Wright Seconded by: Milt McIver

THAT, the Board of Health for the Grey Bruce Health Unit request the Government of Ontario amend Ontario’s Green Energy Act to include municipal input into the decision making process around siting and set-back distances of Wind Turbines and measuring the effects of low frequency sound from the same; and further THAT, copies of this motion be sent to all local MP’s and MPP’s, all Local Municipalities and all Ontario Boards of Health.

Carried.

Sincerely,

Bob Pringle, Chair
Grey Bruce Board of Health

Cc: Larry J. Miller, MP Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound
Ben Lobb, MP Huron-Bruce
Helena Guergis, MP Simcoe-Grey
Bill Murdoch, MPP Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound
Carol Mitchell, MPP Huron-Bruce
Jim Wilson, MPP Simcoe-Grey
Municipalities in Grey-Bruce
Ontario Boards of Health
From: Donald Kerr [mailto:djkerr9@sympatico.ca]
Sent: September-09-10 10:51 AM
To: Mullin, Brian; Fawcett, David; Clarke, Dave; Halliday, Stewart; McQueen, Paul; Risk, Manley; Silvertone, Lynn; Best, Dan
Cc: Robert Gamble; Rick Lloyd; Norm Wingrove; Jeanne Hazell; Eleanor Ward; Douglas Matthews; Bob Waind; akmcgillivray@yahoo.ca; Derek Nischan
Subject: MAQ quarry - No support for the application

Mayor and Councillors:
You are giving consideration to the MAQ quarry application. I urge you to oppose it. Please read the attached letter from Andrew Sorensen of Grey Sauble Conservation Authority. He is an independent expert whose opinion should be acted upon. He outlines many reasons to object to the application: provide more buffer for the Wetland, do not go below the water table, etc. How can you fail to give full consideration to his concerns?
Please do not support the MAQ application for the quarry.

I am a director of the Blue Mountain Watershed Trust with a membership of 139 persons. Our area of interest includes the watersheds of the Batteaux Creek through to the Beaver River and we seek to protect the valuable natural areas in this region. We are a participant in the OMB hearing.

Don Kerr
January 29, 2010

Mr. Randy Scherzer, Senior Planner
County of Grey Planning and Development Department
595 9th Avenue East
Owen Sound, Ontario
N4K 3E3

Dear Mr. Scherzer:


The Grey Sauble Conservation Authority has reviewed the above noted applications according to our mandate for Natural Hazards and the Memorandum of Agreement with the Municipality of Grey Highlands.

General Site Description
The site includes a mixture of woodlands, wetlands, and cultural lands situated within the Beaver River watershed. There are karst features within the central portion of the property associated with the central wetland and wetland area to the north. A wetland is part of a larger wetland known as the provincially significant Rob Roy Swamp. A portion of the woodland is dominated by hardwood species as described in the Natural Environment Report. A number of conifer plantations exist on the property and the topography is variable.

GSACA Regulations
A portion of the subject property is affected by the conservation authority's Development, Interference with Wetlands, and Alteration to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation (Ontario Regulation 151/06, effective May 4, 2006). The regulated area is associated with a watercourse on the property and the provincially significant Rob Roy swamp as well as the 120 meter adjacent lands to the wetland. A permit is required from this office prior to development and/or site alteration within the affected area as outlined on the enclosed map.

Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)
3.1 Natural Hazards
Hazard lands on the property include a tributary of the Beaver River and a provincially significant wetland and potential flood plain areas adjacent to these features. These hazard areas are noted on the attached map. The proposed extraction limits are...
generally located outside hazard land limits however there is some encroachment into the existing hazard zones. The recommended revised extraction area would eliminate this encroachment.

2.1 Natural Heritage
2.1.2 Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term.
2.1.2 The diversity of natural features in an area, and the long term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems should be maintained and where possible, improved, recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features.

The proposal removes a portion of a natural woodland feature adjacent to a provincially significant wetland. There is currently a woodlot linkage and wildlife travel corridor between the Beaver River tributary, the provincially significant wetland, and other planted and natural woodlands located on the south part of the extraction area. The diversity of the woodlot and the quality of the woodlot is generally quite good. The existing Butternut on the site appears to be the species in the poorest health due to butternut canker. The current management of the woodlot does not appear to be compromising the natural features of the site.

2.1.3 Development and Site Alteration shall not be permitted in
a) Significant Habitat of Endangered Species and Threatened Species
Through visits to the site, there are a number of endangered butternut trees on the site in various stages of health. There is also butternut regenerating on the site close to one of the farm houses. These trees have been assessed by the Ministry of Natural Resources butternut Health Assessor under the protocol established for the Endangered Species Act for this species. The Ministry letter notes that the recovery team encourages the retention all Butternut trees. There were additional butternut trees noted in the adjacent to the Rob Roy Swamp that were not previously noted in the reports. This area of additional butternut was not in the proposed extraction area. The proposed revised extraction area would also assist in maintaining habitat for the nationally threatened western chorus frog noted on the site.

b) Significant Wetlands
According to Ministry of Natural Resources mapping, part of the provincially significant Rob Roy Swamp wetland is located on the lands owned by the proponent. The 120 metre adjacent lands to the wetland cover a portion of the proposed extraction area. Ontario regulation 151/06 prohibits development within the wetland itself and 120 metre adjacent lands unless permission is granted by the Authority (i.e. a permit). The proposal is to reduce the setback from the wetland to 30 metres. Azimuth Environmental has provided a number of references to buffers and setbacks. The proposal suggests that a 15 metre setback from the north wetland is acceptable. There are a number of species noted on the property and within the wetland that utilize buffers of more than 30 metres. (i.e. wood frog, spotted salamander, spring peeper, and juvenile leopard frog). Some of these species overwinter in upland areas.
The setback of 120 metres is currently regulated for the Interference with wetlands & alteration to shorelines and watercourses. The 120 metre setback again is a minimum setback where impacts need to be assessed. The woodland feature within the proposed extraction area provides an excellent buffer for the wetland and provides habitat for a number of species of flora and fauna during their life cycle.
Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Comments -- January 28, 2010  Our File: P6937
Official Plan Amendment 42-08-14-OFA (Highland Quarry-MAQ) Zoning 22-2007

It is our opinion that "no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions" would not be addressed with the proposed wetland setbacks. The proposed edge management plan provides some enhancement to the proposed edge of the quarry. However, it is our recommendation that the areas within the 120 metre setback could be enhanced through edge management techniques and in the long term would provide a more appropriate buffer to the wetland for all species noted. Many applications we have reviewed over the last 20 years have provided at least 120 metre setback and in some cases this setback was not enough based on water and habitat issues.

Furthermore, with the extraction proposed below the water table, the solution is to pump water back to the wetland when needed. Although, there is natural variability in natural systems there will be no assurances that the wetland levels will be maintained in the long term. Pumping would be solely at the discretion of the Quarry operator. There is some concern that pumping may actually increase downstream flows when dewatering. The proposed stormwater management plan appears to have addressed this issue.

2.1.4 b) Significant Woodlands
It is our opinion that the woodland feature on the property is a significant woodland according to the PPS and should be retained. This woodland area has been identified as part of the Significant Woodland layer according to proposed updates included in the County of Grey Official Plan Five year review. The woodland provides connections and wildlife corridors across this property and connects to the identified Significant Woodland on the Walker Aggregates proposal in Simcoe County. The suggested criteria to identify Significant woodlands within the Ministry of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Reference Manual include the following:

1. Woodland Size:
The Beaver River watershed includes forest cover in the range of 35% cover. The proposal is to remove a portion of the forest cover within the Beaver River watershed. The removal proposed includes some naturally occurring deciduous wooded area containing endangered species (Butternut) and some conifer plantations. Under the technical manual for the evaluation of woodland size where woodland cover is over 30% cover the guidelines suggest to consider other criteria.

2. Woodland Shape and Proximity (to Other Woodlands or to Other Habitat Types)
Woodland patches that are close to one another are more valuable to wildlife than more distant patches. This woodland is in close proximity and attached to a large contiguous forest. The woodland shape provides a significant amount of interior forest as detailed in the reports. The removal of forest will reduce the available interior forest.

3. Linkages
Linkages to other natural heritage features or areas, to waterbodies, or to other woodlands are important.
Woodlands with one or more natural heritage features or areas within their boundary are considered for significance.
Woodlands which overlap other natural heritage features and areas
Woodlands located within 250 metres of another natural heritage feature.
Woodlands that are in, close to, or adjacent to, a groundwater discharge or headwater region.
The woodland links two portions of the provincially significant wetland by way of a seasonal stream and karst feature through the centre portion of the property. All of the above linkage criteria are relevant to this property. The linkage to the south block of woodland should be enhanced with modification to the edge management plan through the wetland 120 metre setback. There are linkages to the wetlands to the east north and west.

4. Uncommon Characteristics
The woodland has been managed and has not had an opportunity to become an old growth forest. The karst features and the presence of Hart’s Tongue Fern (significant wildlife habitat) and the endangered Butternut would be considered uncommon characteristics.

5. Woodland Diversity
The woodland provides a greater diversity in areas adjacent to the wetlands and karst features. The topography provides a diversity of ground covers.

6. Woodland Management Value
The woodlot is visible from a long term management prospective and diversity generally good. The woodlot is in generally good health based on our site inspections except for the declining butternut and the Scot’s pine plantations.

7. Other
The woodland is within the headwaters area of the Beaver River and provides many ecological functions and water management benefits to the watershed.

Based on the above discussion and suggested standards within the Natural Heritage Technical Guide, it is our opinion that the majority of the woodland feature within the proposed extraction area would be considered a significant woodland and should be retained. We have suggested a revised extraction area as detailed in our July 12, 2009 email. The proposal would create a negative impact as a portion of the significant woodland would be removed from the Beaver River watershed area. Thus, it is our opinion that removal of the woodland does not meet the test of the PPS in regards to “no negative impacts”.

Fish Habitat
We have forwarded the reports and information to the department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada for review. We have requested on a number of occasions for them to provide written confirmation on their position on the proposal with no success. Although, there does not appear to be a direct fish habitat loss with the proposal, the proposal could have some indirect impact on fish habitat and thus the reasoning for us to refer the proposal to their office for comment under our level 2 agreement. We will continue to follow up on this issue.

2.1.4 c) Significant Wildlife Habitat
The Significant Wildlife Technical Guide (MNR 2000) is utilized to identify the significant wildlife habitat. The main categories include the following: Seasonal Concentration Areas, Rare Vegetation Communities or Specialized habitats for wildlife, Habitats of Species of Conservation Concern, excluding the Habitats of endangered and threatened species, and Animal Movement Corridors.
Seasonal Concentration Areas
At least two issues do not appear to be addressed or at least discussed under this section: Landbird migratory stopover areas and Raptor wintering areas.

Rare Vegetation Communities
The Ecological Land Classification map did not identify any rare vegetation communities within the proposed extraction limit.

Specialized habitats for wildlife
-Sites supporting area-sensitive species
The proposed site does support area sensitive birds and a landscape approach is suggested in protecting these areas. Keeping extraction outside of the 120 metre setback from the wetland would serve a dual purpose of minimizing impacts on area sensitive species and providing an appropriate buffer to the wetland. The edge management techniques noted in the plan could be employed to improve the edge in old field habitat areas and the Scot's pine plantation within the 120 metre setback.

-Forest stands providing a diversity of habitats
The guide indicates that stands containing species of conservation concern and a large number of cavity dependent species should be considered significant. Stands containing other specialized habitats for wildlife should be considered significant (i.e. presence of springs and seepage areas)
The forest stand contains springs, wetlands, species of conservation concern (Hart's Tongue fern), and cavity dependent birds.

-Amphibian Woodland breeding ponds
A number of amphibian breeding ponds have been identified in the Rob Roy Wetland.
The guide indicates that the best adjacent habitats are closed-canopy woodlands with rather dense undergrowth that maintains a damp environment. The minimum 120 metre setback from the wetland and beyond provides opportunities for this habitat.

-Specialized raptor nesting habitat
It was noted that raptor nesting was not observed on the site.

-Mink Denning sites
Mink were not noted on the site.

-Seeps and Springs
The guide notes that springs and small intermittent streams provide habitat for numerous uncommon species. In winter, wild turkey and white-tailed deer forage in these areas because of lack of snow cover.
The springs are generally located outside the extraction area and off the property. If extraction is maintained above the water table, it is our opinion that impacts could be minimized on these features. The proposed stormwater management plan provides some water quality benefits in this regard.

Habitats of Species of Conservation Concern, excluding the Habitats of endangered and threatened species
The Hart's Tongue fern population within the woodlot has been documented through Natural Environment Report. We did note on our last site visit, the Hart's Tongue extended along the crest of the slope to the west property boundary and also a small
population in the southwest corner of the main deciduous forest. There is a small part of the population within the proposed extraction area. We have recommended avoidance of this species with the proposed revised extraction area. The Ministry of Natural Resources generally have not supported transplantation of this species and the GSCA does not either. Our proposed revised extraction area would also provide additional habitat for other area sensitive species such as the identified Canada Warbler and the western chorus frog.

Animal Movement Corridors
The proposed loss of forest cover would eliminate a north/south wildlife movement corridor in the Beaver River Watershed connecting two portions of the Provincially significant Rob Roy Swamp.

2.2 Water
Section 2.2.1 e) indicates: Planning Authorities shall protect, improve, or restore the quality and quantity of water by maintaining linkages and related functions among surface water features, ground water features, hydrologic function and Natural heritage features and areas.

In light of the obvious karst features on the site, we are not convinced through the reports supplied to date that sensitive surface water and ground water features and their hydrologic functions are being protected through this application. To minimize impacts to these features, we recommend a revised extraction area to be located outside the 120 metre wetland setback (Regulated Area under Ontario Regulation 151/06) and remain above the water table.

Summary of Recommendations
It is our recommendation that the woodland area which includes the Hart’s tongue fern populations be considered for the significant woodland designation in the Official Plan. The Grey County Official Plan 5 Year review has noted this area to be considered as a significant woodland under draft mapping.

The enclosed map outlines a revised extraction area that addresses no negative impacts on the natural hazard and natural heritage features. The extraction in these amended areas should remain above the water table to maintain existing watershed areas and the sensitive surface and ground water features in the area. The Adaptive Management Plan could be used to ensure quarrying above the water table is maintained. This scenario would appear to address the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement by allowing some extraction of the aggregate resource while maintaining unique and significant natural hazard/natural heritage features.

Further we recommend that the Extraction area and licensed area be located outside the regulated area according to Ontario Regulation 151/06. This includes the 120 metre setback from the Provincially Significant wetland. Our proposed revised extraction area could be designated and zoned for extraction provided extraction remains 2 metres above the estimated groundwater table level of 508 metres above sea level. Therefore maximum extraction would be to 510 metres above sea level.
If any questions should arise, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

Andrew Sorensen
Environmental Planner

enclosure

cc    Dave Clarke, Authority Director
      Lorelie Spencer, Municipality of Grey Highlands
      Don Scott, Cuesta Planning Consultants
      David S. White
      Amanda McLachlan, Ministry of Natural Resources
      Craig Laing, Ministry of Natural Resources
      Dave Gibson, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
GSCA: Regulation of Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses
( Ontario Regulation 151/06)
August 25th, 2010

Dan Best
C.A.O.
Municipality of Grey Highlands
206 Toronto Street South
Unit #1, Box 409
Markdale, ON N0C 1H0

Dear Dan:

Re: Implementation of Drinking Water Source Protection Plans

The following motion was passed by the Grey Sauble Source Protection Authority on June 10th, 2009, supporting the implementation of Source Protection Plans and forwarded to the Ministry of Environment on June 11th, 2009. During recent discussion concerning Source Protection issues, the Source Protection Authority directed staff to forward a copy of this motion to watershed municipalities and the AMO Board of Directors.

Motion No.: SPA-09-004
Moved by: Deb Haswell
Seconded by: Jim McPherson

Be it resolved that the Grey Sauble Source Protection Authority advise the Minister of Environment that the Grey Sauble Source Protection Authority supports the implementation of Drinking Water Source Protection plans when completed and approved on the basis that there will be no effect on municipal taxation.

Carried

Should questions arise, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Yours truly,

R. John Cottrill, B.A., M.E.S.
Chief Administrative Officer

Member of Watershed Municipalities
Arran-Elderslie, Chatsworth, Georgian Bluffs, Grey Highlands,
Meaford, Owen Sound, South Bruce Peninsula, Blue Mountains
Meeting Minutes - Markdale Complex Board
September 1, 2010

Attendees - Monte Wehrle, David Thompson, Stewart Halliday, Manley Risk, Rob Jolley, Mary Loveday-Wight, Dwayne Ouderkirk

Staff Present - None
Absent - Laura Camilleri, Tom Gostick, Eugene Foy
Guests - John Routenberg, Bonnie Bullock

The meeting started at 7.10 p.m. with the listed Board members present, plus the guests who were seeking information. We met outside the Complex doors.

The last meeting minutes were read and we agreed to follow up with the outstanding items from that meeting.

We still have no arena manager and there has been little activity in the arena since May. Stewart said that 2 people have been hired and he tried to explain what he thought their duties would be.

Mats have been installed but Board members are concerned about the quality and usefulness of them. How do you clean them? Water can seep under them due to the cracks between them! The approximate cost was $10,000 to $14,000.

Chair Monte has been receiving phone calls from groups asking what ice times do they have and complaining that they have not been kept informed of what is going on at the arena. After much discussion it was agreed that we (the municipality) are not being fair to the groups who were using the arena before the shutdown. They had given up their ice times last year and don’t know if they will get them back. John and Bonnie are very upset about their treatment.

We decided to document the ice times we know were in place last year.
Markdale Old Timers - Tues. 8.30 p.m. - 11.00 p.m.
Classic Old Timers - Sun. 7.30 p.m. - 8.45 p.m. Wed. 9.00 p.m. - 10.15 p.m.
Girl’s Hockey - Wed. 6.00 p.m. - 9.00 p.m. Now asking for 2 hours on Thur.
Bulldogs Group - Sun. 10.00 a.m. - 11.30 a.m.
Girl’s Hockey - every other Sat. 10.00 a.m. - approximately 3.30 p.m.

We all agreed that Stewart and Manley must take these ice time problems back to C.E.O. Dan Best and the rest of Council. Our Board is completely frustrated about how things are being handled as far as getting groups back into the arena and we feel we have no say in what happens at the arena.

Next meeting will be at the call of the Chair.
September 13, 2010

Members present: Dimitri Haritun, Wayne Wright, Delbert Winters, Carrie McIntyre, Bill Parker.

Dimitri opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Carrie read the August minutes. Delbert motioned to accept the minutes as read, Wayne 2nd. Carried.

Wayne mentioned about the work bee. The basement floor needs touching up with paint. Wayne mentioned that the bowlers are looking good for the league. He will know more in a week or two. They may put up flyers in the area and then an add in the paper. They may look at having a night of open bowling. Delbert made a motion to have an open bowling night as we became aware that some people in the Maxwell area don’t know that we have the bowling alley. Seconded by Bill Parker. Carried. Wayne will keep us updated.

The Board received a thank you letter from the Maxwell Seniors Young at Heart for the help they got from the board members. The Corn roast went well. Many pictures were taken of the event.

Wayne will get in touch with Dimitri about a time to get together to help paint the basement floor. Wayne will check on the rental schedule.

The Board thanks Carl Gilbert for repairing the floor at the bowling alleys.

Meeting adjourned, moved by Carrie.

Next meeting October 4th, 2010, 7:30pm.
August 16, 2010

Mr. Chris Cornfield
Clerks Office
206 Toronto Street South
P.O. Box 409
Markdale ON
N0C 1H0

Dear Mr. Cornfield:

Further to our conversation of July 24th, I am enclosing our original letter to the Public Works Superintendent, dated August 2, 2007.

We continue to experience heavy truck traffic at high speeds on the Blue Mountain/Euphrasia Town Line as the traffic takes a shortcut from G.C. 13 to G.C. 40. Reduced Speed Limit signs should be on the road, as well as new “Horse Rider” signs – there were signs previously, but seem to have disappeared. At present there are no speed limit signs at all on the road until the approach to the Grier Bridge, which says 50, so vehicles assume 80 is fine and from what we have witnessed, go a lot faster than that as well.

The situation created is dangerous to residents walking along the road, with rocks flying everywhere, as well as creating potholes and poor condition of the road.

Another issue is the dust created – the clouds of dust landing on the apple and pear crops create a habitat for mites, which thrive in the dusty condition.

We respectfully request a look at having a chip and tar surface on this road. It will cut down on the clouds of dust that we currently endure, be more safe for people and animals, and we would think would be a cost saving in the long run given the number of times this road is being graded, which to be honest, only lasts for a couple of days and the potholes and water ruts after rainfall are back.
We are attaching the signatures of concerned neighbours. These signatures represent approximately 98% of owners. Two owners were not in the area to sign.

Thank you for your consideration. A follow up letter would be greatly appreciated.

Barry and Elizabeth McEwen  Fire #356715
P.O. Box 426
Clarksburg ON
N0H 1J0
Ratepayer concern - Blue Mountain/Euphrasia Townline high speed of truck traffic 29-2010
August 2, 2007

Mr. Geoff Aitken
Public Works Superintendent
Municipality of Grey Highlands
206 Toronto Street South
P. O. Box 409
Markdale, ON
N0C 1H0

Dear Mr. Aitken:

We would like to draw your attention to a badly needed work project on the Blue Mountain/Euphrasia Town Line.

This road is constantly being graded, with limited success, and in fact is ineffective and inefficient due to the heavy truck traffic and other vehicles using this road as a shortcut to G.R. 40 and C.R. 13. These vehicles travel at very high speeds with no regard to speed limits, pedestrians walking by the side of the road, children, or animals. They throw rocks of all sizes as they speed by.

Besides the danger, the dust created by these vehicles is considerable and constant. A chip and tar surface would, in our view, be a more successful and ultimately less costly endeavour.

We hope you will look at this issue and consider our request with some urgency in your planning. Several of our neighbours also have expressed this same concern.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barry and Elizabeth McEwen
Fire Number 356715
Virginia Stewart Love  
267093 South Line B  
RR2 Proton Station  
Ontario, N0C 1L0  

August 30, 2010  

Grey Highlands Council  
Municipality of Grey Highlands  
P.O. Box 409 Markdale,  
Ontario, N0C 1H0  

Dear Mayor Mullin and Council Members,  

Upon returning from a family commitment, I found several voicemails waiting for me from neighbours greatly concerned about gravel trucks driving up and down our road at excessive speeds over a three-day period (it appears these trucks were delivering gravel for work being done on Grey Road 2). Three of these neighbours had already contacted the OPP as well as the Municipality of Grey Highlands.  

One neighbor said the dust was so awful she was “unable to breathe” and could not work in her garden. Another said she was “nearly hit” as an empty truck sped towards her as she was pulling to the side of the road. She has stone chips in her wind shield to prove it. (This occurred after she was told by the OPP that the area commander would be alerted to the speeding trucks on Tuesday the 17th).  

The 13 year old girl who lives next door was walking to a neighbour’s house and was struck with stones when a gravel truck rushed by her without slowing down. Yet another neighbor had asked the Roads Department to spray the road with water to minimize the dust. You will appreciate that most of us do not have air-conditioning and rely on the breezes coming through our open windows to manage the heat.  

Despite these requests, the road was not sprayed, the OPP never came and the trucks continued to speed up and down South Line B through Wednesday.  

In the event the Plateau Wind Project proceeds, there will be a constant flow of truck traffic that will impact our way of life and create hardships for the people on South Line B. As you are well aware, it takes about 200 trucks per turbine and there are 11 turbines proposed for this area. It is common knowledge that truckers are paid by the load and thus have no incentive to be cautious while driving down our rural gravel roads.  

I have brought the matter of speeding trucks on our road to the attention of Council and noted the prevalence of many Mennonite vehicles as well as children and adults who use the road to visit neighbours or just go for a leisurely walk. Vehicles travelling at excessive and illegal speeds, flinging stones, spewing up dust, and disregarding local vehicle and pedestrian rights is an unacceptable and dangerous situation that must be addressed by those elected to “serve and protect” our community.  

Thank you for considering the legitimate concerns of your ratepayers.  

Virginia Stewart Love  
Cc: Grey County Council  
Grey County TAPS Committee  

Municipality of Grey Highlands  
SEP 1 2010  

RECEIVED