

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA

REPORT NO. DS-2016-0029

**FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF
COUNCIL**

APRIL 20, 2016

**SUBJECT: TOWN OF GEORGINA PROPOSED OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2016
FILE NO. 02.180**

1. RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. That Council receive Report No. DS-2016-0029 prepared by the Planning Division, dated April 20, 2016, respecting the Town of Georgina Proposed Official Plan, April 2016.**
- 2. That Council pass a by By-law, which adopts the Town of Georgina Proposed Official Plan, April 2016, and which repeals the existing 2002 Town of Georgina Official Plan, as amended, save and except the following Secondary Plans, as amended: Sutton/Jackson's Point Secondary Plan; Keswick Business Park Secondary Plan; Keswick Secondary Plan, and; Pepperlaw Secondary Plan.**
- 3. That the Clerk provide notice of Official Plan adoption as prescribed under the Planning Act and to all interested parties, and submit the adopted Official Plan and accompanying supporting materials to the Regional Municipality of York for review and approval.**
- 4. That the Clerk forward a copy of Report No. DS-2016-0029 to Valerie Shuttleworth, Chief Planner, for the Regional Municipality of York and Mike Walters, Chief Administrative Officer, for the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority.**

2. PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to outline the revisions made to the Draft Official Plan, April 2015 and to recommend that Council adopt the Proposed Official Plan, April 2016.

Please note that due to the size of the proposed Official Plan, it has not been included as an attachment to this report. Rather, the document has been circulated to Council and Department Heads, as well as to the Advocate and Georgina Post under separate cover. The proposed Official Plan can also be viewed on the Town's website at <https://www.georgina.ca/living-here/planning-and-development/official-plan-and-secondary-plans/official-plan-update>. Furthermore, an edited version

showing changes made to the Draft Official Plan can also be viewed on the Town's website.

3. BACKGROUND:

The Planning Act requires local Official Plans to be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that the Official Plan:

- Conforms with the upper-tier Official Plan (York Region);
- Conforms with, or does not conflict with, Provincial Plans (Greenbelt Plan, 2005 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2006, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, 2009);
- Has regard to matters of Provincial Interest under Section 2 of the Planning Act; and
- Is consistent with Provincial Policy Statements (PPS, 2014).

On October 25, 2012 Council authorized staff to commence a review of the Town's Official Plan in relation to all of the lands and waters in Georgina outside of the Secondary Plan areas (Secondary Plan areas include Keswick, Keswick Business Park, Sutton/Jackson's Point and Pefferlaw). A map displaying the study area is included as Attachment 1.

In September 2013, the Town retained the firm MHBC Planning, Urban Design and Landscape Architecture to undertake the Official Plan Review (OPR), in conjunction with Town planning staff. The Review was also guided by a Council appointed Steering Committee, and assisted by a Technical Advisory Committee. Through the York Info Partnership, York Region Geomatics staff have prepared the schedules/mapping for the Proposed Official Plan.

3.1 Work Plan

The OPR work plan contains 39 tasks and is organized into the following three major phases:

- Phase 1: Background Research and Policy Review
- Phase 2: Policy Development
- Phase 3: Official Plan Preparation

The OPR is now in the last steps of the 3rd phase, being Council adoption of the Plan and submission to the approval authority (York Region). The complete work plan is included as Schedule 2.

3.2 Background Reports

The OPR work plan included the preparation of the following two key background reports:

(i) Planning Policy Review Report

- Prepared in March 2014
- Outlines the upper tier policy documents and major policy priority areas that must be considered during the OPR
- Reviews the Planning Act, Provincial Policy Statement, Greenbelt Plan, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, York Region Official Plan
- Major priority policy areas included: Environment, Growth Management, Settlement Areas, Agricultural and Rural Areas, Accessibility, Employment, Housing, Cultural Heritage and Transportation

The Planning Policy Review Report can be found on the Town's website at the following link: (<http://www.georgina.ca/opr-index.aspx#officialplan>).

(ii) Planning Directions Report

- Prepared in June 2014
- Provides recommended direction to address the major policy areas and provides direction to ensure the Official Plan polices related to land use, growth and development meet the current and future needs of the Town, in keeping with the Region's Plan and Provincial Policies/Plans.
- Identifies what updates are required within each section of the Plan

The Planning Directions Report can be viewed on the Town's website at the following link: (<http://www.georgina.ca/opr-index.aspx#officialplan>).

3.3 Public Consultation

Public consultation has been a significant component of the OPR process. The Planning Act outlines the requirements for public consultation when preparing and updating an Official Plan.

It is important to note that the original intent of this project was to update the Official Plan in accordance with Sections 26 and 27 of the Planning Act. However, the required update grew in scale to a point where it would be more efficient to prepare a new Official Plan. As a result, the Official Plan was also required to be prepared under Section 17 of the Planning Act. The required public consultation process under the Planning Act, is as follows:

- Holding a special meeting of Council, open to the public, to discuss the revisions that may be required (Section 26(3) of the Planning Act)
- Holding an Open House for the purpose of giving the public an opportunity to review and ask questions about the information and material made available on the proposed or draft Official Plan (Section 17(16) of the Planning Act)
- Holding a Public Meeting for the purpose of giving the public an opportunity to make representations in respect of the proposed or draft Official Plan (Section 17(15) of the Planning Act)

The Town's public consultation process for the OPR included the above noted Planning Act meeting requirements, as well as additional public consultation meetings, all as outlined below:

Phase 1 of OPR:

- Public Workshop #1 (November 14, 2013)
(Public Workshop Report #1 is available at:
<http://www.georgina.ca/opr-index.aspx#officialplan>)
- Special Public Meeting of Council under the Planning Act (December 11, 2013)
- Two Hamlet Open Houses (Udora – January 22, 2014 and Egypt – January 27, 2014)
(Open House Events Report is available at:
<http://www.georgina.ca/opr-index.aspx#officialplan>)

Phase 2 of OPR:

- Public Workshop #2 (March 24, 2014)
(Public Workshop Report #2 is available at:
<http://www.georgina.ca/opr-index.aspx#officialplan>)

Phase 3 of OPR:

- Open House under the Planning Act (May 21, 2015)
- Public Meeting of Council under the Planning Act (October 14, 2015)

In addition to the above noted public consultation sessions, there were also 5 Technical Advisory Committee meetings and 6 Steering Committee meetings that took place throughout the OPR process.

Staff also consulted with Sheri Taylor, Consultant Worker, from the Chippewas of Georgina Island. Staff provided Ms. Taylor with the final proposed policies that were related to the Chippewas of Georgina Island for their review and comment. To date, staff have not received any comments.

Letters were also sent to the owners of lands that contain site-specific land use designations or existing Lakeshore Residential Area designated properties that are proposed to be revised in the Official Plan, in order to allow them the opportunity to provide comments on these proposed revisions.

3.4 Draft Official Plan

As part of the process in preparing the Draft Official Plan, 32 written submissions were received. A summary of these submissions and staff's recommendations are included in Attachment 3. To review these written submissions, please refer to Report No. PB-2015-0025. The Draft Official Plan was authorized by Council to be released on April 8, 2015 for formal agency circulation and review, and for public review and comment. The minutes from the April 8, 2015 Council meeting are included as Attachment 4.

A deadline date for the submission of comments was established for July 31, 2015. Planning staff brought Report No. PB-2015-0073 to Council on October 14, 2015 that outlined the comments received on the Draft Official Plan. 30 written submissions were included in this report. The minutes from the October 14, 2015 Council meeting are included as Attachment 5.

Despite the July 31, 2015 submission deadline, staff have continued to receive and accept comments throughout the OPR process. Since the October 14, 2015 Council meeting, an additional 18 written submissions have been received and reviewed by staff, in consultation with the Town's consultant, the Steering Committee, and key agencies (Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority and York Region) as required. As discussed in more detail below, all of the comments received on the Draft Official Plan have been considered, and revisions have been made in order to produce a proposed Official Plan that is now being recommended for adoption by Council.

4. ANALYSIS:

4.1 Analysis of Comments Received on Draft Official Plan

A total of 48 written submissions were received from the public, agencies and private landowners/agents on the Draft Official Plan. Please refer to Report PB-2015-0073 to review the 30 written submissions that were submitted before the deadline and discussed at the October 14, 2015 Public Meeting of Council. The 18 written

submissions that were received after the July 31, 2015 submission deadline are included in Attachment 6.

The total 48 written submissions have been analyzed and broken down into 328 comments, which are summarized in the tables provided in Attachments 7 and 8. Attachment 7 contains comments that were received prior to the July 31, 2015 submission deadline and which were included in Staff Report PB-2015-0073. Attachment 8 lists the comments received after the July 31, 2015 deadline. The last column in the tables summarizes comments/recommendations as proposed by staff. It should also be noted that when Attachment 7 was included in Staff Report PB-2015-0073, there were several submissions/comments listed as being under staff review. The recommendations for these have now been incorporated into the table.

The 328 specific comments can be categorized into the following general themes:

1	Changes to goals, objectives or policies	228
2	Mapping changes	37
3	Minor editorial changes, typos and small-scale mapping corrections	50
4	Other (general comments not resulting in an action)	13
TOTAL		328

The following provides a summary of the comments received after the submission deadline:

Provincial Comments

Through the One-Window Provincial Planning Service, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) circulated the Draft Official Plan to the Ontario Growth Secretariat (OGS) of MMAH and to the following Ministries: Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs; Natural Resources and Forestry; Environment and Climate Change; Tourism, Culture and Sport, and; Transportation, for comments.

The One-Window comments provided from the MMAH were included as an addendum item at the October 14, 2015 Council meeting. Due to the timing of when the submission was received, an analysis of the Province's comments was not included in the staff report for the October 14, 2015 Council meeting. A summary of the comments and staff's associated response is now outlined in Comments 2-76 in Attachment 8.

Overall, staff do not have any significant issues with the comments provided by the MMAH. Many of the comments were similar to those provided by York Region and involved incorporating additional policies from the York Region Official Plan. Other

suggested revisions included providing clarification on particular policies, as well as the addition of policies to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 and conform to Provincial Plans. A few mapping revisions and technical comments were also provided. The suggested revisions have all been incorporated into the proposed Official Plan, with the exception of a few comments. These comments were either recommended by York Region to not be included (i.e. Comment 18) or staff felt they were not necessary to be included (i.e. Comment 67). The incorporation of the suggested revisions by MMAH has had the effect of enhancing the Plan due to clarification being provided on a number of policies and also better reflecting the policies in the York Region Official Plan, Provincial Policy Statement and the Provincial Plans.

Public Comments

Comments 1 (a-c), 77, 81-85, 89-91, 91 (a-u), and 92-93 in Attachment 8 were provided by members of the general public and/or their respective agents. These included submissions regarding specific properties, as well as more general submissions regarding policy matters, mapping and general submissions. A summary of each comment is provided in Attachment 8.

There are a few submissions made by members of the public that warrant more detailed discussion in this report. These submissions and resulting actions in the Official Plan are incorporated within Section 4.2 of this report.

Internal Department Comments

Comment 78 (a-l) in Attachment 8 was provided by the Development Engineering Division. Various suggestions were offered, including minor edits, mapping revisions and adding policy language in particular sections, such as permit requirements for water taking and clarification on rights-of-ways.

Other Agency Comments

Comment 80 in Attachment 8 was provided by Bell Canada who requested that the Official Plan provide clarification on particular terms and to also include two new definitions.

Comment 87 in Attachment 8 refers to a letter provided by the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority. The letter speaks to not being supportive of the lands within the Keswick Business Park Study Area (KBPSA) being incorporated into the settlement boundary. The KBPSA is further discussed in Section 4.2 of this report.

York Region Comments

Previous comments from York Region are summarized in Attachment 7 and discussed further in Staff Report PB 2015-0073. However, since this time, York Region provided an additional comment (Comment 86 in Attachment 8) relating to source water protection and complete application requirements.

4.2 Additional Revisions made to the Draft Official Plan

The following outlines the significant changes or updates that have been made to the Draft Official Plan in order to produce the Proposed Official Plan.

Guiding Principles and Objectives

- Including additional sustainability objectives related to climate change and low impact development
- Including additional objectives related to promoting agri-tourism uses and supporting communication technologies

Growth Management

- Policy added to state that the Town will complete and adopt an intensification strategy, as required by the York Region Official Plan
- Policy added to establish intensification targets and policies to help ensure a minimum of 40% of all residential development in York Region is to occur in the built up area, as required by the York Region Official Plan
- Employment growth forecast has been updated to reflect no employment numbers in the Keswick Business Park for 2016

General Land Use and Development

- Permitting communication/telecommunication facilities and utilities, electricity generation facilities and broadband fibre optics in all land use designations
- Additional policies to provide guidance on the specific circumstances when development may be permitted in areas that are subject to flooding
- New policy to direct development away from lands that are unsafe for development due to the presence of hazardous forest types for wildland fire
- New policy regarding development on or adjacent to lands affected by oil, gas and salt hazards or petroleum resource operations
- Further direction provided on whether the Minimum Distance Separation Formulae would be applied in certain circumstances
- Additional policy to permit a new or expansion of an existing mineral aggregate operation as an interim use, subject to various conditions

- New policy to outline submission requirements for Municipal Council Support Resolutions under the Feed-in-Tariff and Large Renewable Procurement Programs

Sustainable Natural Environment

- The Environmental Protection Area designation subsection has been moved from Section 6 – Countryside Area to Section 5 – Sustainable Natural Environment in order to organize all environmental policies in one section. This suggestion was requested by Ducks Unlimited Canada
- New policy to clarify that when permitted by the underlying land use designation, existing and new agricultural, agricultural-related and secondary uses and normal farm practices are permitted on lands within the Greenlands System
- Additional policies added to conform to Lake Simcoe Protection Plan
- Additional policies added regarding Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas and Ecologically Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas
- New subsections created for “Subwatershed Planning” and “Ecological Offsetting.” Proposed policies were provided by the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority

Countryside Area

Agricultural Area and Specialty Crop Area

- Policies expanded to permit agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses (subject to the provisions of the Zoning By-law)
- Policy that allowed for minor refinements of the limits or boundary of the Agricultural Protection Area designation has been removed at the request of the Province

Rural Area

- Policies expanded to permit agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses (subject to the provisions of the Zoning By-law)
- New policy to permit outdoor storage facilities for recreational vehicles subject to a Zoning By-law amendment and submission of appropriate studies

Rural Industrial Area, Rural Commercial Area and Commercial Recreation Area

- Policies strengthened to be clear that applications to expand existing designations or the designation of new sites will only be considered after it has been first demonstrated that the proposal is in conformity with the York Region Official Plan and Provincial policies and plans

- New policy that prohibits the designation of new sites in the Agricultural Protection Area and Specialty Crop Area

Parkland Area

- New policy to not permit new Parkland Area uses within the Agricultural Protection Area and Specialty Crop Area designations

Settlement Areas

- New policy to require Secondary Plans to include policies that ensure that ancillary uses on employment lands do not exceed 15% of an employment area, as per the York Region Official Plan.
- Additional policies to require Secondary Plans to further support transit supportive and pedestrian oriented community design measures
- Additional policies added regarding major retail uses being designed to be walkable and transit supportive, as well to require the sites to be designed to support redevelopment and/or retrofitting

Urban Residential Area

The Urban Residential Area designation applies to the Maple Lake Estate lands. The subject lands are identified in Attachment 9. The existing policies in this section remain in the Proposed Official Plan, save and except some technical revisions. The most notable revision in this regard, which was included in the Draft Official Plan, states that any Official Plan amendment application to revise the special provisions for the proposed Maple Lake Estates retirement community shall consider the policies of the Greenbelt Plan, the York Region Official Plan, Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, as amended from time to time, and will be required to consider the functions, attributes and linkages of the significant natural features identified on the schedules of this Plan. Further minor updates have been made, which pertain to referencing the current Ministry names that are noted throughout this Section.

Several submissions have been provided by the North Gwillimbury Forest Alliance to re-designate the lands to the Environmental Protection Area and Rural Area designations as well as to include policies to prohibit the approved development. These submissions were included and discussed in Staff Reports PB-2015-0025 and PB-2015-0073.

In summary, the Urban Residential Area designation and associated policies are maintained in the proposed Official Plan, as the Greenbelt Plan and York Region Official Plan currently recognize and permit the approved Maple Lake Estates development. In this regard, York Region, by letter, dated February 14, 2013 and

included as Attachment 10, indicates that York Region's transition policies along with the pertinent Greenbelt Plan transition provisions, recognize the current Georgina Official Plan and zoning approvals, and provide for the development of the site in accordance with these approvals.

This interpretation of the York Region Official Plan is significant since the Planning Act requires the Town to conform with the upper-tier Official Plan. Section 27(1) of the Planning Act states:

"The Council of a lower-tier municipality shall amend every official plan and every by-law passed under section 34, or a predecessor of it, to conform with a plan that comes into effect as the official plan of the upper-tier municipality."

In addition to this, Section 27(4) of the Planning Act states:

"In the event of a conflict between the official plan of an upper-tier municipality and the official plan of the upper-tier municipality, the plan of the upper-tier municipality prevails to the extent of the conflict but in all other respects of the official plan of the lower-tier municipality remains in effect."

The Greenbelt Plan, 2005 and York Region Official Plan have to be amended first to prohibit the approved development in order for the Town's Official Plan to be amended.

Keswick Business Park Study Area

As part of the Ontario Municipal Board's approval of the settlement of the appeal of the Keswick Business Park Secondary Plan in 2008, the Keswick Business Park Study Area (KBPSA) overlay designation and associated policies were permitted to remain on certain lands located north of Ravenshoe Road and west of Woodbine Avenue. The KBPSA overlay is shown on Attachment 11.

With the exception of the property right at the north east corner of Woodbine Avenue and Ravenshoe Road, the lands within the KBPSA are within a floodplain, and in the Greenbelt Plan's Natural Heritage System (NHS) designation. These lands were originally part of the Town's study area for the Keswick Business Park Secondary Plan, however, as a result of most of these lands being in the floodplain, they were removed from the study area.

Section 9.4.7.4.2 (b) of the Keswick Business Park Secondary Plan states that those landowners within the KBPSA may further pursue the development potential on the subject lands with the appropriate authorities. The policy continues to state that the Town will only consider a further Official Plan amendment to permit the development of these lands when there is a clear delineation of development

potential on the lands, and approval is obtained by the Town, York Region and the Conservation Authority.

MMM Group, representing the landowner of 2354 Ravenshoe Road, undertook a floodplain analysis to determine if a portion of their client's lands are outside the floodplain or could be removed from the floodplain. The subject property is shown on Attachment 12. Discussions regarding the floodplain have been ongoing with MMM Group and the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority. To date, the Conservation Authority have given no indication that the lands can be considered as being outside the floodplain.

MMM Group has since made requests to include all of the lands within the KBPSA into the Town's settlement area boundary. The previous submission letters are included in Staff Report PB-2015-0073. A more recent submission was provided on October 14, 2015 and is included in Attachment 6 (Item 5). The letter provides a summary of the reports submitted and further requests the inclusion of all the lands in the KBPSA into the settlement area boundary through the OPR process. This request was also made by the landowner of 22869 Woodbine Avenue, which is also within the KBPSA. This submission is also included in Attachment 6 (Item 11).

Planning staff have reviewed all the studies submitted as part of this request. The report findings and additional correspondence from MMM Group state that there may be an approximate 1.32 hectare developable area along the Ravenshoe Road frontage. A map of the constraints and the proposed developable area is included as Attachment 13.

The studies show that there are extensive natural heritage features in the study area, including a provincially significant wetland and unevaluated wetland. The lands also contain a significant flood prone area and are also within the NHS of the Greenbelt Plan. Section 3.2.2(6) of the Greenbelt Plan states that:

"At the 20-year Greenbelt Plan review period, modest settlement area expansions may be possible for Towns/Villages, provided the proposed growth:

(d) does not extend into the natural heritage system"

However, Section 3.2.2(6) of the Greenbelt Plan states that:

"When Official Plans are brought into conformity with this Plan, the boundaries of the NHS may be refined, with greater precision, in a manner that is consistent with this Plan and the system shown on Schedule 4."

The Greenbelt Plan therefore, does not permit settlement area expansions into the NHS and only allows for minor refinements.

Staff are of the opinion that it is contrary to the Greenbelt Plan to incorporate all of the lands within the KBPSA into the settlement area boundary, as there is no justification to refine limits of the NHS. Furthermore, even if the 1.32 hectare parcel could potentially be developed (i.e. removed from the floodplain), the limited size of the land area could only accommodate uses such as a small retail plaza or office. The Keswick Business Park is intended to be a key regional employment centre and incorporating a relatively large area of undevelopable land into the settlement boundary to accommodate a retail development or small office would not assist in providing significant employment opportunities. In addition to this, there is currently ample land designated in the Keswick Secondary Plan to accommodate retail/commercial type uses, and it would be premature to designate this land for such uses at this time.

The Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority has also provided a letter indicating that they do not support the request due to the applicants not demonstrating conformity with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and Greenbelt Plan, and consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement. This letter is included as Attachment 14.

In addition to this, the submitted studies have not demonstrated that development can be serviced in a cost effective manner.

The landowners have both requested that, at a minimum, the KBPSA overlay designation remain on the lands. However, the current Official Plan states that the overlay designation and policy framework will be reconsidered during the five-year review of the Official Plan. In consideration of this policy and the work that has been completed by one of the landowners in the KBPSA, it is now appropriate to make a recommendation on the KBPSA, as part of the OPR process. It is therefore being recommended that the KBPSA overlay designation and associated policies be removed from the Official Plan. Discussions have also been held with staff at York Region who are in agreement with the recommendation to remove the KBPSA overlay designation and associated policies.

In regards to 2354 Ravenshoe Road, staff are proposing that the portion of lands outside the constraints identified on Attachment 13 be placed in the Rural Area designation, which generally coincides with the Rural Area designation in the York Region Official Plan. The remainder of the property is proposed to be designated Environmental Protection Area. The property located at 22869 Woodbine Avenue, identified on Attachment 15, is proposed to be placed in a Rural Area designation as well, as there is an existing single detached dwelling on the site and an absence of environmental features.

Healthy and Complete Communities

Housing

- A policy has been expanded to consider minor variances for accessory apartments that do not comply with the zoning provisions, when appropriately justified
- Policy added to ensure sufficient parking is available to accommodate a garden suite

Recreation and Parkland

- Policies expanded to include details on parkland classification.

Community Facilities

- New policy to locate public service facilities in community hubs and to support efficient site design measures, where appropriate

Community Design

- New policy to indicate that building and site design should be conducted in such a manner to increase resiliency and promote adaption in order to reduce climate change impacts
- New policy to indicate that proposed new public and private developments shall put forth best efforts to incorporate York Region's New Communities Guidelines

Sustainability

- New section created to assist the Town in achieving increased environmental, cultural, social and economic sustainability
- Policies speak to consideration of an Integrated Community Sustainability Plan, achieving long term economic prosperity and supporting the York Region Sustainability Strategy
- Subsections created on sustainable buildings and climate change

Servicing and Infrastructure

Transportation

- Inclusion of regional transportation policies that address trip reduction, transit-oriented development guidelines and transportation demand management

Sanitary Sewage and Water Supply Services

- Policy expanded to state that the development of Maple Lake Estates is also subject to the availability and assignment of municipal water and sanitary sewer servicing allocation pursuant to an agreement between the Town and the landowner

Stormwater Management

- New subsection created on low impact development to indicate requirements for when a Low Impact Development Evaluation would be required
- Additional policies surrounding low impact development strategies

Communication Technology

- New section created to encourage leading-edge communication technologies within the built up area
- Policy included to encourage hydro, telephone and other communication services to locate in the road right-of-way where possible

Development Review

Pre-Consultation and Submission Requirements

- Additional studies/information have been listed under the potential submission requirements

Implementation

Implementing By-law

- New policy to indicate that the Town may consider the establishment of a Development Permit System to replace individual zoning, site plan and minor variance applications

Plan of Subdivision/Condominium

- New policy to require various measures to be incorporated into subdivision agreements as per the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan

Consents

- Policies have been reworded to provide clarification as to when a severance of a residence surplus to a farming operation may be permitted

Site Plan Control

- Policy speaking to site plan control exemptions has been removed as it will be addressed in the Site Plan Control By-law
- Policy added to require plans and drawings for residential buildings containing less than 25 units
- New policy to require various measures to be incorporated into site plan agreements as per the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan

Decision Making

- New subsection created that speaks to the Town taking a collaborative approach in the decision making process through coordinating, where appropriate, with York Region, agencies, ministries, the Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation and internal Town departments.

Site Specific Policies

Staff have received submissions from 3 landowners requesting that their property be designated as Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area to allow for development. Staff have reviewed these requests as part of the Official Plan Review process and are of the opinion that a more detailed analysis of the properties is required before recommending they be placed into the Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area designation. The properties require additional studies, including an Environmental Impact Study, to determine the development potential, if any, of the lands.

Existing and proposed Official Plan policies require that any expansion of the Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area designation shall only be considered as part of a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). Since staff have considered these properties as part of this OPR process, all 3 properties have been provided with a special provision in the section that corresponds with the land use designation on the property. The special provision states that the property was considered as part of this review process and that an application to consider the appropriateness of amending the Official Plan with respect to the creation of one or more lots may proceed, and shall be subject to the relevant policies setting out the studies. The properties subject to this special provision are identified on Schedule 16.

Staff also re-considered a request received prior to the release of the Draft Official Plan (Comment 4 in Attachment 3) in order to determine whether there is merit to

also include a similar special provision that would allow the landowner to proceed with an application for some development on the property (1794 Metro Road North). The subject property is displayed on Schedule 17. Staff are maintaining the previous recommendation to not support the request, as there is a large permanent drainage ditch running across the frontage of the property. The property is also entirely within the Greenlands System and is heavily wooded.

A special provision has also been added to the Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area section as a result of a public submission (Item 9 in Attachment 8) requesting that the Official Plan recognize the existing accessory apartment in a detached garage located at 326 Deer Park Drive. The special provision permits the use, since the Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area does not allow accessory apartments in detached structures. The accessory apartment has been in existence for several years and no complaints have been received from the Town's Municipal Law Enforcement Division. The subject property is included as Attachment 18.

Schedule Revisions

There have been a number of revisions made to the Schedules that are included within the Proposed Official Plan. The majority of the revisions are not significant and consist of minor amendments such as enhancing colours, increasing the font of road names etc. A summary of the more significant revisions are outlined below:

- Schedule A1 – The entire Georgina and Regional boundary is now displayed
- Schedule A2 - Renewable energy systems with a nameplate capacity of 10 mW or greater are now identified for information purposes, as requested in a public submission
- Schedules A2, A2 East - The Rural Commercial designation at Woodbine and Baseline Road has been revised to remove the provincially significant wetland and floodplain on the property
- Schedules A2, A2 West - Removal of Community Improvement Plan schedule due to a new policy that allows for the future designation of a Community Improvement Project Area by by-law, within any portion of the municipality
- Schedules A2, D - 1 Isleview Road has been designated from Lakeshore Residential Area to Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area. This change is the result of a public request that brought attention to the fact that the property is currently on municipal services
- Schedules A2, B1 and B2 (and all associated east and west maps) – Updated wetland mapping that has been received from the MNRF has been incorporated into the relevant schedules
- Schedules A2, D – The top 1/3 of the Town lands (former Sedore Farm property) has been placed in the Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area with the remainder of the property being placed in a Rural designation. The Draft Official Plan displays the entire property in the Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area

- Schedules A2, A2 West – The existing agricultural designation adjacent to the Orchard Golf Course has been refined to now include it in the Commercial Recreation Area designation.
- Schedule A2, A2 West - The KBSPA overlay designation has been removed and appropriate designation changes have been made to 2354 Ravenshoe Road and 22869 Woodbine Avenue, as discussed in Section 4.2 of this report
- Schedules A2 West, A2 East, D and E2 – The Town roads along the lakeshore areas have been labelled
- Schedules A2 and A2 West - The Rural Industrial Area designations that are located on the west side of Warden Avenue (between Glenwoods Avenue and Ravenshoe Road) were in the incorrect locations and have been revised appropriately
- Schedules B2, B2 East and B2 West – Subwatershed areas are now identified on these schedules
- Schedules B3, B3 East and B3 West – Ecologically Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas are now identified
- Schedule E - Pollock Road between Warden Avenue and McCowan Road is now identified as a collector road rather than a local road
- Schedule E - The width of the line displaying the planned transportation corridor has been scaled back in size to more appropriately reflect the 200 metre corridor
- Schedule E - The future EA approved interchanges along the planned transportation corridor have been added
- Schedules A2 Lakeshore Areas West and East - Two new maps have been created that enlarge the lakeshore areas
- Schedule E2 – Private roads are now displayed
- Schedule E3 – New schedule created to display the south-east part of Town to further identify private roads
- Schedule F - Additional cycling routes and cycling gateways have been included
- Schedule F - The Lake to Lake corridor has been revised to display the correct alignment
- Schedule I – A new special provisions Schedule has been created, which lists each special provision section number and their corresponding location

One further revision that has been made to the Schedules warrants discussion in this report. Comment 198 on Schedule 7 indicates that a portion of the property located at 25 High Gwillim Drive did not contain a land use designation on the A2 – Land Use Plan and should be included in the Keswick Secondary Plan, as currently depicted on the existing Official Plan schedules. Upon further analysis, staff have determined that the Keswick Secondary Plan does not include this land parcel within the Secondary Plan boundary. Attachment 19 displays this property on Schedule F1 – Keswick Land Use Plan in the Keswick Secondary Plan, and Schedule 20 displays this property on the Schedule A – Land Use Plan in the 2002 Official Plan.

Following the analysis, it became apparent that the parent Official Plan schedules did not correctly display the Keswick Secondary Plan overlay, as it reveals a portion of the property to be within the boundary, when it is clear it should be within the parent Official Plan. While this portion of the property was not specifically assigned a land use designation, it is reasonable that Section 8 - Interpretation, specifically Subsection 8.1.1 Land Use Boundaries and Roads be used to determine the designation. The policy states that:

"It is intended that the boundaries of land use designations on Schedule A – Land Use Plan be considered as approximate and exact only where bounded by roads, railways, rivers or streams or other similar geographic demarcations. It is also intended that the location of proposed roads, as indicated on Schedule I, Roads Plan, be considered as approximate and not exact."

Since the land use designations are considered approximate and the surrounding land use designations, as identified on Schedule A – Land Use Plan are in the Rural Area designation, the property would therefore take on the abutting Rural Area designation.

The York Region Official Plan, 2010 has also not correctly displayed the Keswick Secondary Plan overlay boundary, as the parent Official Plan was used to display the overlay. As a result, the Region's Plan displays the same portion of the property in the Urban Area designation. However, Section 8.4(3) of the York Region Official Plan states:

"That the boundaries and facilities identified on Maps 1 to 12 are intended to indicate the general location. Exact boundaries shall be defined in local official plans and zoning by-laws, except in the following cases:

a. the boundary of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Greenbelt Plan. In this case, the boundary may only be clarified through reference to the applicable Provincial Regulations; and,

b. the boundaries of the Urban Area identified on Map 1, are fixed where they are identified by a municipal street, rail line, parcel fabric as it exists on the day of adoption of this Plan, lot and/or concession blocks, or, other clearly identifiable physical features."

Staff have confirmed with York Region that this policy would apply in this situation, and since there are no identifiable physical features surrounding the property boundaries, the exact designation boundaries would be defined in the local Official Plan. Therefore, this parcel of land would require a land use designation in the Proposed Official Plan. Since the surrounding land use designations in the Regional Plan are in an Agricultural Area designation, staff have recommended that

this portion of the property be placed in the Agricultural Protection Area designation in the Proposed Official Plan. York Region is also in agreement with this.

It is also important to note that several comments were received from a resident, Sylviette Rita Brown, located at 23621 Park Road regarding errors in the Schedules. The majority of the alleged errors are in relation to the key features and natural hazards mapping. As all of the environmental mapping came from either York Region (as confirmed in their Official Plan) or the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority or other Provincial sources, Town staff believe this information is the most up to date and accurate information. Notwithstanding, the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority is currently reviewing these comments and, if any required revisions are noted, these can be made during York Region's review and approval process.

4.3 Proposed Official Plan

Staff have prepared the Proposed Official Plan that includes the revisions discussed in Section 4.1 of this Report. Steering Committee members were provided with a copy of the Proposed Official Plan for their review and comment. A Steering Committee meeting was held on March 8, 2016 and Committee members were in agreement that the Proposed Official Plan be submitted to Council for adoption. The following resolution was passed:

"Be it resolved that the Official Plan Review Steering Committee hereby support and approve the proposed Official Plan as presented this day as well as any minor inclusions, and the Committee recommends the proposed plan be submitted to Council for approval."

In addition to the Proposed Official Plan, staff have also updated the red-line version copy of the Official Plan (i.e. the version showing the changes made to formulate the Draft Official Plan). All revisions that have been made since the release of the Draft Official Plan have been indicated in green text. This tracked version of the Plan can be viewed on the Town's website at: <https://www.georgina.ca/living-here/planning-and-development/official-plan-and-secondary-plans/official-plan-update>

Finally, staff have also included additional information and illustrations throughout the Plan to assist readers in understanding various topics in the Official Plan.

5. **NEXT STEPS**

Should Council adopt the Proposed Official Plan, the Planning Act requires the Clerk to give notice and to submit it to York Region to review and make a decision in regards to its approval. All supporting material relevant to the Official Plan will

also be provided. York Region may approve, approve with modifications or refuse to approve all or parts of the Official Plan and give a notice of decision. The decision of York Region may be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board by those who made any verbal or written submissions prior to Town Council adopting the Official Plan.

It should also be noted that in the situation that additional comments or information come in following Town Council adoption of the Plan, there is still the ability for York Region to make revisions through their review and approval process, if there is the need to do so.

6. FINANCIAL AND BUDGETARY IMPACT:

There is no financial or budgetary impact resulting from this report.

7. PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND NOTICE REQUIREMENTS:

A discussion regarding the public consultation process for the OPR is included in Section 3.3 of this Report.

It is important to note that this is not a statutory public meeting. In regards to this meeting, notice was mailed to all 238 persons who were listed on the Official Plan Review's interested party list on Thursday, March 31st. An advertisement was also placed in the Advocate on Thursday April 7th and Thursday April 14th, 2016. In addition, the notice was placed on the Town's website on Monday, April 4, 2016.

8. CONCLUSION:

The Draft Official Plan has been revised based on the agency and public comments received since its release on April 8, 2015. The resulting Proposed Official Plan is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the York Region Official Plan and relevant Provincial Plans, and staff are of the opinion that the document represents good planning.

In conclusion, it is therefore respectfully recommended that Council adopt the Proposed Official Plan, April 2016 and repeal the existing 2002 Official Plan, save and except the Secondary Plans, as amended, and submit it to York Region for its review and approval.

Prepared by:

Recommended by:

Andrea Furniss, M.PL, MCIP, RPP
Senior Policy Planner

Harold W. Lenters, M.Sc.PI, MCIP, RPP
Director of Development Services

Approved by:

Winanne Grant, B.A., AMCT, CEMC
Chief Administrative Officer

7 April 2016

Attachment 1 – OPR Study Area

Attachment 2 – Work Plan

Attachment 3 – Summary of submissions received prior to the release of the Draft Official Plan

Attachment 4 – April 8, 2015 Council meeting minutes

Attachment 5 – October 14, 2015 Council meeting minutes

Attachment 6 – Written submissions received after submission deadline

Attachment 7 – Comments received prior to submission deadline

Attachment 8 – Comments received after submission deadline

Attachment 9 – Location map: Maple Lake Estates

Attachment 10 – York Region letter, dated February 14, 2013

Attachment 11 – Keswick Business Park Study Area Overlay

Attachment 12 – Location map: 2354 Ravenshoe Road

Attachment 13 – 2354 Ravenshoe Road - Constraints

Attachment 14 – January 22, 2016 LSRCA Letter

Attachment 15 – Location map: 22869 Woodbine Avenue

Attachment 16 – Map displaying property locations subject to Special Provisions

Attachment 17 – Location map: 1794 Metro Road North

Attachment 18 – Location map: 326 Deer Park Drive

Attachment 19 – Keswick Secondary Plan Schedule F1 – Land Use Plan: 25 High Gwillim Dr.

Attachment 20 – 2002 Official Plan Schedule A2 – Land Use Plan: 25 High Gwillim Dr.

 Lands affected by Official Plan Update

0 0.5 1 2
Kilometres

L a k e S i m c o e

Georgina Island

Fox Island

Snake Island

SUTTON /
JACKSON'S POINT

PEPPERLAW

Keswick
Business
Park

KESWICK

Report No. DS-2016-0029
Attachment '1'
Pages 1 of 1

TASKS

BACKGROUND RESEARCH AND POLICY REVIEW

- 1 Start-up TAC Meeting #1
- 2 Prepare Base Maps
- 3 Upper Tier Policy Review
- 4 Growth and Development
- 5 Natural Features Mapping
- 6 Start-up Steering Committee Mtg #1 & TAC Mtg #2
- 7 Initial Discussions with Agricultural, Environmental & Heritage Committees
- 8 Public Workshop #1 Vision /Guiding Principles/Objectives
- 9 Sec.26 (3) Special Public Meeting of Council/Report
- 10 Hamlet Open Houses
- 11 Planning Policy Review (Draft Report)
- 12 TAC Mtg #3 and Steering Committee Mtg #2

POLICY DEVELOPMENT

- 13 Public Workshop #2
- 14 Economic Development, Environmental, Heritage & Agricultural Committees
- 15 Site Specific Designation Review
- 16 Update Report to Council/Planning Policy Review (Final Report)
- 17 Environmental/Natural Heritage Features
- 18 Shoreline Development
- 19 Agriculture and Rural Resources
- 20 Rural Settlements and Pefferlaw SP Boundary Review
- 21 Draft Policy Directions Report
- 22 Steering Committee Mtg #3
- 23 Final Policy Directions Report

OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT PREPARATION

- 24 Guiding Principles and Objectives
- 25 Official Plan Schedules/Land Use Policies
- 26 First Draft of OP Amendment
- 27 Steering Committee Mtg #4 and TAC Mtg #4
- 28 Agricultural, Environmental & Heritage Advisory Com. Review
- 29 Second Draft of OP Amendment
- 30 Report to Council to Approve Release of Draft OPA
- 31 Agency Circulation
- 32 Sec.17(16) Open House
- 33 TAC Mtg #5
- 34 Prepare Third Draft of OP Amendment
- 35 Sec. 17(15) Statutory Public Meeting
- 36 Steering Committee Meeting #5
- 37 Prepare Final Amendment
- 38 Council Meeting to Adopt Final Amendment
- 39 Submit Final Documents to Approval Authority

Official Plan Review - Written Submissions

No.	Date	Contact	Property	Comments	Recommendation
1	10-May-12	Louis & Richard Hui 235 Yorkmills Rd. North York, ON	5692 Smith Blvd.	Request to include property within Baldwin Hamlet boundary	Portion of property included in Baldwin Hamlet boundary
2	08-Nov-13	Anthony Usher Planning Consultant (for North Gwillimbury Forest Alliance) 146 Laird Dr. Suite 105 Toronto, ON M4G 3V7 (416) 425-5964 auplan@bellnet.ca	OP Study Area	Official Plan policies should: a) prohibit development in wetlands within the North Gwillimbury Forest (NGF) lands b) prohibit development in woodlands within the NGF that are determined to be significant based on the criteria in the Regional Plan c) provide clear direction to ensure that the Zoning By-law will be amended to conform to these policies d) no exemptions from these policies beyond what is required by the York Region Official Plan e) extend Official Plan policies to protect all wetlands and significant woodlands through out the review area	The Official Plan includes a Greenlands System and Environmental Protection Area designation and policies that implements the York Region Official Plan, Greenbelt Plan and Lake Simcoe Protection Plan
3	02-Dec-13	Dave Mowat Community Consultation Specialist Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation dmowat@scugogfirstnation.com	OP Study Area	Town should adhere to the archaeological management planning process undertaken by York Region	Policies addressing Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 6 for lands that contain archaeological potential have been included in the OP A new policy has also been incorporated into the OP stating that the York Region Archaeological Management Plan should be consulted as a resource to identify and conserve archaeological resources
4	04-Dec-13	Grant Morris Grant Morris Associates Ltd. 397 Sheppard Ave. Pickering, ON L1V 1E6	1794 Metro Road North	Include property for development in whole or in part, or do not make a decision until the Environmental Impact Study currently being undertaken is completed	Do not support incorporating any portion of the property into the service area boundary or permitting development on private services (property is entirely in the Greenlands System and the majority of the property is in the proposed Environmental Protection Area designation) of the OP. A large permanent drainage ditch is also present.
5	10-Dec-13	Howard Friedman HBR Planning Centre 66 Prospect Street, Unit A Newmarket, ON L3Y 3S9	OP Study Area	No specific requests were made. General comments included an interest in the Official Plan Review, particularly any policies speaking to providing a basis for the Secondary Plan areas and the incorporation of Greenbelt Plan policies and its impact on infrastructure	Policies have been incorporated into the OP regarding policies that should be included in Secondary Plans. The Greenbelt Plan's infrastructure policies have also been incorporated into the DOP
6	11-Dec-13	Keith MacKinnon KLM Planning Partners Inc. (for Metrus Development) 64 Jardin Dr., Unit 1B	Maple Lake Estates (MLE)	Existing development rights should continue to be recognized as part of the OP Review	The Urban Residential Designation will remain, as it conforms with the York Region Official Plan and the Greenbelt Plan. However, there has been one change made to the associated policies, which now indicates that any Official Plan amendment application to revise the special provisions for the proposed Maple Lake Estates planned retirement community shall consider the policies of the Greenbelt Plan, York Region Official Plan, Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and the Lake Simcoe Protection

No.	Date	Contact	Property	Comments	Recommendation
					Plan as amended from time to time, and will be required to consider the functions, attributes and linkages of the significant natural features as identified on the Schedules of this Official Plan (previous policy referenced the Town's Natural Features and Greenlands System Study, 1996)
7	11-Dec-13	Margaret Downes 79 Polva Promenade Udora, ON L0C 1L0	Polva Promenade Udora	Town should improve private lanes that have been abandoned by their original developers and should be, at a minimum, improved to the status of "unassumed road", similar to Estonian Rd.	The Town will be undertaking a study of the unassumed roads in the Town.
8	20-Dec-13	Anthony Usher Planning Consultant (for NGFA) 146 Laird Dr. Suite 105 Toronto, ON M4G 3V7 (416) 425-5964 auplan@bellnet.ca	OP Study Area MLE Lands	<p>Maple Lake Estates exchange - any new alternative should be reviewed against PPS policy 1.1.3.9, Growth Plan policy 2.2.8 and YR OP policy 5.1.12</p> <p>Equivalent approvals should be for lands in Keswick and if not then abutting Keswick</p> <p>1) How do the Town and MHBC propose to address the prospective MLE exchange within the OP Review?</p> <p>2) What steps will be taken to ensure that within the OP review, the consideration of alternative locations is not limited to the lands identified by Metrus, and also includes other options in or abutting Keswick?</p> <p>3) Within the OP Review, when and how do the Town and MHBC propose to inform the public about the current populations of, and updated population allocations among the various centres and areas?</p>	<p>The Official Plan Review does not deal with any land development rights exchanges. A land development rights exchange in relation to Maple Lake Estates is an ongoing process between the Town, Province, York Region, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority and other stakeholders. In order to facilitate any development rights exchange, the Greenbelt Plan and the York Region Official Plan must be amended during the review of those documents, before the Town's Official Plan can be amended.</p> <p>The public was informed of current populations of and updated population allocations among the various centres in the Policy Directions Report (which was presented at Council, Public Workshop #2 and at the Hamlet Open Houses). The population distributions for the various areas of the Town to 2031 are also within the OP</p>
10	23-Jan-14	Ken and Joan Rogers jrbefit@gmail.com	Part of Lot 1, Con 5 3588 Ravenshoe	Expand the Ravenshoe Hamlet boundary to the east to Kennedy Road (farm parcel too small)	Not supportive of including property into Ravenshoe Hamlet boundary. Including this property would not be considered minor rounding out, as it is a 48 acres parcel that could be considered a major expansion in the context of the existing size of the Ravenshoe Hamlet. In addition, the Hamlet Open House for Ravenshoe had many public members indicating that they do not want to see significant development
11	11-Feb-14	Stafano Giannini 148 Kenwood Avenue Toronto, ON M6C 2S3 (416) 656-6665 ext.62 (647) 204-0482 sgiannini@irstudio.ca	5692 Smith Blvd.	Similar request to #1 (new landowners) Incorporate portion of lands (15 acres) into Hamlet of Baldwin	Baldwin Hamlet boundary expanded to include portion of property (15 acres). Given the relative size of Baldwin and the existing development pattern, this is considered reasonable minor rounding out.

No.	Date	Contact	Property	Comments	Recommendation
12	24-Feb-14	Anthony Usher auplan@bellnet.ca	OPR Study Area	Population breakdown required for rural, hamlet, shoreline and Maple Lake Estates	Population charts have been revised to provide a further population breakdown of the numbers. These charts are also included in the OP
14	10-Mar-14	Gwendolyn Ward	OPR Study Area	OP policies should incorporate the kinds of lighting that are recommended to reduce/eliminate unnecessary lighting as more development comes into the area	Objective added that speaks to reducing light pollution to preserve the night sky. Policy added that requires studies to determine impacts on night sky where development is proposed in an area that has minimum light levels at night.
15	20-Mar-14	Anthony Usher Planning Consultant 146 Laird Drive Suite 105 Toronto, ON M4G 3V7	OPR Study Area Maple Lake Estates	The best option for an MLE development approvals exchange would be to provide equivalent development approvals on lands owned by Metrus affiliates in South Keswick, over and above the level of residential development currently permitted or contemplated there	The Official Plan Review does not deal with any land development rights exchanges. A land development rights exchange in relation to Maple Lake Estates is an ongoing process between the Town, Province, York Region, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority and other stakeholders. In order to facilitate any development rights exchange, the Greenbelt Plan and the York Region Official Plan must be amended during the review of those documents, before the Town's Official Plan can be amended.
16	21-Mar-14	Gary Foch garyfoch@rogers.com	Business Park Study Area 22869 Woodbine	Prepare policies to allow for this "gateway property" to accommodate anything reasonable on the subject site (i.e. professional office, bank etc.)	The Keswick Business Park Study Area and associated policies will be removed due to floodplain and natural heritage features. Greenbelt Plan also does not permit expansion into the Natural Heritage System. The property is proposed to be in the Rural designation.
17	24-Mar-14	Ron Foster (in-person)	Conc.5, Part of Lot 2	Would like the ability to build a house on property, which is currently not permitted	A dwelling is not permitted on the property due to a zoning restriction that was placed on the property as a condition of a severance that occurred several years ago. A Zoning By-law amendment (and potentially other planning approvals) would be required in order to permit a dwelling on the property.
18	17-Apr-14	Gwendolyn Ward (Comments primarily from discussion with group at public workshop)	OPR Study Area	<p>High standards and policies regarding building permit requirements on residents doing renovations should also apply to developers</p> <p>Prefer a family focus rather than "housing affordability" Focus on attracting families and middle class</p> <p>Not supportive of Town's current policy of acquiring more waterfront (parking issues, current areas can be fixed up first). Residents unsure whether current waterfront parks generate revenue or whether tax payers front the costs</p> <p>Ground maintenance should happen more frequently (weeding, landscaping)</p>	<p>Residents and developers are both subject to the requirements of the Ontario Building Code.</p> <p>Housing affordability policies are required under the Provincial Policy Statement and the York Region Official Plan. Policies focus on providing a range and mix of housing types.</p> <p>Official Plan speaks to acquiring additional waterfront lands where appropriate and economically feasible, in order to service needs of existing and future residents and visitors.</p> <p>This is not an issue that can be addressed in the Official Plan.</p>

No.	Date	Contact	Property	Comments	Recommendation
				No further development on waterfront lands	Proposed policies that speak to development on waterfront lands require strict criteria to be met prior to development in accordance with the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and the Greenbelt Plan.
				Town needs to improve property standards enforcement	This is not an issue that can be addressed in the Official Plan.
				There are no boundaries in nature or in the water and as a result protection of the lake needs to be considered in the built up area as well	Policies have been incorporated from Provincial Plans that provide for a balance between the protection of environmental features and to allow for existing development to continue or potentially expand.
18 Cont.				North Gwillimbury Forest should be kept intact and in regards to the land exchange, new development should be within Keswick and not on a new satellite urban space	The Official Plan Review does not deal with any land development rights exchanges. A land development rights exchange in relation to Maple Lake Estates is an ongoing process between the Town, Province, York Region, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority and other stakeholders. In order to facilitate any development rights exchange, the Greenbelt Plan and the York Region Official Plan must be amended during the review of those documents, before the Town's Official Plan can be amended.
				Need connections between green spaces and the lake	The proposed Official Plan incorporates a Greenlands System that is largely composed of lands that contain key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features. The system also includes other lands that serve as linkages, corridors and adjacent lands.
				Need job creation in the Town but unsure how it will occur without defined goals and concerted efforts to attract the kinds of employers that the public feels would be a good fit Town should focus on projects/future employers who fit with Georgina's unique environment and focus on nature and outdoor spaces, environmental, green building etc. --> should be reflected in the vision	Staff agree that job creation should be a focus but the vision statement is intended to be a general statement of what the Town would like to achieve in the future (does not detail specifics).
19	08-May-14	Anthony Usher	OPR Study Area Maple Lake Estates	Comments on Planning Policy Review Report, particularly in relation to the environmental policies and Maple Lake Estates	Staff and the consultant have reviewed the submission and believe the new Official Plan accurately addresses the upper-tier policy documents in relation to the environmental policies.
20	29-May-14	Anthony Usher	Maple Lake Estates	Comments to support opinion that the best option for a Maple Lake Estates development approvals	The Official Plan Review does not deal with any land development rights exchanges.

No.	Date	Contact	Property	Comments	Recommendation
				exchange would be to provide equivalent approvals on lands owned by Metrus affiliates in South Keswick, over and above the level of residential development currently permitted or contemplated there	A land development rights exchange in relation to Maple Lake Estates is an ongoing process between the Town, Province, York Region, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority and other stakeholders. In order to facilitate any development rights exchange, the Greenbelt Plan and the York Region Official Plan must be amended during the review of those documents, before the Town's Official Plan can be amended.
21	18-Jul-14	Chad B. John-Baptiste (for Sheryl Kotzer) MMM Group Ltd.	Business Park Study Area 2354 Ravenshoe Rd.	Currently revising "Preliminary Floodplain Investigation Report" to LSRCA Support for Town direction to maintain study area to allow time to justify the refinement of the NHS limits Will be providing input into the Greenbelt Plan Review through York Region	The Keswick Business Park Study Area and associated policies will be removed due to floodplain and natural heritage features. The Greenbelt Plan also does not permit expansion into the Natural Heritage System. The portion of the property without constraints is proposed to be in the Rural designation. The remainder of the property is proposed to be in EPA.
22	21-Aug-14	Leo F. Longo (for North Gwillimbury Forest Alliance) Aird & Berlis LLP Brookfield Place 181 Bay Street, Suite 1800, Box 754 Toronto, ON M5J 2T9 llongo@airdberlis.com	OPR Study Area	In order to be in conformity with the York Region Official Plan, the Town must amend its Official Plan to prohibit development on all of the Town's wetlands and significant woodlands including those located on the Maple Lake Estates property in the NGF The protocol utilized by the Town to review site-specific land use designations is flawed and should not be utilized	Staff and the consultant have reviewed the submission and believe the new Official Plan accurately addresses the upper-tier policy documents in relation to the environmental policies. The protocol was supported by the Steering Committee and presented to Council with no changes made.
23	22-Aug-14	Anthony Usher	OPR Study Area Maple Lake Estates	Comments provided on Planning Directions Report (i.e. majority of MLE lands should be in EPA designation, protocol to review site specific designations is flawed)	Staff and the consultant are of the opinion that the existing Urban Residential Area designation conforms with York Region Official Plan and Greenbelt Plan. The protocol was supported by the Steering Committee and presented to Council with no changes made.
24	03-Sep-14	Jim Keenan 23519 Weirs Sideroad P.O. Box 152 L0E 1N0	OPA Study Area	Town required to follow the laws of the Province and adhere to best planning practices. The protocol outlined in the Planning Directions Report should not be utilized in the review of site-specific land use designations (Maple Lake Estates used as an example)	Staff and the consultant are of the opinion that the existing Urban Residential Area designation conforms with York Region Official Plan and Greenbelt Plan. The protocol was supported by the Steering Committee and presented to Council with no changes made.
25	17-Oct-14	David Mott	326 Deer Park Rd.	Property currently contains an apartment within a detached accessory structure. Requesting that policies in the OP allow for this to be a permitted use so that the apartment can become legalized without having to obtain planning application approvals	A special provision has been included to permit the existing accessory apartment in the detached garage.

No.	Date	Contact	Property	Comments	Recommendation
26	21-Oct-14	Mostafa Fattah mfattah@gmail.com	23721 Highway 48	Remove site-specific official plan policies to allow go-kart operation (Sec.3.6.4.2, 3.10.4.1 and 3.13.4.1)	Site specific policies have been removed.
27	13-Nov-14	Gord Mahoney (no written submission) Michael Smith Planning Consultants 19027 Leslie Street P.O. Box 1010 Sharon, ON L0G 1V0 905-478-2588		OP Land Use A schedule contains error in Keswick Secondary Plan boundary - line going west along Old Homestead goes too far east - includes 3/4 of property that is not indicated in the Keswick Secondary Plan Land Use map	Staff will be correcting this mapping error in the new schedules. Revision made.
28	21-Nov-14	Infrastructure Ontario	OPR Study Area	Recommended policy wording	The suggested recommendations have been incorporated into the Plan (a few of the recommended policies have been slightly revised),
29	26-Nov-14	Corinne Cooper	Rural Designation	To permit a barn venue (catered primarily towards weddings) in the Rural designation	A barn venue to be utilized for weddings would be permitted in the Rural Area if it is secondary to the principle agricultural use of the property. If there is not a primary agricultural use on the property, the rural policies may still allow for the use subject to an Official Plan Amendment (to permit a rural commercial use).
30	05-Dec-14	Gord Mahoney Michael Smith Planning Consultants	4463 Baseline Rd.	Maintain existing land use designation on the property (Rural Industrial)	LSRCA reviewed this property. Designation will be refined to remove features, however a building envelope will still be available.
31	30-Jan-15	Judy Pryma MasonryWorx 150 Jardin Dr. Unit 10 Concord, ON L4K 3P9	OPR Study Area	Recommended site plan control and urban design policies Recommended specific policies in regards to building materials	Site plan control and urban design policies are including in the Official Plan. The Official Plan does not outline preferred building materials.
32	06-Mar-15	Sylviette Brown 23621 Park Road Pefferlaw, ON L0E 1N0	23621 Park Road	Ensure that MNR revised Zephyr-Egypt wetland complex is shown accurately in mapping	The LSRCA is reviewing the hydrological features/wetland mapping to ensure it is accurate.

13.1 ADOPTION OF REPORTS ON CONSENT AGENDA NOT REQUIRING
SEPARATE DISCUSSION cont'd

RESOLUTION NO. C-2015-0284

1. That Council receive Report No. DAS-2015-0014 prepared by the Administrative Services Department dated April 8, 2015 respecting the Ontario Municipal Insurance Exchange (OMEX) Supplemental Insurance Assessment of April 2014 for information purposes.

Carried.

13.2 CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA
REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION

13.2.3 Report from the Planning and Building Department:

13.2.3.1 Town of Georgina Draft Official Plan, April 2015

Report No. PB-2015-0025

Harold Lenters introduced Jim Dymont, Planner, MHBC Planning, Urban Design and Landscape Architecture, consultant team leader, along with the following members of the Official Plan Review Steering Committee; Art Field, Chair, Ted Brown and Mike Fenton, Co Vice-Chairs, and acknowledged Committee members Mayor Quirk, Regional Councillor Wheeler, Councillor Davison and former Councillor Brad Smockum.

Art Field;

- pleased to return as Chair. Will complete project by the end of this year.
- must include the Province, the Region of York, as well as others

Andrea Furniss, Senior Policy Planner, addressed Council as follows:

- Purpose of Official Plan Review is to conform with the York Region Official Plan, with the Provincial Plans, to have regard to the matters of Provincial interest, be consistent with Provincial Policy Statements and to consider local priorities and changing community needs
- the lands affected by the Official Plan Update are all lands outside the secondary plan areas
- phase 1; background research and policy review
- phase 2; Policy Development
- phase 3; Official Plan Preparation
- planning policy review report outlines the upper-tier policy documents and major policy priority areas
- Planning Directions Report provides recommended direction to address those policy areas identified in Planning Policy Review Report

13.2 CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION cont'd

- reviewed the meetings, public workshops, open houses and statutory public meetings held to provide public consultation
- 33 written submissions received from public, agencies, landowners or agents to date
- 82 properties reviewed based on established protocol, 8 property designations recommended by Conservation Authority to remove or refine designation limit
- Lakeshore Area Designation Review; 6 properties not previously included in service area were reviewed and recommending removal of lakeshore designation and be placed in more appropriate designations – either rural or environmentally protected lands

Jim Dymant, Planner, addressed Council as follows:

- Overview of three Major Policy Changes; Vision; “to be a well-balanced and vibrant community that preserves and protects Georgina’s natural environment and rural character; while providing for a high quality of life, growth and economic development in a sustainable manner”, Sustainability and Natural Environment
- Population Growth Forecast distribution and Population Growth Forecast to the year 2031
- General Development Policies include Telecommunication Towers/Renewable Energy Projects, Site Alteration, Hazard Lands, Contaminated Lands, Home-based Business and Minimum Distance Separation
- Greenlands System; match Regional and Provincial mapping as required by the Greenbelt Plan
- Countryside Area; Agricultural Rural, Aggregate, Rural Commercial, Rural Industrial, Parkland
- Secondary Plan Areas; Keswick, Keswick Business Park, Sutton/Jackson’s Point and Pefferlaw
- Urban Residential only applies to Maple Lake Estates
- Hamlets; minor rounding out of designated areas in Baldwin and Udora, permit small scale commercial and industrial uses
- Lakeshore Residential; serviced/unserved areas, minor mapping changes, accessory residential units only within a dwelling, includes Lake Simcoe Protection Plan policies
- Business Park Study Area; no change to current policies or mapping
- Creating Healthy and Complete Communities; affordable housing target at 25%
- Servicing and Infrastructure; recognize cycling and trails, consideration of Greenlands System, update stormwater policies to reflect Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and Source Water Protection
- Implement plan through Zoning By-law within three years, provide transition policies for current applications

13.2 CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION cont'd

Andrea Furniss pointed out the following:

- Next Steps include a revised 2015 Timetable; draft plan on website, copies to libraries, redline version to be posted on website for individuals to see what was taken out and what was added in
- open house May/June 2015 for the public to ask questions
- committee meetings May/June 2015 to receive comments from various Advisory Committees
- deadline for comments is July 31st.
- Statutory Public Meeting in August 2015
- Steering Committee Meeting in September 2015
- Council Adoption in October 2015
- Submit to approval authority in November 2015

Moved by Regional Councillor Wheeler, Seconded by Councillor Davison

RESOLUTION NO. C-2015-0285

1. That Council receive Report No. PB-2015-0025 prepared by the Planning Division, dated April 8, 2015, respecting the Town of Georgina Draft Official Plan, April 2015.
2. That Council authorize staff to release the Town of Georgina Draft Official Plan, April 2015 for formal agency circulation and review, and for public review and comment, and that the deadline for the submission of comments be Friday, July 31, 2015.
3. That Council authorize staff to provide written correspondence to owners of lands that contain a site specific amendment or existing Lakeshore Residential Area designated properties that are proposed to be revised by the Draft Official Plan, April 2015.
4. That Council authorize staff to provide written correspondence to each person who submitted a written submission under the Official Plan Review process, to advise of staff's recommendation on their submission.
5. That Council authorize staff to provide written correspondence to all persons who are registered as an interested party, advising of the Draft Official Plan release, revised project timing, future upcoming public consultation events and how to submit comments on the Draft Official Plan.

**13.2 CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA
REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION cont'd**

6. That notice of the release of the Draft Official Plan and how to submit comments be placed in the local newspaper and posted on the Town's website.
7. That the Clerk forward a copy of Report No. PB-2015-0025 to Valerie Shuttleworth, Chief Planner, for the Regional Municipality of York and Mike Walters, Chief Administrative Officer, for the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority.

Carried.

13.2.1 Report from the Recreation and Culture Department:

- 13.2.1.1 Verbal Report from staff respecting The Link Construction Update and required approvals for Change Orders**

No update was provided

14. RECONVENE TO COUNCIL FROM COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

Moved by Councillor Neeson, Seconded by Councillor Davison

That Council reconvene into Council from Council in Committee at this time.

Carried.

15. COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

Moved by Councillor Neeson, Seconded by Councillor Sebo

RESOLUTION NO. C-2015-0286

That all reports on the Council in Committee agenda, with the exception of the reports that have been deferred, deleted, tabled or withdrawn be received by Council and the recommendations contained therein, as presented or amended, be adopted.

Carried.

- ii. Any person or public body that has requested to be notified of Council's decision regarding the approval or refusal of the requested Zoning By-law Amendment or passing of a By-law.

Carried.

(8:16 p.m.)

- (b) Official Plan Review
Town of Georgina Draft Official Plan, April 2015

Report No. PB-2015-0073

- **Harold Lenters** provided background on the process to date; release of draft Official Plan authorized in April of 2014 and generous 3 1/2 month time period for review period and feedback was provided, with a July 1st deadline,
- received a lot of constructive criticism and comments that can be incorporated into the plan
- Planning Act requires a review of the Official Plan every five years, conforming to the York Region OP, Provincial Plans, acknowledging matters of provincial interest, and to consider local priorities and changing community needs.
- an additional public meeting was not required by legislation, but provides another opportunity for the public to provide feedback
- since 2012, there have been a series of public workshops and background reports. An overview was provided of some policy changes, growth forecasts, secondary plan areas, Maple Lake Estates, Greenland's System, Lakeshore Residential, Business Park Study Area and servicing and infrastructure considerations.
- next steps include the finalization of public, agency and Province's comments/submissions, the preparation of the proposed new Official Plan, the amendment document and the implementing by-law for Council adoption and submitting the documents to the Approval Authority (York Region). Members of the public provided feedback on the report.
- the Province provided feedback

Art Field, Chair of the Official Plan Review Steering Committee;

- In 2013, staff was directed to review the Official Plan
- in September of 2013, Jim Dymont of MHBC Planning Consultants, was engaged to assist with the review and members of the public applied to sit on the Official Plan Review Steering Committee
- believe the draft Official Plan submitted to Council and public for consideration is excellent
- well attended meetings; received 234 comments from regulatory agencies, government, municipal offices and the public; all comments reviewed and analyzed
- the committee's direction was to ensure the Official Plan is compliant with the Region's Official Plan and within Provincial regulations and approvals as required by law

- despite extended delays in the process, still on budget today
- as Chair, offered the Committee's support of staff's report and requested Council to approve the recommendations

Jim Dymont;

- Summarized where the Committee has been, where it is now and where it is going
- must conform with Regional Official Plan, the provincial Plans, have regard to matters of Provincial interest, be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statements and consider local priorities and changing community needs
- process began in October of 2012, this is the seventh public meeting that has been held
- reviewed existing site-specific land use designations, 82 properties reviewed based on established protocol, 8 property designations recommended by Conservation Authority to remove or refine designation limit
- 6 properties not previously included in lakeshore serviced area were reviewed
- recommending removal of Lakeshore Residential Area and place into more appropriate designations
- 824 Trivett's Road, land designated as unserviced residential; Significant Woodland should be mostly designated 'Environmental Protection'
- 26061 Woodbine Avenue, commercial recreation area,
- Technical Advisory Committee performed an overview of major policy changes; guiding principles and objectives, implementation of the Greenbelt Plan and Lake Simcoe Protection Plan respecting the Natural Environment, and updating Best Practices Policies
- Growth Management, Table 1, indicates the population growth forecast to 2031, but will need to be updated in order to conform to the Region's forecast of 2036.
- Growth Management, Table 2, indicates a steady employment growth forecast
- General Development Policies apply across the municipality; telecommunication towers/renewable energy projects, site alteration, hazard lands, contaminated lands, home-based business and minimum distance separation. MDS does not apply to vacant lots at this time
- Regional Official Plan and Provincial Policies require a Greenlands System to be developed and create an Environmental Protection Area
- Countryside Area Umbrella, comprised of the agricultural area, rural area, specialty crop area, rural commercial area, rural industrial area, commercial recreation area and parkland area designations
- Reduced/removed areas where development approvals not obtained
- Secondary Plan Areas of Keswick, Keswick Business Park, Sutton/Jackson's Point and Pepperlaw
- Maple Lake Estates designation; emphasized that the Planning Act says that when Council considers this Official Plan, it shall be consistent with the policy statements and conform with the provincial plans that are in effect on that date.
- The Greenbelt Plan takes precedence over the Provincial Policy Statement. The Greenbelt Plan designates Maple Lake Estates lands as 'Towns and Villages', the MLE lands are excluded from the Greenbelt Plan's Natural Heritage System, so the associated policies do not apply and under the Greenbelt Plan, the approved MLE

development is permitted. In order to conform to the Greenbelt Plan, the MLE lands must be shown as "Towns and Villages".

- York Region Official Plan designates the MLE lands as "Towns and Villages"
- In order to amend the Georgina Official Plan in order to designate the MLE lands differently that what it is designated in the Provincial Plan and Regional Official Plan, those documents would need to be modified first, or it will not comply with the Greenbelt Plan. The Provincial comments did not mention Maple Lake Estates.
- Hamlets; broadened the designated areas in Baldwin and Udora, permits small scale commercial and industrial uses, requires an Official Plan Amendment for more than four new lots
- Lakeshore Residential; serviced and unserviced areas, minor mapping changes to reflect significant environmental features, accessory residential units only within a dwelling, include Lake Simcoe Protection Plan policies.
- Business Park Study Area; no changes proposed to this designation
- technical studies in process of being reviewed, but nothing to justify any change in designation at this time
- Creating Healthy and Complete Communities; affordable housing target at 25% and accessory apartments in Countryside Areas, Recreation and Open Space, Education/Community/EMS Facilities, Community Improvement Areas, Community Design, Heritage Conservation and Archaeological Resources with First Nations consultation
- Servicing and Infrastructure; must comply with Georgina Official Plan when considering public works; recreation trails and new routes, consideration of Greenlands System, update stormwater policies to reflect Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and Source Water Protection, reduce size of Future Provincial Highway designation
- implement Plan through Zoning By-law within three years, provide transition policies for current applications, add definitions as required by Greenbelt Plan
- next steps include finalizing assessment of public, agency and province's comments/submissions, hold steering committee meeting, prepare proposed new Official Plan, amendment document and implementing by-law for Council adoption in first quarter of 2016 and submit documents to York Region, the Approval Authority

Mathew Cory of Malone, Given, Parsons, agent for Glenwoods Gateway Investments, owners of land north of Woodbine/Glenwoods, north half of the Keswick Business Park;

- proceeding as fast as possible to get conditions of draft approval that can be lived with, draft plan and zoning by-law approval being sought
- marketing the Business Park, walkable amenities desired as part of the current expectations for employees in business parks; entertainment, restaurants
- proceeding with the zoning by-law with ancillary retail via Regional Official Plan polices, but requesting that the Town consider the potential retail use in the Business Park as a stand-alone right of use.

Jack Gibbons, North Gwillimbury Forest Alliance, 430 Main St, Jackson's Point;

- prohibits development on all major wetland/woodland areas in rural Georgina except for the Maple Lake Estates property. Special treatment for Maple Lake Estates is inconsistent with Sections 26 and 27 of the Planning Act which legally obliges the Town to bring the Official Plan into conformity with the Provincial Policy Statement and the Regional Official Plan

- Provincial Policy Statement prohibits development on Provincially Significant Wetlands and the Maple Lake Estate lands are located on Provincially Significant Wetland. Therefore, most of the property is off-limits for development.

- Regional Official Plan; Section 2.2.35 prohibits development on Georgina's wetlands. Section 2.2.44 prohibits development on significant wetlands. Approximately 90% of property is located on wetlands and significant woodlands and therefore off limits for development.

- nothing in the transition section of the Regional Official Plan that exempts the Maple Lake Estates property from Environmental Protection rules

- nothing in the Greenbelt Plan that exempts the Town of Georgina from its legal obligation to bring the Official Plan into conformity with the Provincial Policy Statement and Regional Official Plan with respect to Maple Lake Estates.

- Page 7 of the Greenbelt Plan states that the Greenbelt does not apply to lands within the built boundaries of 'Towns and Villages' such as Maple Lake Estates as it existed on the day the Greenbelt Plan came into effect.

- the Town of Georgina is legally obliged to bring its Official Plan into conformity/consistency with the Regional Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statement

- the consultant asserts the opposite, saying that it is in the Greenbelt Plan but there is nothing in that plan to support the consultant's assertion. The Greenbelt Plan does not apply to 'Towns and Villages' and suggested Council ask the consultant to indicate the exact page and paragraph that indicates Council is exempt from Planning Act obligations to protect the Maple Lake Estates wetlands and woodlands in perpetuity.

- Ducks Unlimited indicates that Georgina has lost 50% of its wetlands and suggests development on significantly wetland be prohibited

- requested Council to obey the law and amend the draft Official Plan to prohibit development on all of the North Gwillimbury Forest wetlands and significant woodlands

Sylviette Brown of 23621 Park Road;

- wetlands should be protected

- sits on second largest provincially significant wetland

- requested Council to protect all wetlands. Georgina is a unique, beautiful community that should not change at the expense of the wetlands, animals and sanctuaries

- multiple wildlife abounded when she was more actively involved in farming

- hands tied as to what developments can occur in certain areas such as solar parks on hazardous lands; hopefully new Official Plan will have more strenuous limitations

- Georgina should not be permitted to become a dumping ground of Toronto's subways. Can accommodate, but should be stringent limits put in place and monitored. Multiple trucks go by daily to the fill site with no monitoring. Solar parks approved but no monitoring after the fact
- need progression in an orderly fashion

Paul Harpley, South Lake Simcoe Naturalists;

- July 23rd report raised a number of issues
- Pefferlaw Secondary Plan as is and greenbelt relationship; pb20150026
- recommended settlement area boundary.
- concur with Ducks Unlimited; very important that wetlands are protected
- there are opportunities in the Sutton Secondary Plan as well
- support Hamlet plans
- Urban River Valleys in the Greenbelt
- Maple Lake Estate issue; he has to support Ducks Unlimited and the North Gwillimbury Forest Alliance, this issue needs to be resolved
- Wildlife corridors; most are significant areas
- this is a very important opportunity to make a difference in conservation

Chad John-Baptiste, MMM Group

- summarized his correspondence; representing Nizza Enterprises, 2354 Ravenshoe Rd, just south of the Keswick Business Park
- submitted comments as part of the Official Plan Review process in July
- concern with 'top-down' approval process with regard to the Keswick Business Park Study Area
- as part of the five-year process, now is the time to look at the area, asses it and make determinations, to be included in the urban boundary; believes this can be accomplished now. The land is a gateway into Keswick and into the Business Park.

Moved by Regional Councillor Wheeler, Seconded by Councillor Davison

That the Council meeting recess at 9:18 p.m.

Carried.

Regional Councillor Wheeler left the meeting at this time and did not return.

The meeting resumed at 9:30 p.m.

William Joannou, ACI Architects Inc, agent for the property owner at 824 Trivett's Road, addressed Council as follows;

- owns 12-14 acre parcel accessed by Trivett's Road, Jubilee Road and an unassumed laneway and fronts fully on southern boundary of Metro Road North.

Councillor Neeson returned to the meeting at 9:31 p.m.

- Also owns existing property in the Lakeshore designation as well as another 80 acre parcel south of Metro Road North already re-designated Environmental Protection.
- 12-14 acre parcel in question has services to the edge of the property.
- has owned the parcel for over 35 years with designation of Lakeshore Residential and has had many discussions with various Planners and Mayors respecting the property with the thought of eventually developing the land.
- submitted letters responded to staff report, as well as two letters from previous consultants recording the history of the site, status of property reconfirmed.
- response letter from Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Senior Planner from the Region of York, and Director of Planning from the Town of Georgina, confirming that existing Lakeshore Residential designation will remain in effect and that all future applications for residential developments are permitted under the Greenbelt Plan.
- recent staff report rejects the notion of retaining the existing designation and changing it to Environmental Protection, neutralizing the property and rendering it useless for any form of reasonable development.
- inquired what the natural features are that exist on the property to include it in the Natural Heritage Systems. For over 35 years, the vegetation has naturally matured. While other lots surrounding the subject property have been farmed cleared and farmed and are receiving better designations for having removed these natural features. The trees were protected as a selling feature but the owner now seems to be penalized for protecting the trees.
- the Ministry advised that there is nothing specific being protected on the property.
- owner paid into infrastructure development with intent that if the infrastructure was brought to his property, he could eventually take advantage of it, but now all been taken away through a simple re-designation of the property and is requesting a reasonable approach to this site.

Lori Dechente;

- father owns 5692 Smith Blvd.
- her family has been involved with the Official Plan review from the beginning and understands both parties wish to protect wildlife and allow development as well.
- area must change with some type of development while respecting the current landscape.
- traffic has increased on Hwy 48, 40-50% more than when they moved to the area four years ago

Mayor Quirk mentioned that if the Province had a concern with respect to the Town not being in conformity, it would have been raised in the correspondence sent from the Province to the Region of York. The Town cannot make changes to the Greenbelt Plan, only the Province can. The Town must work within provincial planning and legislation. The Town's goal is to protect the lands. The 'Towns and Villages' designation can only be removed by the Province.

Harold Lenters advised that no direct notification to residents is required. The Planning Act requires the municipality to advertise notices in the newspaper and Town staff have gone beyond those requirements by sending letters to those individuals staff believes would be affected by significant designation changes. A master circulation list containing the names of all interested parties has been updated from the beginning of the process.

Councillor Davison voiced concerns from a resident respecting a large rural property on Lake Drive where a proposed designation change will allow for growth in an area where staff had assured Council would not be permitted and inquired why this change was made. As well Trivett's Road is narrow where two plans of subdivision meet and it would need major work to accommodate any new development. Why the change of this property now?

Harold Lenters advised that Mr. Joannou submitted copies of letters by William Joannou, ACI Architects Inc., dated March 17, 2005, from Scott Patterson of Peil Planner Consulting Engineers & Landscape Architects; Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Region of York and from himself, confirming the impact of the Greenbelt Plan on existing Official Plan designations on lands. The existing Lakeshore Residential designation will remain. Further applications for development are allowed under the Greenbelt Plan. He added that under the Greenbelt Transition Provisions, where an Official Plan designation is in place, Council may permit continuation of additional planning application approvals.

A second letter was submitted, from the same consulting firm to the Greenbelt Consultation at the Ministry, asking that lands be removed from the Greenbelt Plan, but they were not removed.

Harold Lenters clarified that the intent of the Greenbelt Plan is to provide certainty of where development can and cannot occur. If it was certainty that this land was to be protected, the plan would not have designated the lands 'Towns & Villages', would not have excluded it from the Natural Heritage System, but would have put it in the Natural Heritage System and not have designated it 'Towns & Villages'. Even if the Ministry did not designate the lands 'Towns and Villages', and put it in Natural Heritage System and even if Maple Lake Estates did not have a zoning by-law amendment and have a plan of subdivision registered, the Greenbelt Plan still says Council may consider further approvals without regard to the Greenbelt Plan. The Maple Lake Estates lands has all planning approvals, it has been designated Towns & Villages and is outside the Natural Heritage System.

Harold Lenters further clarified that included in the report that was submitted to Council respecting the Interim Control By-law, was a detailed explanation of the York Region Official Plan and how it is structured. The Greenbelt Transition Provisions do apply. It may not be precisely worded but that part of it cannot be eliminated. While the two policies for woodlands and wetlands prohibit development, they are overridden by the Greenbelt Plan provisions and transition provisions.

The transition provisions in the Region's plan say that if applications for development were submitted before the Region's plan is adopted, they can be processed without having regard to the Region's plan, so the wetlands and woodlands policies do not apply.

In the rural area, the Town is allowing accessory apartments in homes. The Province also requested municipalities to look at the idea of permitting accessory apartments in detached buildings and the Town produced a policy allowing for accessory apartments in detached building in the rural area on larger lots and in future, provisions will be inserted in the zoning by-law to permit it under certain conditions and certain regulations. The Town is facilitating accessory apartments in detached buildings in the rural area. The current zoning by-law does not allow an accessory apartment in a detached building, so this would need a zoning amendment application at this time.

Concerning ferry route changes, there was discussion of whether a ferry route should be shown. It may give a false sense of security regarding the location of the ferry route. A notation to explain it could be a possibility.

Councillor Sebo feels that river corridors need to be protected above and beyond what has occurred to date and wondered if the three river valleys of the Maskinonge, Black and Pefferlaw Rivers in Keswick, Sutton and Pefferlaw will be designated 'Urban River Valley'.

Harold Lenters advised that the designation of Urban River Valley will be further reviewed. All the rivers fall under environmental protection, but he needs to determine if they need to be designated and protected separately.

Staff will review a new designation for Urban River Valley Lands. The Province has recommended a number of changes to environmental policies. Almost all of the corridors are encompassed in an Environmental Protection designation with policies to protect them. The need to define and designate them separately may not be necessary.

Towns and Villages are governed by existing policies and are in the Town's current Official Plan and in addition they have designated the Maple Lake Estates land as a Town and Village which is intended for growth and development. Decisions have to be in conformity with the Planning Act, be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and in conformity with and not conflicting with the Provincial Plan. The Greenbelt Plan focuses on creating certainty of what should and should not be protected, which works with the growth plan.

The lead Ministry of Municipal Affairs Official orchestrating the preparation of the Greenbelt Plan indicated that it is intended to be a 'move forward' document and not intended to claw back development approvals. The Plan did give the option for Council to claw back development approvals in the case where all the approvals were not granted.

Moved by Councillor Harding, Seconded by Councillor Davison

RESOLUTION NO. C-2015-0707

1. That Council receive Report No. PB-2015-0073 prepared by the Planning Division, dated October 14, 2015 respecting the Official Plan Review and the Town of Georgina Draft Official Plan, April 2015.
2. That staff proceed with the remaining tasks of the Official Plan Review as set out in Section 5 of Report No. PB-2015-0073.
3. That the Clerk forward a copy of Report No. PB-2015-0073 and Council's resolution thereon, to Valerie Shuttleworth, Chief Planner, for the Regional Municipality of York.
4. That Staff provide written notice of the next Public Meeting, a minimum of two weeks in advance of the date of said meeting, to the following:
 - i. Any person or public body that has requested to be notified of any future public meeting(s); and,
 - ii. Any person or public body that has requested to be notified of Council's decision respecting the adoption of the proposed Official Plan.

Carried.

2. STATUTORY MEETING(S) UNDER OTHER LEGISLATION *None.*
- 3 OTHER PUBLIC MEETINGS *None.*
16. OTHER BUSINESS
17. BY-LAWS *None.*
18. CLOSED SESSION *None.*
 - (1) Motion to move into closed session of Council
 - (2) Motion to reconvene into open session of Council and report on matters discussed in closed session.

1. Gord Mahoney, Michael Smith Planning Consultants (Agent for 2111250 Ontario Inc.)	1 – 2
2. Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	3 – 27
3. William Joannou (Agent for 315197 Ontario Limited.)	28 – 38
4. Bell Canada	39 – 42
5. MMM Group (Agent for Nizza Enterprises).....	43 – 48
6. Sylviette Rita Brown.....	49
7. Aird & Berlis (Agent for Glenwoods Gateway Investments Inc.)	50 – 51
8. Sylviette Rita Brown.....	52
9. Michael Smith (Agent for Gloria and David Mott).....	53 – 57
10. Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority	58 – 59
11. DKGK Holdings Inc.....	60 – 67
12. Rockford Consulting Group (Agent for Domenic Di Monte)	68
13. Sylviette Rita Brown.....	69
14. Sylviette Rita Brown.....	70 – 75
15. Sylviette Rita Brown.....	76
16. Joel Brenner (Agent for property owner of 23078 Warden Ave.).....	77 – 93

* 2 of the submissions were not provided in letter format (#78 and #86 in Attachment 8).

Michael Smith

Planning Consultants;
Development Coordinators Ltd.

19027 Leslie St., Suite 200
P.O. Box 1010
Sharon, Ontario L0G 1V0
Bus (905) 478-2588
Fax (905) 478-2488
www.msplanning.ca

COPY

TOWN OF GEORGINA

AUG 28 2015

PLANNING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION

REFER	NOTED
GAUL - fy (D. Previna)	VR
Clark	the
FILE # 02.185	

Thursday, August 26th, 2015

Our File: 766-00

Velvet Ross, M.C.I.P. R.P.P.
Manager of Planning
Town of Georgina
26557 Civic Centre Road, R.R. #2
Keswick, ON.
L4P 3G1

Dear Ms. Ross:

RE: Official Plan Review Study and
Official Plan Amendment Application (Town File: 02.185)
Owner 2111250 Ontario Inc. (C/O A & T Homes)
S/S Lake Dr. East and E/S Trivetts Road
Roll #: 127-999

On May 21st, 2015, our office, on behalf of our client, A & T Homes, submitted an application to amend the Town's current Official Plan for the above noted property.

The purpose of the application is to amend the Town's current Official Plan to permit the creation, via plan of subdivision, of 13 residential lots (6 residential lots along the Lake Drive East frontage and 7 residential lots along Trivetts Road).

To facilitate the proposed development, the Official Plan Amendment application seeks three amendments to the current Official Plan.

1. To permit lot creation by way of Plan of Subdivision;
2. To permit a Plan of Subdivision application to be submitted along with the applications for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment; and,
3. To change the current land use designation adjacent to Trivetts Road from 'Lakeshore Residential Area' to 'Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area'.

As you are aware, at the same time the Official Plan Amendment application was submitted, the Town was, and still is, in the midst of an Official Plan Review Study. It should be noted that within the Town's Draft Official Plan that was released for public review and comment, the Plan proposes to re-designate the land adjacent to Trivetts


Road from 'Lakeshore Residential Area' to 'Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area'. The other amendments requested in the application submitted are not proposed in the Draft Official Plan.

Timing for the possible approval of the Official Plan Amendment application and approval of the Draft Official Plan is unsure. If our client's application for an amendment is approved by Council prior to the approval of the Town's Draft Official Plan, we request that the approved amendment be inserted into the Draft Official Plan so that the amendment can be carried forward into the updated Official Plan.

That said if the timing for approvals does not work out as noted above, please accept this letter as our client's comments on the Draft Official Plan and its request to have the three amendment provisions noted above included in the Town's Draft Official Plan for Council's consideration.

If you have any questions regarding the above please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Truly,



Gord Mahoney
Planning Consultant

Copy: A & T Homes, Owner
Adrian Cammaert, Senior Policy Planner
Tolek Makarewicz, Area Planner

**Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing**

Municipal Services Office
Central Ontario
777 Bay Street, 13th Floor
Toronto ON M5G 2E5
Phone: 416 585-6226
Fax: 416 585-6882
Toll-Free: 1 800 668-0230

**Ministère des
Affaires municipales
et du Logement**

Bureau des services aux municipalités
du Centre de l'Ontario
777, rue Bay, 13^e étage
Toronto ON M5G 2E5
Téléphone : 416 585-6226
Télécopieur : 416 585-6882
Sans frais : 1 800-668-0230



September 30, 2015

Ms. Karen Whitney
Director of Community Planning
Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, ON
L3Y 6Z1

Dear Ms. Whitney:

RE: Town of Georgina Draft Official Plan Review (April 2015)
MMAH File No.: 19-EOP-155976

TOWN OF GEORGINA	
OCT 05 2015	
PLANNING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION	
REFER	NOTED
FILE #	

Please find enclosed the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing's (MMAH) One-Window comments, per the request from the Region of York by letters dated May 22, 2015 and May 29, 2015, that MMAH and its partner ministries review the draft Georgina Official Plan policies in support of the Town's five-year review of the Official Plan ("OP").

It is our understanding that the official plan review is structured in multiple phases. The first phase will focus on preparing a new parent Official Plan to reflect the Greenbelt Plan, Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2006 ("Growth Plan"), Lake Simcoe Protection Plan ("LSPP"), South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan, and York Region Official Plan ("YROP"). The draft OP applies to all lands in Georgina with the exception of the Secondary Plan Areas (Sutton/Jackson's Point, Keswick, Keswick Business Park and Pefferlaw). The second phase will consist of the review of the Keswick Secondary Plan. A review of the remaining secondary plans will be completed as additional phases of the official plan review. We understand the Town is anticipating bringing forward the OP for Council adoption by the end of 2015 and then submitting to the Region of York as the approval authority.

As you are aware, presently the Province is undertaking a co-ordinated review of provincial plans, including the Greenbelt Plan and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, we recommend that the Region be mindful of this on-going review as the Town continues to update of the Official Plan, to ensure that the approval of the updated Plan appropriately conforms with these provincial Plans.

Through the One-Window Provincial Planning Service, the draft policies were circulated to the Ontario Growth Secretariat (OGS) of MMAH and to the following Ministries: Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA), Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR), Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS), and Transportation (MTO) for comments.

The One-Window comments are intended to assist the Town in its review of the draft policies and the Region with its decision-making process as the approval authority of the proposed official plan. Based on our review, we offer the following pre-consultation comments (the letter highlights general comments and specific policy and technical comments are included in **Appendix A**):

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Growth Management

Growth Plan policy 5.4.2.2(a) requires that where planning is conducted by an upper-tier municipality, the upper tier municipality in consultation with the lower-tier municipalities will allocate growth forecasts provided in Schedule 3 to the lower-tier municipalities. It appears that the Town has implemented the growth forecasts, as allocated by York Region in its Official Plan of 70,300 people and 21,200 jobs to 2031.

Growth Plan sub-policies 5.4.2.2(b) and (c) require upper-tier municipalities, in consultation with the lower-tier municipalities, to identify the residential intensification target and density target for designated greenfield areas in the lower-tier municipality. Targets for intensification and designated greenfield areas are not incorporated in the draft OP, in particular Section 2.2.8 (Growth Management Objectives) or Section 3 (Growth Management).

Recommendation:

Include the residential intensification target and designated greenfield area density target in the draft OP, as identified by the York Region Official Plan ("ROP"). Inclusion of these targets in the Town's parent OP would provide greater clarity and certainty on how the Region is planning to achieve its Growth Plan intensification and designated greenfield area density targets and how the Town will be directing and accommodating the majority of its growth in the urban serviced communities of Keswick and Sutton/Jackson's Point.

Also, a policy be added that an 'intensification strategy' be developed in co-operation with the Region to achieve the Town's intensification target in accordance with Growth Plan Policy 2.2.3.6. Additional policies should be added to the OP to reflect the intensification strategy policies of the Growth Plan Policy 2.2.3.6.

Greenbelt Plan

Prime Agricultural Refinement

Policy 6.1.17 of the draft OP speaks to refinements to the 'Agricultural Protection Area' designation found in the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside through an Agricultural Assessment Study to the satisfaction to the Town.

Section 3.1.3.2 of the Greenbelt Plan states that, "prime agricultural areas shall not be redesignated in municipal official plans for non-agricultural uses except for: a) refinements to the prime agricultural and rural area designations, subject to the criteria identified in the municipal implementation policies." The municipal implementation policies in section 5.3 state that municipalities "may amend the designation for prime agricultural areas at the time they bring their official plans into conformity with this Plan." Therefore, the redesignation (refinement) of prime agricultural areas (boundaries) is only permitted as a one-time opportunity at the time of Greenbelt conformity.

The Region of York undertook a refinement of its prime agricultural and rural area designations as part of its comprehensive official plan review and Greenbelt Plan conformity exercise. We understand the Agricultural Protection Area and Rural Area designations conform with the York OP (Map 8).

Recommendation:

Based on the foregoing, it is recommended that Policy 6.1.17 be removed.

Countryside Area (Rural Areas)

With respect to 'Rural Industrial', 'Rural Commercial Area' and 'Commercial Recreation Area' land use designations on Schedule A-2, the draft OP (Sections 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6) recognizes that there are existing and approved industrial uses, commercial uses and commercial recreation development within the Countryside Area. In accordance with the Greenbelt Plan and the York ROP, industrial and commercial uses are permitted in the rural areas of the Protected Countryside provided that they are resource-based (Greenbelt Plan Policy 3.1.4.1 and York ROP Policy 6.4.3), to retain the character of lands in the rural area and to protect the viability of existing agriculture, agriculture-related and secondary agricultural uses.

The Greenbelt Plan states that the rural areas of the Protected Countryside are intended to accommodate a range of non-agricultural commercial, industrial and institutional uses serving the rural resource and agricultural sectors (Section 4.1). The Growth Plan states that development outside of settlement areas may be permitted where it is related to the management or use of resources, resource-based recreational activities, and rural land uses that cannot be located in

settlement areas (Policy 2.2.9.2). In accordance with provincial policies, the York ROP states that non resource-based industrial and commercial uses and institutional uses shall be directed to settlement areas (Policy 6.4.6).

Recommendation:

In accordance with the preceding comments regarding refinements to the specialty crop areas and prime agricultural areas not being permitted and policies applying to non-agricultural uses within the rural areas of the Greenbelt Protected Countryside, the following is recommended:

- Policies to be added to Sections 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 that designation of new sites for 'Rural Industrial Area, 'Rural Commercial Area' and 'Commercial Recreation Area' is prohibited in specialty crop areas and prime agricultural areas (Agricultural Protection Area); and
- Policies to be added to Sections 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 to indicate that any new sites for industrial and commercial uses will need to meet the test of being resource-based, serving the rural resource or agricultural sectors.

Commercial Recreation Area

Sub-section 6.6.3 a) to n) contains both compliance policies and technical information/studies that "may" be required for expansions/new sites for a Commercial Recreation Area. A new policy should be added to clearly state which policies the application must comply with (i.e. 6.6.3 (b), (d), (f), (h), (l) as per Greenbelt Plan Policy 4.1.1.2, and others which are additional municipal requirements that may be optional). Conformity to Provincial Plans and the York Region Official Plan as stated in sub-section 6.6.3 (l) and (m) are required by all development applications and should not be optional. This comment also applies to Sections 6.4.3 and 6.5.3 of the draft OP.

Recommendation:

Revise the preamble of sub-section 6.6.3 and preambles of subsections 6.4.3 and 6.5.3 such that it reads:

- "Expansions of a Commercial Recreation Area designation or the designation of new sites shall require an amendment to this Plan and the Zoning By-law, and **shall conform with Provincial policies and plans and the York Region Official Plan.** The following studies ..."

Major Recreational Areas (Commercial Recreation Area)

New major recreational uses such as golf courses, marinas and outdoor playing fields or expansion of these uses may be permitted in the Rural Area subject to an OPA and rezoning, in accordance with the policies of Section 6.6 (Commercial Recreation Areas).

'Major recreational uses' is a defined term in the Greenbelt Plan with associated policies in Section 4.1.2 of the Greenbelt Plan. The term 'major recreational uses' and associated definition has been included in the draft OP in sub-section 6.2.6. However, Section 6.6 does not use this term when describing certain commercial recreation uses such as parks, marinas and golf courses or include the applicable policies of section 4.1.2 of the Greenbelt Plan for applications to establish or expand a 'major recreational use' in the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System.

In addition, it appears that a stand-alone "conference centre" is considered a commercial recreational use permitted within the rural area. A stand-alone conference facility would generally be considered an urban use which should be directed to the settlement area in accordance with the Greenbelt Plan and the Growth Plan. If supported by the Regional Official Plan, such a use should only be permitted in the "Commercial Recreation Area" designation where it has met the tests for a rural use, as provided in the Greenbelt Plan policy 4.1.1.2 and the Growth Plan 2.2.2.1(i).

Recommendations:

- Add policies which require that applications to establish or expand 'major recreational uses,' such as golf courses, marinas and outdoor playing fields, are subject Section 4.1.2 of the Greenbelt Plan;
- Delete 'conference centre' from the list of "as of right" permitted uses in Subsection 6.6.1 a).

Rural and Agricultural Designations and Greenlands System within the secondary plan areas

While we understand that updates to the secondary plans are to occur in subsequent phases of the Official Plan review, to ensure that the rural and agricultural policy framework applies consistently across the Town, we recommend that lands within the existing secondary plans currently designated agricultural and/or rural be similarly identified in the parent official plan schedules.

Similarly, the Greenlands System shown on Schedule A1 - Municipal Structure and Schedule A2 - Land Use Plan reflects the Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System (NHS) and the Greenlands System in the York ROP. The Greenlands

System is shown outside of the Urban Area and Towns and Villages. However, in the York ROP (Map 2), the Regional Greenlands System extends into the Urban Area and Towns and Villages in Georgina such as Pepperlaw and Sutton/Jackson's Point.

Recommendation:

Identify rural/agricultural areas located within the secondary plan areas of the "Towns and Villages" within Schedule A-2. Revise the draft OP schedules to conform with the York ROP in terms of displaying the full extent of the Regional Greenlands System in rural areas and settlement areas.

Lake Simcoe Protection Plan

On June 2, 2009, the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan (LSPP) came into effect under the authority of the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008*. The LSPP generally applies to the Lake Simcoe watershed, when making land use decisions all planning authorities within the plan area are to ensure that the policies of the LSPP are addressed. The new draft OP is therefore subject to the LSPP and conformity with the LSPP is being undertaken as part of the OP review. Specific comments regarding LSPP implementation are included in **Appendix A**.

South Georgian Bay-Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan

The Town of Georgina is located within the South Georgian Bay-Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region. The South Georgian Bay-Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan ("SPP") was approved by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change on January 26, 2015 and takes effect on July 1, 2015. We commend the Town for undertaking OP conformity with the applicable significant drinking water threat policies of the SPP as part of the current OP review which is timely given the recent approval of the SPP. Specific comments regarding source water protection and SPP conformity are included in **Appendix A**.

Natural Hazards

The PPS 2014 introduced a new policy direction related to wildland fires. The MNR has mapping which indicates that there are areas within Georgina that may be classified as "hazardous forest types for wildland fire." As such, the Official Plan should include mapping and policies to address section 3.1.8 of the PPS, 2014. Please contact Jackie Burkart, District Planner, MNR (905-713-7368) directly for the relevant mapping and a copy of the most recent draft guidelines to support the implementation of this policy.

The PPS 2014 provides policy direction regarding floodplains wherein development is generally prohibited. Please see Appendix A for specific recommendations to update the official plan policies to be consistent with the PPS, 2014.

Marine Archaeological Resources

Section 2.6.2 of the PPS prohibits development and site alteration on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved. Such archaeological resources include marine archaeological remains, such as: ships, boats, vessels (and artifacts from the contents they carried), old piers, wharfs, fords, fishing traps dwellings, aircraft and other items of cultural heritage value. The draft OP currently does not address the protection of marine archaeological resources under Section 8.8 (Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources).

Recommendation:

Given that the Town of Georgina contains substantial shoreline area along Lake Simcoe that has potential for marine archaeological resources, we recommend adding a new policy in the Official Plan Section 8.8 to conserve such resources using the following suggested wording:

"The Town may require a marine archaeological assessment to be conducted by a licensed marine archaeologist, pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act*, to determine if there is a high potential for partially or fully submerged archaeological resources that are of cultural heritage value and if such resources will be impacted by shoreline or waterfront developments."

Natural Heritage Mapping

To ensure the accuracy of the natural heritage mapping (Schedule sets A and B), it would be appreciated if the Town could provide GIS shapefiles for the proposed 'Environmental Protection Area' and 'Greenlands System' designations for MNRF's review. This would provide an excellent visual for comparing the Town's mapping with MNRF natural heritage data. MNRF may provide additional comments upon further review/comparison of the mapping.

ADDITIONAL 2014 PPS POLICIES:

The following are some key themes included in the 2014 PPS that the Town should develop additional policies for inclusion in the Official Plan as part of the OP review:

Climate Change – PPS Policy 1.8 require municipalities to incorporate climate

change considerations into policy decisions and support climate change adaptation through land use and development patterns that are sustainable, for instance: maximizing vegetation in settlement areas to support improved air quality, community liveability, and reduced greenhouse gas emission, maximizing opportunities for use of renewable energy systems, and promoting the use of active transportation. We recommend the Town to integrate climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies, and work with the Region to develop action plans that supports the York Region Sustainability Strategy: Towards a Sustainable Region.

Asset Management Planning – There is a new PPS Policy 1.6.1 requirement to consider the life-cycle cost of infrastructure in terms of planning for infrastructure, electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems. Furthermore, public service facilities shall be coordinated and integrated with land use planning so that they are financially viable over their life cycle, which may be demonstrated through asset management planning. Policies in Section 11.14 of the draft OP should be expanded to this effect.

Electricity Planning – there are new PPS Policies 1.6.1 and 1.6.11.1 highlighting electricity planning and PPS Policy 1.6.8 for transportation and infrastructure corridors where planning authorities shall plan for and protect corridors and rights of way for infrastructure, including electricity generation facilities and transmission facilities as well as transportation and transit. Section 4.1.1 b) of the draft OP dealing with electricity transmission and distribution system should be expanded to include protection of corridors and rights of way for electricity generation facilities and transmission facilities. The Ministry of Energy's Infosheet may assist with policy development regarding this matter. Please see: <http://www.energy.gov.on.ca/en/files/2015/03/pps-infosheet-electricity-planning-en.pdf>

Aboriginal Engagement – the 2014 PPS includes a new Policy 2.6.5 that planning authorities shall consider the interests of aboriginal communities in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources. Also, that engagement with aboriginal communities is encouraged at all stages of the planning process (PPS Policies 1.2.2, 2.6.4, 2.6.5, and 4.3). Therefore, policies should be developed which identify how and when Aboriginal communities will be engaged in planning matters and the official plan should specifically direct that Aboriginal communities will be engaged in matters related to cultural heritage resources and archaeology.

Community Hubs - PPS Policy 1.6.5 deals with 'community hubs' in that public service facilities should be co-located in community hubs, where appropriate, to promote cost-effectiveness and facilitate service integration, access to transit and active transportation. Supporting community hubs is a priority of the Province as the Community Hub Framework Advisory Group Chaired by Karen Pitre recently released a report to guide the creation of community hubs. The report, entitled

"Community Hubs in Ontario: A Strategic Framework and Action Plan" lays out eight overarching recommendations, which the province has accepted and will begin to implement. MMAH notes the Town's newest community facility known as "the Link" located in a former public school as an example of a community hub providing an array of community and social services in a central location. To support similar future projects, it is recommended that a policy be included supporting co-location of public service facilities in Section 8.4 of the draft OP dealing with Community Facilities.

Integrated Decision Making – The PPS, 2014 includes many enhanced policies which encourage decision makers to better co-ordinate and integrate their decision making. While the Official Plan contains policies which identify linkages with other local, Regional and Provincial strategies and undertakings, and identifies the need for consultation with other agencies, stakeholders, and the public; we recommend including a policy within the implementation section of the plan that recognizes these relationships and the need to ensure that appropriate consideration and co-ordination is undertaken before decisions are finalized. As you are aware, many of the PPS, 2014 policies intersect with various sectors within municipal organizations; for example, active transportation and climate change policy implementation requires co-ordination with public works and community services departments, and asset management policies with the finance department. As such, the implementing policy should recognize inter-departmental relationships as well as external relations within the decision making process.

Planning Act Tools – We note that the Plan identifies many tools under the *Planning Act* to assist with the implementation of the Official Plan. The Town may wish to consider also including the use of the Development Permit System (DPS). The DPS combines the zoning, site plan and minor variance processes into one application and approval process. A key benefit compared to traditional zoning is that flexibility can be built into the DPS, plus conditions can be added to the issuance of permit under the DPS by-law. The DPS may be used in both rural and urban settings to achieve different outcomes. For example, in a rural setting, it is helpful when addressing development around a sensitive natural area, as has been the experience of the Township of Lake of Bays. On the other hand, the City of Brampton is using a DPS to facilitate development within its urban growth centre. In order for the Town to be able to implement a DPS, at a minimum, a policy in support of the use of this *Planning Act* tool is recommended.

Information and supporting materials for implementation of the DPS, including a handbook and presentation can be found at the MMAH website:
<http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page4844.aspx>

Thank you once again for providing us with the opportunity to review and comment on the Town of Georgina Official Plan Review. By copy of this letter, we are requesting to receive notice on the progress of this review. We are available to review and/or discuss proposed changes to the draft Official Plan in order to ensure that provincial interests are appropriately addressed, prior to adoption of the Official Plan. Should you have any questions, please contact Karen Ho, Planner at 416-585-6862, Louis Bitonti, Senior Planner at 416-585-6563, or the undersigned at 416-585-6053.

Yours truly,



Sybelle von Kursell, MCIP, RPP
Team Lead, Community Planning and Development

cc. Adrian Cammaert, Senior Planner, Town of Georgina
Jennifer Best, Senior Planner, York Region
OMAFRA
MNR
MOECC
MTCS
MTO

APPENDIX A: SPECIFIC POLICY AND TECHNICAL COMMENTS

Bold = recommended addition ~~Strikethrough~~ = recommended deletion

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
Growth Management			
Sections 2 and 3	See letter re: Growth Management		
Cultural Heritage			
8.8	See letter re: Marine Archaeological Resources		
2.2.2.6, 7.3, 7.4, 8.8.3, 8.8.7, 8.8.11, 8.8.26 and 11.2.6.1	Several sections of the OP refer to the preservation of cultural heritage resources. The term 'preserve' is no longer used in the provincial policy context of cultural heritage and should be replaced with the term 'conserve' which includes the full range of options for the protection of resources.	PPS Definition of 'conserved'	It is recommended that the term 'preserve' if used in the context of cultural heritage to be replaced with 'conserve' to be consistent with the PPS.
Entire OP	Several phrases are used throughout the Draft OP to indirectly describe certain types of cultural heritage resources, such as: "buildings and features of historical significance" (Section 8.8.16), "buildings or structures of historical, cultural or architectural merit" (Section 11.2.6.1) and "documentation that is of architectural and historical significance to the Town of Georgina" (Section 11.8.2) etc.	PPS Policy 2.6	Updating this type of wording is recommended to reflect the terminology currently used in provincial policy for example "cultural heritage value or interest" is recommended.
Renewable Energy			
4.8	Legislation related to renewable energy projects should also include Ontario Regulation 359/09 – Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V.0.1 of the Environmental Protection Act.	Ontario Regulation 359/09	To add the reference to Ontario Regulation 359/09 in the opening paragraph of OP Policy 4.8 such that it reads: "Renewable energy projects, such as wind turbines, solar panels, geothermal and other similar sources are exempted from municipal approval under the <i>Planning Act</i> and are subject to Ontario Regulation 359/09 – Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V.0.1 of the Environmental Protection Act and the Province's Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009 and any amendments made thereto."

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
Lake Simcoe Protection Plan			
5.3.2	Section 6.2 of the Lake Shore Protection Plan (LSPP) requires the minimum VPZ in a shoreline built-up area to be 30 metres, and 100 metres outside of existing settlement areas and outside of shoreline built-up areas. Based on the definition of the LSPP of what is considered "shoreline built-up areas," there are areas in the Lake Simcoe shoreline in Georgina that are not designated for development (e.g. designated Environmental Protection Areas adjacent to the specialty crop area and also by Doyle beach).	LSPP 6.2, YROP 2.2.15.17	To modify Policy 5.3.2 and include the 100 metres VPZ requirement as per Section 6.2 of LSPP: "The minimum vegetation protection zone in a shoreline built-up area is 30 metres from the Lake Simcoe shoreline, or larger if determined appropriate by an evaluation required by Section 5.3.3. For areas of Lake Simcoe Shoreline outside of existing settlement areas and outside of shoreline built-up areas, the vegetation protection zone shall be 100 metres from the Lake Simcoe shoreline."
12.5.92	The current draft OP defines 'shoreline built-up areas' as all lands located outside of settlement areas. In order to be considered 'shoreline built-up area' according to the LSPP, the area must have existing concentrated development or designated in the OP and/or zoned to allow for development, as of the date the LSPP came into effect. The areas designated as environmental protection areas (described above) should not be considered as part of the shoreline built-up area.'		We recommend revising or removing the term 'shoreline built-up areas' such that it conforms with the LSPP definition and to reflect the EPA designated areas.
5.3.7 a) (iv)	It is noted that in this draft policy it has combined LSPP sub policies 6.26 (d), (e) and (f) which describes the method to establishing the appropriate minimum VPZ within the shoreline built-up area. We recommend expanding sub-policy 5.3.7 a) (iv) such that it reflects the details and the intent of LSPP policy 6.26 in order to ensure that all key natural heritage and key hydrologic features, and their ecological functions are protected.	LSPP 6.26 (d), (e) and (f)	We recommend expanding draft policy 5.3.7 a) (iv) such that it aligns with the protection level of features those LSPP sub-policies 6.26 (d), (e) and (f) provides.
5.4.3	Section 5.4.3 related to Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas needs to contemplate LSPP Policies 6.36, 6.38, 6.39 and 6.40. As source protection is recognized in some detail, the missing components	PPS 2.2, LSPP 6.36, 6.38, 6.39 and 6.40	Expand Section 5.4.3 and include additional policies to address the expansion of settlement area boundaries and the requirement for an EIS for major developments that are in proximity to or within significant groundwater recharge areas.

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
	include policies for the expansion of settlement area boundaries and the requirement for environmental impact studies for major developments.		In addition, the term "major source water development" should be replaced with the term " <i>major development</i> " which is a defined term in the OP and conforms with the terminology in the LSPP.
9.3.1.2	Proposals for sewer and water infrastructure are also subject to water and sewage infrastructure policies of the LSPP.	LSPP Chapter 4	Revise draft OP Policy 9.3.1.2 such that it reads: "All proposals for sewer and water infrastructure proposals shall be subject to the water and sewer infrastructure policies of the Greenbelt Plan and the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. "
10	LSPP Policy 4.20 sets out conditions that municipalities must include in subdivisions and site plan agreements, to protect water quality in Lake Simcoe and its tributaries. Section 11 of the draft OP should include additional policy to include such conditions.	LSPP 4.20	Add a new policy to Section 11 (Implementation), or other appropriate sections of the OP, to include the conditions set out in LSPP 4.20 as a part of all subdivision and site plan agreements.
Source Water Protection			
5.4	Only those areas that are described in Ontario Regulation 284/07 require source water protection plans. This should be reflected in the introduction under draft OP Policy 5.4.	O. Reg. 284/07	We recommend adding to the introduction paragraph in Policy 5.4 to clarify that only certain designated areas as described in Ontario Regulation 284/07 are required to have source water protection plans.
5.4.1.1.1	Policy LUP-1 of the South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan ("SGBLS SPP") outlines uses and activities that are prohibited in vulnerable areas that may cause a significant drinking water threat. Uses included in draft OP Policy 5.4.1.1.1 conforms with LUP-1 however, there are certain uses that were excluded.	PPS 2.2, SGBLS SPP– Policy LUP-1	OP Policy 5.4.1.1.1 should be modified to add the following prohibited uses as per LUP-1 of the SGBLS SPP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large (more than 10,000 L) on-site sewage systems • agricultural and non-agricultural source material storage facilities • road salt storage facilities • snow storage facilities • fuel storage • outdoor confinement or farm animal yard

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
5.4.2.4	This policy corresponds with SPP policy SEWG(b)-1 which applies only to existing sewage facilities. The authority to require a Risk Management Plan is exercised under the Clean Water Act and assigned to a Risk Management Official. It is not appropriate to have this policy in the OP. Therefore, Policy 5.4.2.4 of the draft OP should be removed.	SGBLS SPP– Policy SEWG(b)-1	Recommend removing draft OP Policy 5.4.2.4.
5.4.2.5, 5.4.3.2	The meaning of term 'major source water development' is unclear and should be replaced with the term 'major development' as defined in the draft OP which is consistent with the SPP.	SGBLS SPP– Section 20	Replace the term "major source water development" with "major development" in policies 5.4.2.5 and 5.4.3.2.
5.4.4.1	In draft OP Policy 5.4.4.1, requirement of a Contaminant Management Plan for fuel/chemical storage currently applies only to major development within Highly Vulnerable Aquifers. It is recommended that this policy also apply to major development within Intake Protection Zones.	PPS Policy 2.2.1	To revise draft OP Policy 5.4.4.1 to include 'Intake Protection Zones,' as follows: "An application for major development within Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Intake Protection Zones , as displayed on Schedule B3 – Source Water Protection, involving the manufacturing, handling and/or storage of bulk fuel or chemicals (activities prescribed under the Clean Water Act), shall be accompanied by a Contaminant Management Plan, as deemed necessary by the Town, in consultation with York Region's Risk Management Office."
10	The Town may consider as part the 'complete application' requirement to include a compliance letter from the Risk Management Official (RMO) for applications that are within a vulnerable area or create significant drinking water threat.	Clean Water Act, Section 59	We recommend adding to the 'complete application' requirements in the draft OP to provide a compliance letter issued by the RMO, or another requirement that would trigger the submission of information on proposed activities. For example, the City of Barrie's Official Plan speaks to requiring submission of a "Source Water Information Form" as part of their complete application for proposals within vulnerable areas.
Housing			
8.6.1.7 (a)	In sub-policy 8.6.1.7(a) the term "assisted housing" should be updated to align with the <i>Planning Act</i> terminology. The term "affordable" is inclusive of the	<i>Planning Act</i> s. 28, PPS	Delete the word "assisted" and replace with "affordable" in sub-policy 8.6.1.7(a) such that it reads:

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
	meaning "assisted." As such, we recommend using the term "affordable housing," to be consistent with language in sub-policy 8.6.1.7(h) of the draft OP and the <i>Planning Act</i> .		"(a) Participation in Provincial and Federal government Community Improvement programmes and application for respective grants for the construction of community improvements and assisted affordable housing, and for the restoration of heritage buildings..."
8.1.12 8.1.13	An accessory apartment is a permitted use in all residential designations of the draft OP. However, the "may only be" wording does not reflect the permissive approach of the OP.	<i>Planning Act</i> s.16(3)	Revised wording in draft Policies 8.1.12(a) and 8.1.13 is recommended such that an accessory apartment is authorized in a single detached, semi-detached, and/or townhouse dwelling as per the <i>Planning Act</i> .
8.1.12 (b)	Sub-policy 8.1.12(b) currently requires that "any deviation from the zoning provisions regulating accessory apartments shall not be permitted." It is unclear whether this policy considers minor variances or the intent is to prohibit any changes or flexibility regarding zoning standards for accessory apartments altogether.	<i>Planning Act</i> S.16	Further clarification is recommended to clearly explain under what circumstance would require a minor variance and/or rezoning.
8.1.12	A new sub-policy should be added to draft OP policy 8.1.12 to indicate that accessory apartments are not permitted within a floodplain, to minimize risk associated with human health and safety and to property.	PPS 3.1	Add a new sub-policy (f) to draft OP policy 8.1.12 such that it reads: "(f) accessory apartments shall not be permitted within existing homes located on hazardous land or within a hazardous site. "
Natural Hazards			
4.4	See letter re: Natural Hazards		
12.5 New Definition	A definition is required for the term "Hazardous forest types for wildland fire" to ensure consistency with the 2014 PPS.	PPS 6.0	To add the following new term and definition for "Hazardous forest types for wildland fire" in Section 12.5 of the draft OP: "Hazardous forest types for wildland fire: means forest types assessed as being associated with the risk of high to extreme wildland fire using risk assessment tools established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, as amended from time to time."
4.4.2	Needs a stronger policy to address policies 3.1.2 a), c)	PPS 3.1.2, 3.1.4	Remove the word "generally" and add the term "site alteration" in

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
	<p>and d) of the PPS to prohibit development and <u>site alteration</u> in hazard areas. The wording in the current draft policy 4.4.2 is insufficient. In addition, the proposed policy framework for the entirety of Section 4.4 is heavily slanted toward shoreline flooding. It should include inland river flooding as well.</p> <p>Policy 4.4.2 should be further modified to ensure that development in floodplain is only permitted in accordance with PPS 3.1.4(b) where the nature of the use is such that it must locate within the floodplain, such as flood and/or erosion control works or it is a minor addition to existing building, or it is a passive-non-structural use that would not affect flood flows.</p>		<p>the first sentence of OP policy 4.4.2, to be consistent with PPS 3.1.2, such that it reads:</p> <p>"New development and site alteration will be generally prohibited in areas that are subject to flooding."</p> <p>Additional policy(s)/policy modification is required to be consistent with policies 3.1.2 and 3.1.4(b) of 2014 PPS.</p>
11.4.1	This policy should be expanded to indicate that consents are not permitted in certain Hazard Lands including flood plains.	PPS 3.1.2 (a), (c), (d)	We recommend adding a policy to Section 11.4.1 to reiterate that no new lot creation is permitted in hazardous areas as per referenced sections of the PPS.
Mineral Aggregate			
4.10.3 (d)	This draft policy (as written) is more restrictive than provincial policy by prohibiting mineral aggregate operations in Specialty Crop Areas. Aggregate extraction is permitted as an interim use in Specialty Crop Areas as per section 2.5.4 of the PPS and in accordance to Section 5.3 of the Greenbelt Plan, municipal official plans and zoning bylaws shall not contain provisions that are more restrictive than mineral aggregate resources policies as per Section 4.3.2 of the Greenbelt Plan.	PPS 2.5.4, Greenbelt Plan Section 5.3	Removing draft sub-policy 4.10.3(d) is recommended to conform with the Greenbelt Plan and be consistent with the PPS.
4.10.8 (e)	The draft OP is more restrictive than the Provincial Standards by allowing the final depth of extraction to be at least 2.5 metres above the water table for pit operations. However, it is noted that pits can extract to 1.5 metres above water table in accordance to the Aggregate Resources of Ontario Provincial Standards.	Aggregate Resources of Ontario Provincial Standards	Revise the depth of extraction for pit operations from 2.0 metres to 1.5 metres above water table.

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
4.10.9 (a)	Subsection (a)(i) of Policy 4.10.9 prohibits new mineral aggregate operations in "wetlands" which is more restrictive than the Greenbelt Plan. Pursuant to sub-policy 4.3.2.3(a)(i) of the Greenbelt Plan, mineral aggregate operations are prohibited in "significant wetlands".	Greenbelt Plan 4.3.2.3(a)(i)	In sub-policy 4.10.9(a)(i) of the OP, to replace the term "wetlands" with "significant wetlands" and provide the associated definition within Section 12 of the OP.
4.10.10	Based on the comment made previously on draft OP Policy 4.10.3(d) regarding Specialty Crop Areas, OP Policy 4.10.10 should include a rehabilitation policy for Specialty Crop Areas since mineral extraction is permitted.	PPS 2.5.4.1, Greenbelt Plan 4.3.2.8(c)	Add a sub-policy to draft OP Policy 4.10.10 to include rehabilitation of Specialty Crop Areas similar to Greenbelt Policy 4.3.2.8(c).
4.10.10(c)	Policy 4.10.10(c) does not provide the level of protection for agricultural lands as required by the 2014 PPS. We recommend revising this sub-policy to better reflect PPS 2.5.4.1(c) requirement to examine alternative locations and the degree to which rehabilitation is feasible.	PPS 2.5.4	To modify sub-policy 4.10.10 (b) such that it reads: "The other alternatives have been satisfactorily considered by the applicant and found unsuitable. The consideration of other alternatives shall include resources in areas of Canada Land Inventory Class 4 through 7 lands, resources on lands identified as designated growth areas, and resources on prime agricultural lands where rehabilitation is feasible. Where no other alternatives are found, prime agricultural lands shall be protected in this order of priority: specialty crop areas, Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2 and 3 lands; and, "
New Policy	A new policy regarding comprehensive rehabilitation as per PPS Policy 2.5.3.2 is encouraged to achieve improved land use compatibility and connectivity between natural heritage features or prime agricultural areas, as well as, creating a rehabilitated landscape which best protects hydrological regimes over the long term.	PPS 2.5.3.2	We suggest adding a new policy to OP Section 4.10, as well as, a new definition for 'comprehensive rehabilitation.'
Greenbelt			
5.1.1, 6.3.1	Georgina Draft OP policies do not appear to clearly permit the full range of agricultural uses, agriculture-related and secondary uses. While existing uses are permitted by OP section 6.3.1, Greenbelt Plan policy	Greenbelt Plan 3.2.2, 3.2.4, 4.5	Recommend adding a policy to Section 5.1.1 in accordance with Greenbelt Plan policy 3.2.2.1 to clarify the full range of agricultural uses, agriculture-related and secondary uses are permitted in the Greenlands System and new buildings and structure for

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
	3.2.2.1 permits the full range of existing and new agricultural uses, agriculture-related and secondary uses.		<p>agriculture, agriculture-related and secondary uses are not subject to the Natural Heritage System (Greenlands System) policies but subject to the KNHF/HSF policies (Environmental Protection Area) such as following:</p> <p>"The full range of existing and new agriculture, agriculture-related and secondary uses and normal farm practices are permitted on lands within the Greenlands System.</p> <p>New buildings or structures for agriculture, agriculture-related and secondary uses are not subject to Section 5.1.1 but are subject to Section 6.3."</p>
5.1.1.1 a)	The wording of this policy does not fully reflect the wording of the Greenbelt Plan where the other sub-policies in this section do.	Greenbelt Plan 3.2.2.3 a)	<p>Recommend replacing the word "adverse" with "negative" and adding the words "or their functions" at the end so that it reads:</p> <p>"There will be no negative effects on key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features or their functions."</p>
5.1.1.4	Minimum vegetation protection zone for key natural heritage features and key hydrological features is 30 metres for certain features, as required by the Greenbelt Plan and policy 6.3.1.5 of the draft OP. This should be reiterated in the proposed draft OP Policy 5.1.1.4 as it also applies to features within the Greenlands System.	Greenbelt 3.2.4.4	<p>Add a sub-policy (b) to draft OP Policy 5.1.1.4 such that it reads:</p> <p>"(b) Is a minimum of 30 metres from the key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features identified in Section 6.3.1; and,</p> <p>(b) (c) Is established to achieve, and be maintained as natural self-sustaining vegetation."</p>
6.3.1	Missing sand barrens, savannahs and tallgrass prairies, and alvars in the list of key natural heritage features.	Greenbelt Plan 3.2.4	Add the following key natural heritage features, as per Section 3.2.4 of the Greenbelt Plan: sand barrens, savannahs and tallgrass prairies, and alvars.
6.3.1	Missing lakes (and their littoral zones) in the list of key hydrologic features.	Greenbelt Plan 3.2.4	Add "lakes (and their littoral zones)" to the list of key hydrologic features as per Section 3.2.4 of the Greenbelt Plan.
6.3.1	Under three core components, third bullet for 30 metre Vegetative Buffer Zone, fish habitat, seepage areas and springs are missing and the qualifier "significant" should be added to woodlands.	Greenbelt Plan 3.2.4.4	Add "fish habitat", "seepage areas and springs" and the qualifier "significant" to woodlands to the 30 metre Vegetative Buffer Zone components in the third bullet.
6.3.1.4	This policy will need to ensure that if the abutting land use designation is an urban area, it should not warrant any settlement boundary expansions as these would be subject to a Regional Municipal Comprehensive	Growth Plan 2.2.8	To clarify draft OP Policy 6.3.1.4 such that the Town will need to be satisfied with the change in designation as a result of the refinement cannot include an Urban Area designation.

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
	Review under the Growth Plan.		
6.3.1.5	The Greenbelt Plan minimum 30-metre vegetation protection zone applies to "significant woodlands."	Greenbelt Plan 3.2.4.4	Add the word "significant" before the word "woodlands".
6.3.1.14	OP Policy 6.3.1.14 provides a 'notwithstanding' clause related to the requirement for an Environmental Impact Statement, which is not in conformity with the Greenbelt Plan. We recommend deleting this policy, recognizing that policy 10.1.2.3 provides for the scoping of an EIS.	Greenbelt Plan	Delete policy 6.3.1.14.
6.3.1.17	Should any unauthorized removal, modification or destruction of natural features occur, replacement/ replantation or restoration of the impacted area should be required.	YROP 2.2.4.7	Revise draft OP policy 6.3.1.17 by adding the following sentence: "The removal, modification or destruction of the natural features, functions or linkages shall not provide the rationale for removal of these lands from the Environmental Protection Area designation. The impacted area shall be restored. "
6.4, 6.5 and 6.6	See letter re: Countryside Area (Rural Areas); Commercial Recreation Area Major Recreational Areas (Commercial Recreation Area)		
10.1.2.3	The draft policy permits the Town to scope reports such as an Environment Impact Statement, if the development is minor in nature or straight forward. This policy should be further clarified, as the qualifier 'minor' or "straight forward" is unclear and subjective.	Clarification	Further clarification is recommended to determine what is considered as a "minor or straight forward" development application. We suggest the final two sentences of the policy to be replaced with the following: "Scoping shall be done by the Town, the relevant conservation authority, and other relevant agencies in consultation with the applicant at the preconsultation meeting in accordance with the policies of this Plan. Such scoping will reflect the type of development being proposed and the sensitivity and characteristics of the area within and surrounding it."

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
12.5.74 (definitions)	<p>The definition of 'negative impacts' in the draft OP does not include water and hydrologic features and their functions. To conform to the Greenbelt Plan, the definition for this term should be revised to include impacts to quality and quantity of water and hydrologic features.</p> <p>With respect to negative impacts to 'other natural heritage features' the test in the draft OP is the loss of natural features or ecological functions, however the tests of the Greenbelt Plan is any degradation that threatens the health, and integrity of the natural features or ecological functions caused by development and site alteration activities. Both development and site alteration are defined terms in the draft OP.</p>	Greenbelt Plan - Definitions	<p>To revise the definition for the term 'negative terms' such that it reads:</p> <p><i>"Negative impact(s)</i> Means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. In regard to water, degradation to the quality or quantity of surface or ground water, key hydrologic features or vulnerable areas, and their related hydrologic functions, due to single, multiple or successive development or site alteration activities; b. In regard to <i>fish habitat</i>, the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of <i>fish habitat</i>, except where, in conjunction with the appropriate authorities, it has been authorized under the Fisheries Act, using the guiding principle of no net loss of productive capacity; and c. In regard to other natural heritage features and areas, degradation that threatens the health and integrity of the natural features or ecological functions for which an area is identified due to single, multiple or successive development or site alteration activities."
12.5.29	In the Greenbelt Plan, "development" excludes facilities for transportation, infrastructure and utilities by public body; activities or works under the Drainage Act; or existing agricultural practices.	Greenbelt Plan/PPS	Revise the definition for the term 'development' or include a policy to Section 6.3 Environmental Protection Areas such that it excludes the three uses as described in the definition for the term 'development' of the Greenbelt Plan.
12.5.98	The definition in the OP for the term 'significant woodlands' is incomplete. As per the Greenbelt Plan, identification of significant woodlands is determined based on the criteria established by MNRF.	Greenbelt Plan Definitions	<p>Add the following sentence to the end of the definition for the term "significant woodlands" in Section 12.5.98 of the OP:</p> <p>"These are to be identified using criteria established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry."</p>
12.5 New Definition	A definition for significant wetlands is required to ensure conformity with the Greenbelt Plan.	Greenbelt Plan Definitions	<p>To add the following new term and definition for "significant wetlands" in Section 12.5 of the draft OP:</p> <p>"Significant wetlands: an area identified as provincially significant by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry using evaluation procedures established by the Province, as amended from time to time."</p>

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
Agriculture			
4.7.2 (Minimum Distance Separation Formulae)	We recommend this policy to be expanded to state a direction on several additional options that are available to municipalities for MDS application. The Official Plan may also be expanded to clarify whether MDS will be applied differently in Agricultural designations vs. Rural designations.	PPS 2.3.3.3., 1.1.5.9	Provide clear direction as to whether or not MDS will be applied in the following circumstances/ options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where a new lot is proposed with an existing dwelling, and that dwelling is located on a lot separate from the subject livestock facility (MDS Guideline 8) Application of MDS to cemeteries (Type A or B, MDS Guideline 38) Application of MDS after a catastrophe (MDS Guideline 11)
6.1.10, 6.2.8, 6.2.10, 6.7.5, 11.1.1...etc.	The draft OP refers several times to the 'Agricultural Code of Practice' document. This document has now been replaced by the 'MDS Formulae and Guidelines.'	PPS 2.3.3.3, 1.1.5.9	Replace the term 'Agricultural Code of Practice' with ' MDS Formulae and Guidelines ', wherever the term is used in the OP.
6.1.1 b), 12.5.9, 12.5.41, 11.4.2.10	<p>The draft OP defines the term 'agricultural-related uses,' as per the definition of the Greenbelt Plan which apply to farm related commercial and farm related industrial that are small in scale, directly related to the farm operation and required to be in close proximity to the farm operation.</p> <p>The term 'farm-related commercial/industrial uses' is a defined term in the OP which serves the same purpose as 'agricultural-related uses.' The added definition for farm-related uses appears redundant and confusing. For instance in Policy 11.4.2.10 (e) the permitted use for farm-related commercial/industrial uses.</p>	PPS 2.3.2	Recommend deleting definition 12.5.41 Farm Related Commercial/ Industrial Use and replacing all instances in the OP of the term 'farm-related commercial/industrial use' with the term 'agricultural-related use' in accordance with the PPS.
6.1.5	This policy currently permits lot creation for agricultural and farm-related uses, subject to minimum lot requirements as per Section 4.6.3(a) of the Greenbelt Plan. However, Section 4.6.3(a) only applies to only agricultural uses, whereas agricultural-related uses are subject to different tests in Section 4.6.3(b) of the Greenbelt Plan. We recommend removing the term 'farm-related use' in order to conform with the	Greenbelt Plan 4.6	<p>In Policy 6.1.5, remove the phrase "agriculture and farm related" and replace with the term "agricultural" such that it reads:</p> <p>"The fragmentation of agricultural parcels of land and the creation of non-viable farm operations shall not be permitted. The creation of parcels of land for agriculture and farm-related agricultural uses of less than 40 hectares in agricultural areas, and less than 16 hectares in the Specialty Crop Area, shall not be permitted."</p>

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
	Greenbelt Plan and to avoid confusion with 'agriculture-related use.'		
6.1.6	Please see above for rationale.	PPS 2.3.4.1, Greenbelt Plan 4.6	Remove and replace the terms "Farm-related" and "Non-farm" with "Agriculture-related" and "Non-agriculture" such that it reads: "Farm Agriculture-related severances are permitted under certain conditions, in accordance with the provisions of Section 11.4.2.4 Non-farm Non-agriculture related severances of the agricultural land base will not be permitted, unless in accordance with Section 11.4.2.5."
6.1.10 (c)	Since, the majority of agricultural-related uses will not pose an odour conflict, as such the policy should clarify that MDS should only be applied in those cases where a higher density of human occupancy or activity is anticipated. In addition, the reference to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Affairs (OMAFRA) in sub-policy 6.1.10(c) is incorrect. The requirement to comply with MDS stems from the <i>Planning Act</i> , through the PPS. OMAFRA is responsible for preparing, maintaining and advising on the formulae and guidelines.	PPS 2.3.3.3, Greenbelt Plan 3.1.2., 3.1.3, MDS Guidelines	Recommend modifying sub-policy 6.1.10(c) as follows: "6.1.10 Applications for the development of farm-related commercial/ industrial agricultural-related uses shall: c) Incorporate appropriate separation distances from farm operations in accordance with the Minimum Distance Separation Formulae, where merited by a higher density of human occupancy or activity or significant visitation by the broader public to an agricultural area. in the Agricultural Code of Practice as required by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs ... "
6.1.17	See letter re: Prime Agricultural Refinement		
6.7	The draft OP should include a policy clearly stating that uses contemplated by Section 6.7 – Parkland Area are not permitted within the 'Specialty Crop Area' and 'Agricultural Protection Area,' designation.	PPS 2.3.6, Greenbelt Plan 3.1	We recommend adding a new policy in Section 6.7 clarifying that parkland uses are not permitted within the Agricultural Protection Area, aside from existing areas designated for such uses.
11.4.1.1 (f)	Greenbelt section 3.1.3 requires new land uses and creation of new lots in prime agricultural areas to comply with the MDS Formulae. Draft sub-policy 11.4.1.1(f) should be strengthened to conform with the Greenbelt such that all decisions made regarding consents in agricultural areas must comply with the	PPS 2.3.3.3 and 1.1.5.9, Greenbelt Plan 3.1.3	Recommend revising draft OP Policy 11.4.1.1 (f) as follows: "f) Decisions of the Committee of Adjustment shall carefully consider shall comply with the Minimum Distance Separation Formulae in the Agricultural Code of Practice as required by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food when

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
	MDS Formulae.		considering a consent application which would affect agricultural lands."
11.4.2.4 & 11.4.2.5	<p>Draft OP 11.4.2.4 is confusing and redundant with policy 11.4.2.5 dealing with severances of a residence surplus to a farming operation as a result of a farm consolidation, and furthermore is not consistent with Greenbelt Plan Policy 4.6.3.</p> <p>The last sentence of 11.4.2.4 could apply to 11.4.2.5 (ag viability); therefore we recommend separating that sentence from rest of this policy and dealing with surplus residences through policy 11.4.2.5.</p> <p>Note that an earlier section of the draft OP already addresses severances for agricultural uses. If the municipality wishes to permit severances for agricultural-related uses, it has not clarified this in the OP.</p>	PPS 2.3.4.1/Greenbelt Plan 4.6.3	<p>Recommend modifying 11.4.2.4 and 11.4.2.5 as follows:</p> <p>11.4.2.4 Severances for agriculture, forestry or conservation uses, which support the respective goals, objectives and policies of this Plan will be permitted. Land consolidations for these uses will be encouraged. Therefore, where a consolidation occurs, and as a result of the consolidation an existing dwelling becomes superfluous, a lot containing the existing dwelling may be severed from the consolidated parcel, in accordance with the general requirements for severances. In these circumstances, and to ensure that a bona fide consent is intended, Council, or the Committee, may require, as a condition of severing the lot containing the dwelling, that the remaining parcels be consolidated through title registration where appropriate. Where severance of a farm parcel is required to permit consolidation, the Council and the Committee will give consideration to the agricultural viability of the resultant parcel.</p> <p>11.4.2.5 Within the Specialty Crop Area and Agricultural Protection Area, severance of a <i>residence surplus to a farming operation as a result of a farm consolidation</i> may be permitted in instances where a farmer owns and operates the agricultural operation on a number of land holdings in the Town which may or may are not be contiguous. A condition of severing such surplus dwelling shall be the prohibition of the construction of a new dwelling on the retained lot of farmland in perpetuity through a rezoning or other municipal approaches. Council and the Committee will give consideration to the agricultural viability of the resultant farm parcel. The new residential lot will be limited to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and appropriate services.</p> <p>The term "residence surplus to a farming operation" should also be italicized as this is a defined term in the OP from the Greenbelt Plan/PPS definition.</p>

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
12.5.7 (Definitions)	The term 'Agricultural uses' as defined in the draft OP does not include biomass as an agricultural use. We recommend revising this definition to match the updated definition in Section 6.0 of the 2014 PPS and to reflect the range of agricultural uses which may be permitted.	PPS 6.0	It is recommended that the term 'biomass' be added to the definition of 'Agricultural Uses,' as follows: "Agricultural Uses: means the growing of crops, including nursery, biomass and horticultural crops; raising of livestock; raising of other animals for food..."
Transportation			
7.6.4, Schedule E	Schedule E of the OP indicates the extension of Highway 404 with a proposed interchange at Glenwoods Avenue, north of Ravenshoe Road. It should be noted that this interchange has no status pending York/Municipal EA Amendment and MTO's approval. The approved Route Planning and Environmental Assessment for the extension of Highway 404 extension does not include this interchange. An EA Amendment and justification for the need of the Glenwoods Avenue interchange must be completed by the Town or the Region for MTO's consideration.	YROP 7.2.54	We recommend modifying draft OP Policy 7.6.4 and indicate on Schedule E, that the proposed interchange is subject to an EA amendment process and MTO's approval. We suggest revising Policy 7.6.4 such that it reads: "Schedule E – Roads Plan identifies a proposed additional interchange at Highway 404 and Glenwoods Avenue. It is the intent of the Town, in conjunction with York Region to promote the early development of this identified interchange pending York/Municipal EA Amendment and Ministry of Transportation's approval. "
Stormwater Management			
9.5.10	Any development proposals that are required to prepare a stormwater management report or plan for MTO's approval, should include an assessment in accordance to the MTO's Drainage Guidelines to determine if the development will impact on the drainage system.		To modify draft OP Policy 9.5.10 to include the Ministry of Transportation's Drainage Guidelines as follows: "In the consideration of development adjacent or in proximity to a Provincial Highway, the stormwater management report and plan prepared in accordance to Ministry of Transportation Drainage Guidelines , shall be reviewed and approved by the Ministry of Transportation."
Schedules			
Schedules A and B	See letter re: Rural and Agricultural Designations and Greenlands System within the secondary plan areas		

Draft OP Policy	Comments	Provincial Policy Justification	Recommended Action/ Proposed Modification
Typographical and Technical Comments			
6.2.15 b)	Typographical Error – replace the word “internment” with “interment”		
6.3.1.11	Existing policies are under Section 5.7 of the OP. Replace policy reference in the last sentence from “5.6” with “5.7.”		
7.2, 7.5.13, 9.5.5 etc.	Replace all “Ministry of the Environment” with “Ministry of Environment and Climate Change”		
4.10.8, 5.3.6 (a)(iii) etc.	Replace all “Ministry of Natural Resources” with “Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry”		
9.5.3(b)	Typographical Error – replace “integreated” with “integrated”		
12.5.53	This definition contains a typo. Should be 'processing OR'.		
12.5.61	Typographical Error for the term “Alvar”		



William B. Joannou
B.Sc., M.Sc., B.Arch., CMAA

Oct. 9, 2015

Town of Georgina
Town of Georgina Civic Centre
26557 Civic Centre Road
RR# 2, Keswick, Ontario, L4P 3G1

Tel: 905-476-4301

Fax: 905-476-4394

page 1 of 3

Attn: Adrian Cammaert, Senior Planner - Policy

Re: Release of Draft Official Plan April 20, 2015, 824 Trivetts Road, Georgina, Ontario,

Hi Adrian,

We have a copy of Report# PB-2015-0073. We had a hard time finding the posting on Oct. 8,15 at the link you provided. We called planning and after many attempts with several people were able to get PDF's sent to us directly by e-mail from Anna Geneole. Anna could not find the posting on the official web site either and we insisted she get the Report to us right away from her own access. We appreciate her assistance.

1. We rushed a meeting with the Owner as time is very short before the Public Meeting next week as well as the complications of this Thanksgiving long weekend. We referred to items 199 and 200 on page 29 of 36 of the Consultant response to our issues and concerns and the Owner was very upset that the response did not agree with leaving the existing Lakeshore Residential designation of the property or of changing it to Services Lakeshore Residential, but to stay with the proposed new designation of Environmental Protection "EP" and only based on the consultants assertion of numerous natural features and that the site is within the NHS (Natural Heritage System of the GBP (Green Belt Plan). Very vague considering how **NEGATIVELY** this proposed change will be.

We immediately request more information on the following so that we may prepare ourselves for the public meeting next week. This is crucially important to the Owner.

- A. What are the numerous natural features the consultant is referring to and we need any maps or documentation to back up this claim?
- B. Please provide the NHS of the GBP mapping or documentation that the consultant is referring to and basing his decision on.
- C. What are the "restrictive Development Policies the consultant is referring to? and are these present to the existing designation on the lands or imposed as a result of the new proposed EP yet to take effect.

2. The site was previously designated Lakeshore Residential which is what we feel it should remain or be upgraded to Serviced Lakeshore Residential not downgraded to EP. It appears that your consultant is saying he is ignoring the fact it was already Lakeshore Residential and is pushing forwards with the EP re-designation. We are again requesting that the new plan leave the old designation alone or upgrade it to Serviced Lakeshore Residential only. The Owner is prepared to fight the above moving forwards as he feels the Draft Official Plan is wrong and penalizing his property.
3. This property has been left intact over the years allowing the natural vegetation to just grow, was not farmed such as neighboring properties nor were natural features removed. This was done to maintain some features in case this property was to be developed and thus would retain some features as a bonus, as a selling point, improve each severed lot and maintain some natural features for future developments.

Neighboring properties who have removed natural features and or farmed have destroyed all previous natural features and have under this Draft Plan been rewarded by designations of Lakeshore Serviced Residential while this Owner was penalized with and downgrading to EP designation for being friendly to the environment and with no ability to realize development of his land for which he has been holding, paying taxes for and maintaining for +/- 35 years or more. He rightfully feels cheated. It appears that someone has simply looked at where trees are now existing and just extended the line of control and re-designation to EP around it.

4. The Owner further asserts that he receives on a yearly basis a notice from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry where they identify EP zones and natural features to be protected on this property, the local areas as well as another +/- 80 Acres the Owner owns immediately south of this property across Metro Road North. There has never been any natural features or EP and or GBP issues raised for this 14 Acre site at any time. There have been for the other +/- 80 acres which is not part of this argument.
5. The Owner requests that you review this matter once again to check the sanity of what the Draft Plan is subjecting this property and owner to and make amendments to the Plan that are more equitable and fair in comparison to other properties and Owner's or leave the designation as was previously as Serviced Lakeshore Residential. Please put yourself in this Owner's position.

6. The property was purchased originally as Lakeshore Residential which allowed residential development and the intension by the Owner was that such development could be realized. The re-designation to EP makes any real re-development impossible and the property is left worthless.

If you intend to pursue and force the Owner to accept the re-designation to EP, the Owner will argue and insist that you purchase the lands at current fair market values and based on the previous designation of Lakeshore Residential and before the new Official Plan is approved.

We are hoping you get a chance to respond to this letter before the public meeting next week.

Sincerely
on behalf of 315197 Ontario Limited
ACI Architects Inc.


William Joannou

CC: by e-mail

Major	- Margaret Quirk	mquirk@georgina.ca
Counselor	- Dave Neeson	dneeson@georgina.ca
Director Planning & Building	- D. Lenters	dlienters@georgina.ca

Town of Georgina

Official Plan

Schedule A2 LAND USE PLAN

DRAFT

Lake Simcoe




LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

Lakeshore Residential Area	Commercial Recreation Area	Agricultural Protection Area
Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area	Rural Industrial Area	Specialty Crop Area
Urban Residential Area	Keswick Business Park Study Area	Environmental Protection Area
Hamlet Area	Parkland Area	Greenlands System
Rural Commercial Area	Rural Area	

BASE MAP INFORMATION

Provincial Highway
Road
Railway
Municipal Boundary
Regional Boundary
Hydro Corridor
Secondary Plan Area
Watercourse
Waterbody



Sources: Town of Georgina, Regional Municipality of York, ArcGIS Online Basemaps.
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority. Produced by York Region and
MHBC Planning under licence from Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources,
Copyright © Queens Printer 2015

Date: March 5, 2015

Town of Georgina

Official Plan


Schedule B1

KEY NATURAL

HERITAGE FEATURES

DRAFT

Lake Simcoe



- Woodland
- Wetland
- Woodland & Wetland
- Life Science Area of Natural & Scientific Interest
- Greenland System
- River Valley Connections

BASE MAP INFORMATION

- Provincial Highway
- Road
- Railway
- Municipal Boundary
- Regional Boundary
- Hydro Corridor
- Secondary Plan Area
- Watercourse
- Waterbody



GEORGINA



Sources: Town of Georgina, Regional Municipality of York, ArcGIS Online Basemaps.
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority. Produced by York Region and
MHC Planning under licence from Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources,
Copyright © Queens Printer 2015

Date: March 5, 2015



**PLANNERS
CONSULTING
ENGINEERS &
LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTS**

Principals:

Paul Puopolo, MA, MCIP, RPP
OALA, President

John Ariens, BES, MCIP, RPP

Ed Gazendam, M. Eng., P. Eng.

Sergio Marchia, BA, MCIP, RPP

John Perks, B.A.Sc., M.B.A., P. Eng.

David Sisco, BA, MCIP, RPP

☐ **Kitchener**

379 Queen St. S.
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 1W6
Bus.: (519) 745-9455
Fax: (519) 745-7647
email: kitchener@peil.net

☐ **Hamilton**

360 James St. N.
Suite 200, East Wing
Hamilton, Ontario L8L 1H5
Toll Free: 1-888-719-2793
Bus.: (905) 546-1010
Fax: (905) 546-1011
email: hamilton@peil.net

☐ **Brantford**

Bus.: (519) 759-8788
Fax: (519) 759-8796

☐ **Greater Toronto Area**

52 Village Centre Place, Suite 200
Mississauga, Ontario L4Z 1V9
Toll Free: 1-877-822-3778
Bus.: (905) 890-3550
Fax: (905) 890-7081
email: GTA@peil.net

February 14, 2005
File No.: T-P205

Greenbelt Consultations
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
14th Floor, 777 Bay Street
Toronto, ON
M5G 2E5

Dear Sir/Madam:

RE: Draft Greenbelt Plan

As a follow up to our letter of January 19, 2005, regarding 92.952 acres of property owned by 315197 Ontario Ltd. and legally described as Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on Plan 65R-2192 (12.582 acres) and Part 1 on Plan 65R-2173 (80.37 acres) in the Town of Georgina, Regional Municipality of York, we reiterate our position that our client's lands should be removed from the Draft Greenbelt Plan.

The portion of the lands located north of Metro Road is designated as "Lakeshore Residential Area" in the Town of Georgina Official Plan. Lands located south of Metro Road are designated "Rural Area" with small portions designated as "Environmental Protection Area 1" and Environmental Protection Area 3".


In addition to these designations, the lands north of Metro Road and a portion of the lands south of Metro Road are also designated as "Community Improvement Areas". These "Community Improvement Areas" have been identified and officially designated as such in the local Official Plan and should be recognized in the Greenbelt Plan (refer to attached figure).

As these lands have been recognized and designated within the local Municipal Official Plan, we see the inclusion of these lands in the Protected Countryside designation of the Greenbelt Plan as an oversight of the existing Planning Controls that have been approved by the local municipality, and request that these lands be removed from the Greenbelt Plan as this is an error.

We thank you for the opportunity to submit our comments regarding the draft Greenbelt Plan and trust that the above information will result in the removal of these lands from the Plan.

Please provide to us your written decision with regard to the removal of these lands and advise us of the timing of your decision in order that we can make the necessary deputiation regarding same.

Yours truly,
**PLANNING & ENGINEERING
INITIATIVES LTD.**


Paul F. Puopolo, MA, MCIP, RPP, OALA
President

PFP/baw
Encl.

cc: 315197 Ontario Ltd.
Karyn Stone/Harold Lenters, Town of Georgina



PEIL

**PLANNERS
CONSULTING
ENGINEERS &
LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTS**

Principals:

Paul Puopolo, MA, MCIP, RPP,
OALA, President

John Ariens, BES, MCIP, RPP

Sergio Manchia, BA, MCIP, RPP

John Perks, BASc., MBA, P. Eng.

David Sisco, BA, MCIP, RPP

via fax and mail

March 17, 2005
File No.: T-P205

315197 Ontario Ltd.
91 Danforth Avenue
Toronto, Ontario
M4K 1N2

Dear Sir:

RE: 824 Trivetts Road
Town of Georgina

Further to your request, we have contacted Mr. Dan Tovey, Planner of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing; Mrs. Barb Jeffrey, Senior Planner of the Region of York; and Mr. Harold Lenters, Director of Planning, Town of Georgina to confirm the impact of the Greenbelt Plan on the existing Official Plan designations of your lands. All have confirmed that the existing "Lakeshore Residential" designation applicable to the 12.582 acre parcel will remain and further applications for residential development are permitted under the Greenbelt Plan policies.

The Greenbelt Plan effectively removes the Community Improvement Area as delineated on Schedule K of the Town of Georgina Official Plan. These Community Improvement Areas will be re-evaluated through the update of local Official Plans.

The 80.37 acre parcel designated "Rural" will be brought into conformity with the Greenbelt Plan "Protected Countryside" during the next local Official Plan update.

☐ **Kitchener**

379 Queen St. S.
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 1W6
Bus.: (519) 745-9455
Fax: (519) 745-7647
email: kitchener@peil.net

☐ **Hamilton**

360 James St. N.
Suite 200, East Wing
Hamilton, Ontario L8L 1H5
Bus.: (905) 546-1010
Fax: (905) 546-1011
email: hamilton@peil.net

☐ **Greater Toronto Area**

52 Village Centre Place, Suite 200
Mississauga, Ontario L4Z 1V9
Bus.: (905) 890-3550
Fax: (905) 890-7081
email: GTA@peil.net

☐ **Brantford**

Bus.: (519) 759-8788
Fax: (519) 759-8796

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,
PLANNING & ENGINEERING
INITIATIVES LTD.

Scott J. Patterson, BA, CPT
Planner

SJP/baw

cc: Paul Puopolo, PEIL

Toll Free: 1-877-822-3798

WWW.PEIL.NET

SIMCOE

DRIVE

NORVAL ROAD

ELMWOOD STREET

R.O.W.

ISLE VIEW ROAD


(OPENED BY
QUARTER SESSION REPORT
REG'D PLAN 207

LOT 2
LOT 3

65R-2192

12-781200

TRIVETTE LANE




65R-2192

PART 2
12.240 AC.
12-781200

PART 3
0.342 AC.





65R-2192

PART 2
12.240 AC.
12-781200

RAILWAY)



October 14, 2015

Harold Lenters
Director of Planning and Building
Georgina Civic Centre
26557 Civic Centre Road
R.R. #2 Keswick, ON L4P 3G1

Re: Town of Georgina Official Plan (April 2015 Draft)

TOWN OF GEORGINA	
OCT 16 2015	
PLANNING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION	
REFER	NOTED
	Hwl
FILE #	

Dear Mr. Lenters:

We are pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the Official Plan Review process and comment on the Town of Georgina's Official Plan (April 2015 Draft).

Bell Canada is Ontario's principal telecommunications infrastructure provider, developing and maintaining an essential public service. The *Bell Canada Act*, a federal statute, requires that Bell supply, manage and operate most of the trunk telecommunications system in Ontario. Bell is therefore also responsible for the infrastructure that supports most 911 emergency services in the Province. The critical nature of Bell's services is declared in the *Bell Canada Act* to be "for the general advantage of Canada" and the *Telecommunications Act* affirms that the services of telecommunications providers are "essential in the maintenance of Canada's identity and sovereignty." Further, the *Telecommunications Act* outlines objectives for Canada's telecommunications policy, which speaks to ensuring affordable and reliable services, enhanced efficiency and competitiveness, efficient and effective regulation where required, and responsiveness to economic and social requirements of users.

Provincial policy further indicates the economic and social functions of telecommunications systems and emphasizes the importance of delivering cost-effective and efficient services. The 2014 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requires the development of coordinated, efficient and cost-effective infrastructure, including telecommunications systems (Section 1.6.1). Section 1.7.1 k) of the 2014 PPS recognizes that "efficient, coordinated telecommunications infrastructure" is a component of supporting long-term economic prosperity. We note that the definition of infrastructure in the 2014 PPS is inclusive of communications/telecommunications, which is indicative of the importance in providing efficient telecommunications services to support current needs and future growth (Section 1.6.1). Furthermore, the 2014 PPS states that infrastructure should be "strategically located to support the effective and efficient delivery of emergency management services" (Section 1.6.4), which is relevant to telecommunications since it is an integral component of the 911 emergency service.

To support the intent of the *Bell Canada Act* and *Telecommunications Act* and ensure consistency with Provincial policy, Bell Canada has become increasingly involved in municipal policy and infrastructure initiatives. Bell Canada is supportive of municipal infrastructure initiatives,, official plans, zoning by-laws, design guidelines and other initiatives that:

- Recognize the role of modern telecommunications infrastructure in creating economically competitive communities;
- Provide flexibility in the permission of utility structures, which ensures that utilities can be designed, located and maintained in a cost-effective and efficient manner, and ensures that Bell's technicians will have ease of access to maintain the infrastructure;
- Emphasize the need for municipalities, developers and Bell Canada to communicate and coordinate with one another to ensure the coordinated delivery of services; and
- Balance the desire to create attractive, uncluttered streetscapes with the need to provide cost-effective and efficient telecommunications services.

We have reviewed the Town of Georgina Official Plan and offer the following specific comments:

Section 12.5 – Definitions

Bell requests that the Town consider adding the following definitions (to Section 12.5) to clarify the intent of the Official Plan and to align the Plan with the Provincial Policy Statement definitions explicitly with respect to “communications/telecommunications” as follows:

***Infrastructure:** means physical structures (facilities or corridors) that form the foundation for development or resource use. Infrastructure includes: sewage and water systems, sewage treatment systems, waste management systems, electric power generation and transmission including renewable energy systems, communications/telecommunications, transit and transportation corridors and facilities, oil and gas pipelines and associated facilities.*

***Utility(ies):** means an essential public service such as electricity, gas, television or communications/telecommunications that is provided by a regulated company or government agency.*

Adding these definitions will help address our comments below.

Section 4.1 – Land Uses Permitted in all Designations

We note that Section 4.1 uses undefined terms such as “public utilities”, “telephone and cable television transmission utility services”. As such, the use of the terms “infrastructure” and “utility(ies)”, coupled with the definitions provided above, will provide greater clarity that telecommunication services can be provided and are permitted in all land use designations. Bell's activities consist of more than just telephone and

internet; therefore, the definition of infrastructure which includes “communications/telecommunications” is a more inclusive term. It is critical that Bell’s essential services be clearly permitted in all land use designations. It is our approach to work closely with municipalities to appropriately locate and design infrastructure in a manner that achieves the municipality’s design objectives and minimizes impacts on sensitive environmental features. As Bell’s infrastructure is federally regulated, a cooperative approach is ideal to ensure the deployment of these essential services.

Bell Canada requests that Section 4.1.1 be revised to ensure that both infrastructure and utilities, such as communication/telecommunications facilities, be permitted in any designation to ensure servicing can be provided to meet the public need in a timely and efficient manner. The need to provide coordinated, efficient and cost-effective infrastructure, including telecommunications, is a policy of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (Section 1.6.1). Following are our recommended wording changes which are ~~crossed out~~ where they are suggested deletions, and/or ***italicized in bold*** where they are suggested additions.

4.1.1 (a) Public Uses ***and Infrastructure***

(i) public uses, such as public roads, railway lines, public parks, trails and other non-intensive recreational facilities; municipal and regional uses, buildings and structures; ***infrastructure and*** ~~public~~ utilities such as, local water supply, sewage, and drainage facilities, ~~gas, telephone and cable television transmission utility services~~ ***communication/telecommunication facilities and utilities*** are permitted in all designations, subject to any regulatory requirements such as the provisions of the Environmental Assessment Act. The location of such uses should be justified and should be compatible with the surrounding land uses; and

(ii) The Town will encourage the underground installation of ~~public utility facilities~~ ***infrastructure and utilities*** where feasible and the associated costs will be at the expense of the developer.

Section 9.1 – General Infrastructure

It is indicated in Section 9.1.1, consistent with the Greenbelt Plan, that *“Infrastructure, and expansions and extensions of infrastructure within the Greenbelt Protected Countryside are permitted provided the project meets one of the following two objectives to the satisfaction of Council: a) It supports agriculture, recreation and tourism, rural settlement areas, resource use of the rural economic activity in the Greenbelt Protected Countryside and is permitted within the Greenbelt; b) It serves the significant growth and economic development expected in southern Ontario outside of the Greenbelt Protected Countryside by providing for the appropriate infrastructure connections among urban growth centres and between these centres and Ontario’s borders.”*

We note that Section 9.1 uses the term “infrastructure” which is not defined by the Official Plan. As such, the use of the terms “infrastructure” and “utility(ies),” coupled with the definitions provided above, will provide greater clarity that telecommunication services can be provided in the Greenbelt Protected Countryside designation.

We agree that the intent of the Plan should not be to restrict the permission of utilities in these designations, but rather to ensure that utilities are sensitive to natural heritage features. Typically, telecommunications utilities would be provided within the public road right-of-way to support growth and development. However, in cases when there are no alternatives, Bell will work with municipalities to ensure that the placement and operation of telecommunications utilities is sensitive to environmental features within natural heritage features. Bell has previously undertaken Environmental Impact Studies in relation to utility lines that were required to cross natural heritage features. The timely deployment and maintenance of telecommunications infrastructure is an important public interest. Bell's activities are best managed through proactive communication between Bell and municipal staff, including the coordination of any necessary natural heritage impact studies.

We would like to thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the Town of Georgina's Official Plan (April 2015 Draft). Please advise Bell of any further meetings, reports, drafts, decisions, etc. related to this matter. We request that all documentation be forwarded to our Development and Municipal Services Control Centre:

Ms. Meaghan Palynchuk
Manager – Municipal Relations
Access Network Provisioning, Ontario
Development and Municipal Services Control Centre
Bell Canada
Floor 5 BLUE, 100 Borough Drive
Toronto, Ontario
M1P 4W2

If you have any questions, please direct them to the undersigned.

Yours truly,



Meaghan Palynchuk
Manager, Municipal Relations
Access Network Provisioning, Ontario

cc: Chris Tyrrell – MMM Group Ltd.

Bell Canada
Development and Municipal Services Control Centre
Floor 5 BLUE, 100 Borough Drive
Toronto, Ontario
M1P 4W2

Telephone 905-540-7254
Fax 905-895-3872
meaghan.palynchuk@bell.ca

MMM Group Limited
 100 Commerce Valley Drive, Suite 1000
 Thornhill, ON Canada L3T 0A1
 T: 905.882.7100 | F: 905.882.5055

www.mmm.ca

14 October 2015

Project No. 14.12224.002.P01

John Espinosa
 Town Clerk, Office of the Clerk (Clerk's Division)
 Town of Georgina
 26557 Civic Centre Drive
 Keswick, ON L4P 3G1

Dear Mr. Espinosa,

Subject: **Proposed New Official Plan Comments
 Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Request
 2354 Ravenshoe Road
 Keswick, Town of Georgina
 Nizza Enterprises**

TOWN OF GEORGINA	
NOV 06 2015	
PLANNING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION	
REFER	NOTED
	<i>hu</i>
FILE #	

On behalf of our client, Nizza Enterprises, MMM Group Limited (MMM) is submitting a formal, written submission in relation to a Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Request for the above noted property. A formal submission package was made to the Town of Georgina on July 31, 2015.

Subject Lands

The Subject Lands are located at the northeast corner of Ravenshoe Road and Woodbine Avenue in the Town of Georgina. The Subject Lands are approximately 10.4 hectares (25.71 acres) and are legally described as Part of Lot 1, Concession 4, Keswick, Town of Georgina. Figure 1 illustrates the Subject Land's locational context and is enclosed as part of this letter.

The lands are located within the "Keswick Business Park Study Area (KBPSA)" designation as shown on Schedule A in the Town of Georgina's Official Plan. The KBPSA is subject to the Official Plan policies in Section 3.21, which indicates that the designation is to recognize the long-term potential of this area as a location for employment generating land uses (Section 3.21 (a)). Furthermore, the Keswick Business Park Secondary Plan (KBPSP) has policy language that states that the intent of the KBPSA was to allow landowners in the area to conduct further review and analysis of their lands in order to determine the development potential of the lands.

Background

Following a meeting with Town staff on March 28th, 2014, MMM submitted a comment letter to the Town of Georgina on July 18th, 2014 with respect to the Town's Official Plan Review. The letter outlined our client's intentions to develop their lands and also confirmed our support of the recommendation outlined in the Planning Directions Report (June 2014), to maintain the KBPSA overlay during the Town's Official Plan review process.

As per Section 9.4.7.4.2 (b) of the Keswick Business Park Secondary Plan, such policy provides that the onus is placed on the landowner to further pursue and determine the development potential of their lands with the appropriate authorities. The studies as included with this submission to the Town serve to identify the approximate developable area of the subject lands in concert with policy 9.4.7.4.2 (b) of the Keswick Business Park Secondary Plan.

In June 2012, MMM submitted a Preliminary Floodplain Investigation Report for the Subject Lands to the Lake Simcoe and Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA), with LSRCA comments received in 2013. To date, MMM has addressed the LSRCA comments and have also completed an analysis on site investigations to determine locations for cut & fill and the development potential of the subject lands.

Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Request

On July 31, 2015, MMM submitted a Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Request to recommend the Town of Georgina include all the lands within the Keswick Business Park Study Area (KBPSA) into the Town's settlement boundary. The timing of this submission is appropriate as Provincial and local planning documents permit the expansion of a settlement area boundary only at the time of a comprehensive review. In addition to the Town of Georgina's current Official Plan Review (OPR) exercise, this submission also coincides with York Region Official Plan (YROP) Review as well as the 2015 Co-ordinated Provincial Plan Review.

Copies of the submission package have been circulated to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) and York Region on August 24, 2015. MMM was also present at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting on August 12, 2015 as well as the Steering Committee meeting on September 29, 2015.

The following provides a brief summary of the findings of the reports submitted in support of the Settlement Area Expansion Request to the Town of Georgina.

Preliminary Floodplain Investigation Report

The findings of the Preliminary Floodplain Investigation Report support an area of approximately 1.47 hectares (3.63 acres) along the Ravenshoe Road frontage that would be considered as developable land or land suitable for development. The York Region Official Plan ("YROP") and

the Town of Georgina's Official Plan has protected a portion to the east of the Subject Lands to facilitate the proposed Highway 404 extension. Therefore, it is anticipated that the developable area will be reduced to approximately 1.3 hectares (3.3 acres). This developable area includes a 15.0 metre buffer from the floodline as per LSRCA requirements. We believe that the approximate 1.5 hectares of land is suitable in terms of size and land area for a small retail or commercial use building, and potentially even a small office building or other small scale employment uses.

Planning Justification Report

The findings of Planning Justification Report support the inclusion of the subject lands and remaining three properties into the Keswick Business Park Secondary Plan and settlement area boundary. This minor rounding out is consistent with provincial and local policy for settlement area boundary expansions. The Planning Justification Report also supports the re-designation of the subject lands from Agricultural Protection Area with the Keswick Business Park Study Area overlay designation to Employment.

Preliminary Site Servicing Report

The findings of the Preliminary Site Servicing Report provide that there are several options to service the subject lands. The Report concludes that the preferred option would be to connect to the Town owned watermain located along Woodbine Avenue. As this proposed extension is relatively close to the subject lands, this option would be ideal in terms of the least amount of impact to the environment and most logical in terms of connection points in order to provide water servicing to the subject lands.

The preferred option for wastewater servicing would be to connect to the existing pumping station located at Joe Dales Drive either directly or when the KBP develops. As with the water servicing options, although connecting at the pumping station would be considered an appropriate option, connecting to the services as part of the KBP would also be viable given the proximity of the subject lands to the KBP.

Employment Land Needs Analysis

The Employment Land Needs Analysis concludes that given its locational advantages and the very limited supply of effective employment lands in Georgina, it is likely that employment demand in the Keswick Business Park will exceed 8,000 jobs by 2031 which was what was projected in the Planning Directions Report (2014).

It is our opinion that the Keswick Business Park would require additional land area to accommodate the projected employment numbers for the area.

Preliminary Natural Environmental Report

Phase One of the Preliminary Natural Environmental Report was submitted in July 2014 while Phase Two includes data from summer 2014 site investigations. The findings and summary of the Phase Two report conclude that several natural heritage features and associated policies constrain the developable area of the subject lands. The most restrictive feature is the wetland found on the subject lands. Development and site alteration is prohibited in wetlands, both Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW) as well as un-evaluated wetlands.

The report notes that an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) would be required should any development on the lands occur within 120 m of the PSW to adequately demonstrate that there is no impact to the form and function of the PSW.

Proposed Planning Approach

We are committed to working with all agencies in this regard, and would like to propose our planning approach as follows:

1. Town includes all lands within the KBPSA into the settlement area boundary on the basis of a “minor rounding out” of the KBP and expands the settlement area boundary as part of the Official Plan Review;
2. Based on discussions with the Region, we are to follow the Town’s Official Plan Review process. Should the Town deem it appropriate for the four properties contained within the KBPSA to be included in the KBPSP, upon approval of the Town’s Official Plan, a Regional Official Plan amendment would follow; and,
3. The Landowners within the KBPSA and the Town of Georgina Staff work to amend the KBPSP to determine the land uses and extent of the Natural Heritage System on a site by site basis.

Response to Town’s Comments Relating to the Boundary Expansion Request

A Staff Report was prepared by the Planning Division, dated October 14, 2015 (PB-2015-0073) with respect to the Official Plan and Town of Georgina Draft Official Plan released in April, 2015. The report presented an analysis of comments received on the Draft Official Plan and were summarized in Attachment ‘3’. Specifically, the Town has maintained that the process remains a “top-down” approach, where a YROP amendment would be required followed by a local Official Plan Amendment (comment 216 in Attachment ‘3’).

Policy 6.1.10 of the YROP addresses the Keswick Business Park Study Area and states the following:

"That the Keswick Business Park Study Area is subject to Section 3.4.4 of the Greenbelt Plan and special provisions in the Official Plan of the Town of Georgina. Any development of these lands will require an amendment to this Plan and the local official plan"

In our opinion, section 3.4.4 of the Greenbelt Plan states that it is through the approval of the Town's Official Plan and Greenbelt Plan conformity that policy 6.1.10 of the YROP is addressed. Therefore, this Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Request is in keeping with the Provincial and local planning documents by seeking the inclusion of all the lands in the KPBSA into the settlement boundary via the Town's Official Plan Review process, followed by a Regional Official Plan Amendment.

In addition, staff had indicated that they were awaiting comments from the LSRCA regarding the acceptability of the submitted floodplain analysis. At the time of this letter was written, we have been advised by the LSRCA that their comments for the Subject Lands are anticipated for the end of October, 2015.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments related to the Town of Georgina's proposed new Official Plan. Should you have any questions or require further information related to the items listed above, please contact me at 905-882-4211, ext. 6328 or Christina Addorisio at ext. 6157.

Regards,


MMM GROUP LIMITED


Chad B. John-Baptiste, MCIP, RPP
Planning Manager
Planning & Environmental Design

cc: Sheryl Kotzer, Nizza Enterprises
Mark Flowers, DaviesHowe LLP

encl: Figure 1

Figure 1



RECEIVED

OCT 14 2015

TOWN OF GEORGINA

SYLVETTE BROWN
23621 PARK ROAD
PEPPERLAW, ON L0E 1N0

OCTOBER 14, 2015

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA
26557 CIVIC CENTRE ROAD
KESWICK, O L4P 3G1

(f) 905.476.8100


Attn: Mr. John Espinosa, Clerk, and
Mr. Harold Lenters, Director of Planning and Building

TO REQUEST

DEAR MESSERS ESPINOSA and LENTERS:

Re: Amendment to the 2002 *Official Plan*,
Notice of Public Meeting Scheduled for October 14, 2015, 7:30 p.m.

I, or someone on my behalf, will be attending the meeting tonight to be apprised of all and any changes which are applicable to the Farm Property located at 23621 Park Road, Town of Georgian. I am requesting the disclosure of amendments made to the proposed *Official Plan* for the above noted farm property and to adjoining properties which has/have the potential of impacting, on the aforementioned farm property. These amendments to include "Permitted Land Use Changes", "Land Use Restrictions" and changes to "Farm Property Development Requirements" requested or implemented on behalf of any parties or authorities which includes Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change and Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry between 2002 to 2015 inclusive.


SYLVETTE BROWN

AIRD & BERLIS LLP

Barristers and Solicitors

Andrea Skinner
Direct: 416.865.3423
E-mail: askinner@airdberlis.com

October 14, 2015

BY EMAIL

Our File No.: 125632

**Town of Georgina Civic Centre
26557 Civic Centre Drive,
Keswick, ON, L4P 3G1**

Attention: Mayor and Members of Council

Care of: Carolyn Lance, Council Services Coordinator (clance@georgina.ca)

Dear Sirs and Mesdames:

**Re: Glenwoods Gateway Investments Inc.
Northeast corner of Woodbine Avenue and Glenwoods Avenue
Town of Georgina, Proposed New Official Plan**

We are counsel for Glenwoods Gateway Investments Inc., the owner of certain lands within the Keswick Business Park Secondary Plan ("KBPSP").

Our client is in the process of working with Town staff to finalize a proposed zoning by-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision for lands located within the KBPSP, municipally known as 23675/23965 Woodbine Avenue and 2596 Glenwoods Avenue, Keswick. Through that process, it has become clear to our client that, in order for the KBPSP to thrive, it is necessary for the Town to consider expanding the range and mix of uses, including retail and major retail uses, within the KBPSP, particularly in areas which benefit from access and exposure to Woodbine Avenue (i.e. the Business Park 2 Gateway zones).

By way of background, the KBPSP was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in 2008. Since then – 7 years later – planning principles and market expectations for business park areas have evolved. The emerging trend for business parks is to move away from mono-use areas, and instead to support a greater range and mix of uses that promotes employees walking within the business park area during the day, and affords opportunity for activity in the evening as well.

In addition, since the KBPSP was adopted, York Region has adopted a new Official Plan, which has, only relatively recently, now been largely approved by the Ontario Municipal Board. Further, York Region is now undertaking a review of its Official Plan, including a review of its employment land requirements and associated policies. Our client intends to monitor and participate in that process.

In summary, as part of the process that the Town is currently undertaking, and commensurate with York Region's current municipal comprehensive review process, we

October 14, 2015
Page 2

request that Town staff and Council consider expanding the range and mix of uses, including retail uses, that are permitted in the KBPSP, particularly in the Business Park 2 Gateway zones. This is consistent with both provincial policy, emerging employment and retail trends, and principles of good planning.

Our client's consultant, Matthew Cory (Malone Given Parsons Ltd.) will be attending at tonight's public meeting to make oral submissions that will supplement and expand on this letter.

In the meantime, if you have any questions or wish to discuss, please don't hesitate to contact our office.

Yours truly,

AIRD & BERLIS LLP



Andrea Skinner

AS/np

cc. **Tammi Roberts**, Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Members of Council
(troberts@georgina.ca)
Harold Lenters, Director of Planning and Building (hlinters@georgina.ca)
John Espinosa, Town Clerk (jespinosa@georgina.ca)
Steven A. Zakem, Aird & Berlis LLP (szakem@airdberlis.com)
Matthew Cory, Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (mcory@mgp.ca)
Client

24032587.1

RECEIVED

OCT 19 2015

TOWN OF GEORGINA

SYLVIETTE BROWN
23621 PARK ROAD
PEPPER LAKE, ON L0E 1N0

OCTOBER 19, 2015

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA
26557 CIVIC CENTRE ROAD
KESWICK, ON L4P 3G1

Attn: Town Clerk and Planning Department

(f) 905.476.8100

**NOTICE TO THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA RE EXISTING 2002 OFFICIAL
PLAN AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO AMENDED OFFICIAL PLAN**

Official plans can be described as "adaptive" or "unitary", or a combination thereof, i.e., "a program and policy... designed to secure the health, safety, convenience or welfare of the inhabitants of (an) area"

On Wednesday, October 14, 2015 I attended the Public Meeting at the Municipal Offices to ascertain how Georgina intends to secure the health, safety and welfare of the inhabitants at the Zephyr Creek Bridge on Park Road and the Fill Site on Smith Blvd east of Park Road. There were no materials evidence forthcoming to ensure proper planning other than "taxes" and "road" maintenance as commented for the Fill Site. This behaviour is not in compliance with Georgina's mandated responsibility under the *Planning Act* (see s. 16 (1) and (2)).


SYLVIETTE BROWN

TOWN OF GEORGINA	
OCT 19 2015	
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION	
REFER	NOTED
	<i>huc</i>
FILE #	

Andrea Furniss

From: Harold Lenters
Sent: January-29-16 12:29 PM
To: Andrea Furniss
Subject: FW: Gloria and David Mott Property - 326 Deer Park Drive, Roches Point
Attachments: 20151117 Corresp from Town of Georgina.pdf; 20151117 Corresp from Mott to Town of Georgina.pdf; 20151117 Town of Georgina- Zoning Map.pdf; 20151117 Town of Georgina- Draft OP Sch A2 (Land Use).pdf; 20151117 Aerial View.pdf

Original email from Mike smith

Harold W. Lenters, M.Sc.Pl., MCIP, RPP | Director of Planning and Building | Planning and Building Department | Town of Georgina
26557 Civic Centre Road, Keswick, ON L4P 3G1
T: 905-476-4301 Ext. 2246 | 905-722-6516 | 705-437-2210
E: hlenters@georgina.ca
Website: www.georgina.ca

From: Michael Smith [<mailto:michael@msplanning.ca>]
Sent: November 18, 2015 11:24 AM
To: Harold Lenters
Subject: Gloria and David Mott Property - 326 Deer Park Drive, Roches Point

Harold:

Further to our discussion yesterday, enclosed is mapping which identifies Gloria and David Mott's property. The property address is 326 Deer Park Road.

The property is designated *Lakeshore Residential* on Schedule A2 – Land Use Plan in the proposed Official Plan and is zoned Residential (R) in Zoning By-law No. 500. I understand the property is on municipal services.

David Mott advises me that approximately 27 years ago he obtained a permit for a detached garage which was constructed about 12 metres north of the single family dwelling. At or about that time an accessory apartment was constructed within the garage and that apartment has been occupied since that time by various family members.

David had discussed this matter initially with Tolek Makarewicz and subsequently with Andrea Furniss (See correspondence enclosed). His request is that the new Official Plan include a special provision permitting the accessory apartment in the detached garage.


As we discussed, the proposed Official Plan does provide for an accessory apartment in a Rural designation. The Mott's property abuts the Environmental Protection Area designation on its north and east sides. It is the last in a row of twelve lots.

In conclusion, I would appreciate if you would consider David and Gloria's request and permit the accessory dwelling unit in the detached garage by special provision in the proposed Official Plan. A zoning amendment will be required

which I would suggest would be submitted once the Official Plan policy is in place. Finally, you have indicated that applicable development charges may need to be paid prior to the passing of a zoning by-law amendment, should the Town agree to the Official Plan provision requested.

Thanks, Michael

Michael Smith, MCIP, RPP
Michael Smith Planning Consultants;
Development Coordinators Ltd.
19027 Leslie St., Suite #200 - P.O. Box 1010
Sharon, Ontario, L0G 1V0
(905) 478-2588 Ext. 25
(905) 478-2488 (Fax)



1: 2,255

November 17, 2015



Notes

This map was printed from a YorkMaps application.


Town of Georgina

Official Plan

Schedule A2


LAND USE PLAN

DRAFT



LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

	Lakeshore Residential Area		Commercial Recreation Area		Agriculture
	Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area		Rural Industrial Area		Specialty
	Urban Residential Area		Keswick Business Park Study Area		Environment
	Hamlet Area		Parkland Area		Greenland
	Rural Commercial Area		Rural Area		



TOFG. ZONING



Friday, January 22, 2016

Harold Lenters, MCIP, RPP
Director of Planning and Building
Town of Georgina
26557 Civic Centre Road
Keswick, Ontario
L4P 3G1

Dear Mr. Lenters;

Re: Settlement Area Boundary Expansion – Keswick Business Park
Official Plan - Municipal Comprehensive Review
Town of Georgina, Region of York

The Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) has reviewed the Planning Justification Report prepared by MMM Group Limited in July 2015. We understand that the purpose of this Report is to justify a settlement area boundary expansion for four properties located within the Keswick Business Park Study Area through the Town's current Official Plan review process. It is also the intent of the Planning Report to justify the re-designation of lands on 2354 Ravenshoe Road from "Agricultural Protection Area" to "Employment".

Based on our review of this Report, we offer the following comments:

Greenbelt Plan

Section 2.1 of the Planning Report identifies that the subject lands contain natural heritage features including a provincially significant wetland and an unevaluated wetland. These key natural heritage features are contiguous to the Maskinonge River which is located to the east of the properties. Together, the Maskinonge River and associated key natural heritage features form part of the Greenbelt's Natural Heritage System (NHS) according to Schedule 4 and our interpretation of Policy 3.2.2.6 of the Greenbelt Plan. Given that Policy 3.4.4.1b) of the Greenbelt Plan states that any proposed settlement area expansion shall not extend into the Natural Heritage System, it is our interpretation that conformity with this Provincial Plan has not been demonstrated.

.../2


Mr. Harold Lenters, MCIP, RPP
January 22, 2016
Page 2 of 2

Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)

The subject lands also contain a significant flood prone area from the Maskinonge River according to existing flood plain mapping and the Flood Plain Analysis prepared by MMM Group. Both the Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement [Policies 2.2.8.2h) and 1.1.3.8 respectively] identify that a planning authority shall apply the policies of Section 2 (Wise Use and Management of Resources) and Section 3 (Protecting Public Health and Safety) of the PPS in determining the most appropriate direction for expansions to the boundaries of settlement areas. Based on the site's natural heritage features and the existence of the Greenbelt's NHS on the subject lands in addition to the existing natural hazard lands (flood plain), we believe that this would not be the most appropriate direction for any settlement area expansion. In fact, given that the majority of the subject lands is non-developable due to these environmental constraints including those lands immediately abutting the existing settlement area, it would appear that any boundary expansion at this location would create an undesirable "leap-frogging" over natural features and natural hazards to a small potentially developable area. For these reasons, we believe that conformity with the Growth Plan and consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement has not been demonstrated.

If you have any questions regarding these comments or should you wish to meet to discuss, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Charles F. Burgess, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Planning

/cfb

copy: MMM Group Limited, Christina Addorisio
Town of Georgina, Andrea Furniss
LSRCA, Rob Baldwin, Marianne Maertens, Shauna Fernandes, Kevin Jarus

Dear Mr. H.Lenters

CC Andrea Furniss; Jim Dymont, Naomi Davison, Danny Wheeler,
Sandra Malcic, Valerie Shuttleworth

Subject: Georgina Gateway Lands, 22869 Woodbine Ave Keswick ON
and abutting lands

As you are aware DKGK Holdings Inc. has provided input regarding
the subject property during the Georgina OPA process to the Town,
Region and Dymont Consulting.

The subject property was part of the recent Staff Report submission
to Town and Regional Council consideration.

The subject property is at the Gateway to Georgina. The owner has
a desire to improve the property to augment the locational benefits
and is striving to start down the evolutionary path to fulfill its
highest and best use. The current designation significantly impairs
the economic feasibility of this occurring, as does the zoning.

The land is currently located within the Keswick Business Park
Study Area within the Keswick Business Park Secondary Plan
(located just south of the Business Park Area) and in the Georgina
Official Plan, currently under review.

The subject land is in the centre of a Cluster of Lands in a Special
Study Area as defined in the above documents. Kindly refer to
Schedule A attached hereto of the 4 land parcels in the "Special
Study Area", herein referred to as the Gateway Lands,.

Up to and including August of 2015 submissions were made to the
Town, Dymont and the Region to request re-designation of the
Gateway Lands by various owners and/or their Consultants under
the existing Regional and Municipal policy provision.

As you are aware recent proposed changes to the Planning Act (Bill
73) suggests that Municipal Official Plan reviews occur every 10
years as opposed to every 5 years, further slowing the process of
the Gateway Lands from realizing their full potential in the fullness
of time. The Province is concurrently reviewing the Greenbelt Plan
for lands conformity.

The Gateway Lands represent a first impression of the Community. They represent a logical connection between Georgina and outside markets, a statement of the local economy and a branding of what the Community means. A recently erected Welcome Sign feature was the first foundational step. The theme needs to continue and that can only occur by bringing the Gateway Lands into the OPA urban boundary as a whole, designate it accordingly thus permitting the slow development process to continue on these lands in the fullness of time. Unkept lands and abandoned golf driving ranges will remain unless the path is set for a renaissance of the Gateway Lands. If not, historic visuals will be reminiscent of the 30 years of 54 ft tractor trailers parked behind the now going Welcome Sign. Taking advantage of the current OPA intake window to change the course of history is intuitive, logical, forward thinking, productive and visionary. Alternatively, what could be improved at the Gateway, if "frozen" for the next 10 or 20 years?

The Gateway Properties eastern frontage on Woodbine Avenue makes it easily accessible from a right-turn maneuver from Woodbine Avenue, allowing it to be more easily accessed by individuals entering Georgina or Keswick than exiting. This indicates that the property's uses would become a pull-factor for Georgina, drawing visitors from south of Ravenshoe Road to explore the Woodbine Avenue retail node just a bit further north.

Creating a Gateway to this retail node in close proximity to Hwy 404 will allow the node to play a larger role in the regional economy, adding value to existing end users and residents, while simultaneously attracting new ones.

By taking the Gateway Lands and increasing the malleability of uses available within it, the Town, in the fullness of time can align a Gateway themed site-specific redevelopment with sustainable objectives outlined in the Places to Grow Act and supporting Provincial, Regional and Municipal framework. Facilitating the adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and the gradual redevelopment of the sites they can slowly evolve in the fullness of time into a more robust and commercially active mixed-use asset on the Gateway Lands commuter corridor.

Each of the Gateway Land parcels have specific benefits contributing as a whole to the mutual benefit of each other and the greater good. A few key related factors are;

Specific to 2345 Ravenshoe Rd a Floodplain Investigation(s) Report, a Planning Justification Report, a Preliminary Site Servicing Report and a Natural Environment Report have been completed and submitted. These reports were commissioned by MMM Group Limited as provided for in the "Special Study" area policy in the OPA, concluding development lands exist fronting on Ravenshoe, notwithstanding any detailed analysis of the Woodbine frontage yet to be undertaken, which will present further development opportunities. The property is zoned RU permitting a conservative blend Employment and Commercial uses, that do not currently adhere to the highest and best use of the site.

Specific to 22869 Woodbine the request to bring the lands into the Urban Expansion Boundary has been ongoing commencing with discussions in 2002, reports defining developable lands including a 2006 LSRCA Board ruling that offsite cut and fill options are permitted and grandfathered, and more that followed over the years. These lands are Zoned RU permitting a conservative blend Residential, Employment and Commercial uses, that do not currently adhere to the highest and best use of the site.

Further it should be noted that 22937 Woodbine forms the north of the Gateway Lands in the OP, part of which lands are in the "Special Study" area and part in the Keswick Business Park. These lands are zoned C2-OS-3 and form the northern boundary of the land cluster of the "Special Study" area. The current Zoning provides for some Commercial uses.

In addition, it should be noted that the N/E corner of Ravenshoe and Woodbine, the "Perdu" land is Commercially Zoned C2-49(H) and OS-77, designated within the current OP to permit a high density gas bar/car wash station in addition to other uses all on private services. This property forms the southern boundary of the Gateway Lands all in the current "Special Study " area denoted in the existing Georgina OP.

The cumulative submissions of each of the owners or their consultants speak to the Town OP policy provisions which were provided within the Business Park Special Study Area. All indicate that the Gateway Lands are "special", in fact they are VERY SPECIAL.

They are so, based on their location and what that location can evolve to, to reflect the culture, professionalism, vision and future of the Town;

They are inconsistent with each other in terms of development evolution to this point in time due to an inconsistent policy and direction for the Gateway Lands. To remedy this they should be brought into the development process by way of an Urban Boundary Expansion within this OPA Review intake window - as opposed to the next one in 10 years or 20 years away;

The Provincial Policy Statement speaks to the need for these lands to be permitted to evolve going forward;

The conformity exercise component of the Greenbelt Act is clearly displayed by the lack of conformity of the Gateway Lands with surrounding lands or these "Special Study" lands would not have been designated so;

The future 404 extension forms a natural boundary to the east for the Gateway Lands evolution;

Pursuant to the MMM Group's report, Georgina, given its current employment boundaries can't meet the 2041 Regional Growth Plan targets;

That Commercial uses will be less stressful than current residential uses on existing private services speaking directly to multiple policies within the Provincial Lake Simcoe Protection Act;

That the Provincial Policy Statement permits on site servicing in "minor rounding out" areas. The Gateway Lands represent 6% of the entire Keswick Business Park;

These are key points in determining the development potential of properties in the Gateway Corridor.

Weighting all of these key points, the logical and policy supported evolution of the Gateway Lands is to permit them to evolve in the fullness of time, to become the Gateway Lands, representative of what Georgina is.

Demographic profiling and the significant impact the various cohorts will have in transitioning the current Standardized Economy into the future Customized Economy should also be given significant weight.

The question becomes - Does Georgina wish to leave the Gateway Lands in the condition and situation that they currently are for 10, likely 20 more as Georgina's 1st impression? And, if it does, what benefit does that serve the greater good?

The answers are clear.

The recommendation therefore is to bring all the Gateway Lands into the Urban Expansion Boundary within this OPA intake, and concurrently re-designate the lands with definitions and uses that would be reflective of, and can mature in harmony with evolving demographic cohorts driving functional, locational and economic needs through the fullness of time, which will in turn define the highest and best uses. The wording of the designation must provide for the synergy between evolving needs driven by the cohorts of the day. Hence the traditional Planning vision based on historical best practices are moving assertively to being obsolete.

An factual analogy and comparable concept would be the current University educational system. Today's curriculum will be outdated in 3 years. Next year's within 2...and soon enough education will be real time. With the exponential speed increasing of world connectivity and technology, real time planning could be a reality within 10 years, or the best opportunities to attract and capture businesses in an ever increasing competitive market will instantly evaporate.

In bringing the lands into the Urban Expansion Boundary now, the conservative development advancement of these properties can move forward a little at a time. This timely move will also demonstrate Georgina's willingness to facilitate the start of visionary, creative, effective and adaptive approaches to development of properties along the Woodbine corridor today. This proactive approach fosters immediate growth as opposed to waiting 10 years to revisit the opportunity, and possibly seeing some improvements commencing in 20 years.

Permitting enhancements to the existing sites and buildings in concert with the themes of a Gateway Lands by definition will always facilitate significant economic benefits.

Please refer to Schedule B for an example of a first step ask for 22869 Woodbine Ave.

Respectfully submitted and thank you for your consideration

DKGK Holdings Inc.

Schedule A

Georgina Gateway Land Cluster



22937 Woodbine Ave
Nanos
33 Acres

22869 Woodbine Ave
DKGK Holdings
1 acre

2354 Ravenshoe Rd
Nizza Enterprises
26 Acres

1 Woodbine Ave
Perdu Inc.
1.7 Acres

Schedule B

22869 Current Uses

SECTION 28 - RURAL (RU) ZONE

28.1 PERMITTED RESIDENTIAL USES

- (500-2007-0017) - dwelling legally existing prior to September 10, 2008.
- single family dwelling
- (500-2004-0013) - temporary accommodations for seasonal farm workers

28.2 PERMITTED NON-RESIDENTIAL USES

- aerodrome (private)
- agricultural/aquacultural, conservation or forestry use, excluding mushroom farms and Adventure Games provided that such forestry or agricultural use does not include any recreational or athletic activity for which a membership or admission fee or donation is received or solicited or for which a fee is charged for participation in the activity
- bed and breakfast residence
- clinic, veterinary (animal hospital)
- day care, private home
- day nursery within a church
- farm produce storage area
- home industry
- home occupation
- kennel
- tourist information centre
- accessory buildings, structures and uses to any permitted use

The proposed uses would follow other precedent setting examples already in existence in the Community. As example the Royal LePage office in Sutton has site specific uses . The subject site is defined as follows;

7.5.8 PART LOT 6, BLOCK 69, PLAN 69;

**'R1-9'
(Map 7)**

In the area designated 'R1-9' in Schedule 'A' hereto, a business or professional office or a health care clinic shall be permitted uses within the existing building in addition to those shown in Section 7.2.

22869 Proposed Uses

What is being proposed for the subject site is the following complimentary uses to RU:

xx.xx.xx Part Lot 1 Conc 4 as in R212456 except D993, Georgina RU-XX Map-XX. In the area designated to permit a RU-XX in Schedule "A" hereto, A Real Estate office and any ancillary businesses like Mortgage, Credit, Banking, Funding and/or professional offices like Law, Accounting, Book-Keeping, and/or a Restaurant and/or a health care clinic shall be permitted uses within the existing building in addition to those shown in Section 28(RU).

Respectfully Submitted,
DKGK Holdings Inc.

Current!



Future Possibly ?





February 8, 2016

Att:

Andrea Furniss, M.Pl., MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner Policy Planning and Building Department|
Town of Georgina
26557 Civic Centre Rd., R.R. #2,
Keswick, L4P 3G1

Re: **TOWN OF GEORGINA OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Reference to Property known as:

Part Lot 1, Concession 9 and Part Lots 9 and 110 in registered Plan 189 in the Town of Georgina

Property Owner Mr. Domenic Di Monte

Ms Andrea Furniss,

I would like to take this opportunity to formally ask the **TOWN OF GEORGINA OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE** to recommend my property on Pugsley Road be included in the Town of Georgina Official Plan Review for the following reasons:

- 1) There is existing development on west side of Pugsley therefore makes sense to balance uses
- 2) There is existing water and sewer services on Pugsley with available capacity already in the ground
- 3) Official plan calls for minimal infill. This is minimal infill
- 4) Current road is built to handle potential growth on east side of Pugsley
- 5) Town will benefit from additional development charges revenue

Please take into consideration that said Infill development will improve the immediate Pugsley Road Neighborhood. We are open to any recommendations the Steering Committee would like to see..

**Rockford Consulting Group (Domenic De Luca Principal) as Authorized Agent for
Mr. Domenic Di Monte said owner of above Property:**

Your Sincerely

Domenic De Luca

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2016

GREENWORLD FARMING
SYLVIETTE RITA BROWN, Trustee In Trust
 23621 PARK ROAD
 PEPPERLAW, ON L0E 1N0

TOWN OF GEORGINA**FEBRUARY 10, 2016**

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA
 MUNICIPAL OFFICES
 26557 CIVIC CENTRE ROAD
 KESWICK, ON L4P 3G1

Fax: 905.476.8100Attn: Town Clerk


**INTERIM NOTICE TO CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA RE DRAFT
 OFFICIAL PLAN – April 15, 2015 and S. 3 *Planning Act* RSO 1900 c.P 13 and *O. Regs.* thereto**

TOWN OF GEORGINA	
FEB 10 2016	
PLANNING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION	
REFER	NOTED
Adren	HWL
J. Dymat	
FILE #	

To formally advise,

1. I, as a Ratepayer as per S.3 of the *Planning Act* have now been provided with a copy of Georgina's *Official Plan* denoted "Draft". I have serious issues which the Town is now being placed on notice the *Official Plan* Draft require serious amendments prior to being adopted as "Final".
2. Some of the issues to be addressed as noted in the Draft copy relate to the wording and mapping as it pertains to Lot 7W Con. 2 and neighbouring properties south to north, Ravenshoe Road to Old Homestead Road and east to west, Zephyr-Egypt Wetlands to Black River.
3. Written objections will be formalize shortly and presented to Council-of-the-Whole for review and possible revisions. Please advise of the next Council Meeting wherein written and oral submissions can be made.

RESPECTFULLY,



SYLVIETTE RITA BROWN, Trustee

c.c. Regional Clerk Mr. Dennis Kelly, The Corporation of the Regional Municipality of York
 Fax: 905.895.3031

GREENWORLD FARMING
SYLVETTE RITA BROWN, Trustee In Trust
23621 PARK ROAD
PEPPERLAW, ON L0E 1N0

FEBRUARY 16, 2016

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA
MUNICIPAL OFFICES
26557 CIVIC CENTRE ROAD
KESWICK, ON L4P 3G1

Attn: Town Clerk

**FURTHER INTERIM NOTICE IN RELATION TO DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN PREPARED BY
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF YORK AND MHBC PLANNING UNDER LICENCE FROM
ONTARIO MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCE AND FORESTRY**

To formally advise,

1. "Prepared by York Region" to mean compliance with The Corporation of the Regional Municipality of York's (York) 2009 Official Plan approved by the Minister.
2. "Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources" to mean Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR).
3. My objection to the multiple Draft Maps prepared by MHBC Planning (Barrie On) are set out in "Appendix A" to this interim Notice. Suffice it is to say there are some glaring errors in mapping of land and water depictions on the Maps. In sum Draft Maps are being created without factual foundation or underpinnings, i.e., deceit and deprivation.
4. MNR has not completed its mapping and accompanying text on Wetlands on Pt. Lt. 7W (and Pt. Lot 7S) Con. 2 Georgina. Request for same from Minister's Office remains unanswered. Integrity in mapping and accompanying text are an absolute must in planning under the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c.P. 13.
5. The textual content as to agriculture is too vague and broad for meaningful interpretation. I strongly suggest the Town and its Consultants by way of MNR read and head the provincial *Farming and Food Protection Act*. It is not for York, MNR or the Corporation of the Town of Georgina (Georgina) to choose inappropriate terminologies from a "void" especially when such provides grounds for misinterpretation.

RESPECTFULLY,


SYLVETTE RITA BROWN, Trustee In Trust

TOWN OF GEORGINA	
FEB 16 2016	
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT PLANNING SECTION	
REFER	NOTED
AF	Hue
FILE #	

Fax: 905-476-8100 and Regular Mail

RECEIVED
FEB 16 2016
TOWN OF GEORGINA

APPENDIX A

Draft Official Plan

Prepared by York Region and MHBC Planning under licence from Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (Should read Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry) as published on The Town of Georgina Web Site.

1. MUNICIPAL STRUCTURE A1

Pt. Lot. 7W Con. 2 Con. 2 south portion denoted Greenlands System part of north portion denoted Greenlands System with two portions denoted Greenbelt Plan Area.

Pt. Lot. 7E and Lot 8 Con. 2 (Beamlight LP major electrical generating development) denoted Greenbelt Plan Area and Greenlands System)

2. HERITAGE FEATURES B1

Pt. Lot. 7W Con. 2 Con. 2 South of Zephyr Creek denoted (Life Science) Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) Farm forest erroneously denoted "Woodland and Wetland" [which is currently before MNRF by Ontario Federation of Agriculture]. Of further note the 1983 MMM Group Mapping information, soil and vegetation, sought has yet to be disclosed.

3. KEY HYDROLOGIC FEATURES B2 (East)

Pt. Lot. 7W Con. 2 Con. 2 Wetland south of Zephyr Creek Streamway only, despite fact CN Railway Line bisects Wetlands east of Lt. 8 Con. 2 majority of hydrologic area north west of Railway Line and southeast of Zephyr Creek Streamway. This is erroneous since in the Hurricane Hazel 100yr+ magnitude storm flood water was contained on the east side of the Railway Line which represents a major development in flood plain modelling by any competent modellers.

Brown Hill Immediately East and West of Black River North and South of Ravenshoe Road. This area had substantial flooding during Hurricane Hazel due to the fact there was no major development to dam or contain the flood water, i.e., Railway Line 2+ to east. [This is verifiable by the elevation of the Zephyr Creek Bridge the Region of York built over Zephyr Creek in 2001 and the elevation of the Black River Bridge the Region of York built over the Black River. The former is level with the Park Road road surface while the latter is substantially elevated] above the Ravenshoe Road surface. However due to extensive peat and vegetative removal in the Mount Albert Wetland Brown Hill will be inundated with water in a 100yr+ magnitude storm.

Smith Blvd. east of Park Road Fill Site which represents a major development is in Greenlands System with major Wetland depicted immediately to the east.

4. KEY HYDROLOGIC FEATURES B2

Exaggeration of Wetland on south side of Zephyr Creek Streamway; exaggeration of Greenland system (exaggeration or misrepresentation are not innocent) Gokkurt property on Park Road cannot be part of Wetland or Greenland System – contaminated fill has been deposited on the property and remains there.

5. ROADS PLAN E

Frog Street correctly depicted as unimproved road allowance east and west of Park Road. Should be depicted as such in other mapping as should major bridges

6. LAND USE PLAN A2

MNRF misuse of terminology “wet land” and “wetlands”; no soil or vegetation analysis; over extension of environmentally protected area; internal farm drains marked environmentally protected areas; environmentally protected area in south-east corner of farm (no soil or vegetation analysis); deceit and deprivation?

7. LAND USE PLAN A2

Beamlight LP mostly in environmentally protected area but not denoted on map as a major development

8. NATURAL HAZARDS Schedule C

The errors in mapping “hazardous lands” or not mapping “hazardous lands” are so gross a valid argument could be made they are purposeful to transpose drainage liabilities of the

municipalities. Limiting my objections to the areas south of Old Homestead Road to Ravenshoe Road (inclusive) and east of Park Road to Wier Sideroad and west of Park Road to Black River (inclusive).

To wit:

- i) Beamlight LP, an "electrical solar generating facility" is 90% in hazardous lands (Pt. Lt 7E and Lt. 8 Con. 2);
- ii) My farm property is fully denoted to be in "hazardous lands" (Pt. Lt. 7W Con. 2);
- iii) Three drains lead to or away from GR3 (Frog St) which has no functional ditches in the road allowance west of Park Road;
- iv) No portions of Lots 5 and 6 Con. 3 are denoted hazardous lands despite significant groundwater charging areas as per aerial mappings; where did these groundwater charging areas go?
- v) Pt. Lot. 7S Con. 2 is fully denoted "hazardous land" despite the fact it is not inundated with any drainage water save the small tributary linking it to Zephyr Creek (seasonally). It was not flooded during Hurricane Hazel in 1954 and has not been flooded since;
- vi) Sustainability of land not addressed by draft Official Plan or draft mappings;
- vii) MNRF in 2012 Map denoted the land east of the farm woodlot on my property "wetland" (one word) which is an error in terminology. There is a vast difference between the meaning of "wet land" and "wetland" and "hazardous lands". It is up to MNRF (and LSRCA if it relies on MNRF) and Consultants for Georgina to research correct terminologies to be applied to mapping Georgina may rely on in its Official Plan prior to final approval to mitigate future unreasonable interpretations.
- viii) The Fill Site on Smith Blvd east of Park Road has purposefully been ignored in mapping. The height and size of this Site and water runoff at and around the base during 1-to 2-yr + magnitude storms is hazardous. The electrical solar generating facility denoted as Earthlight LP immediately to the west and north of the Fill Site is at risk of harm to the facility and the community.

- ix) Only the Zephyr Creek Streamway in Lots 6, 5, 4 Con. 2 has been denoted "hazardous land" and the Drain from Frog Street constructed by Region of York and Georgina in 1988 and 1989. This Drain is no longer functional due to heavy vegetative overgrowth because it cannot be maintained, i.e., no easement was procured at the time of construction for maintenance, and of significance no engineering analysis was prepared to see if Zephyr Creek Channel was a sufficient outlet for Drain water wherever it comes from.
- x) The East Drain of Park Road in Con. 2 and 3 has not been denoted "hazardous lands" to conceal the fact it is this Drain which overcharges Zephyr Creek Channel and Streamway in Pt. Lot 7W Con. 2 with surface drainage water from Con. 3 and 4 laced with corrosive road toxins the Drain picks-up. Three (3) homes in the immediate area of the Zephyr Creek Bridge have burned from electrical fires with the loss of two (2) human lives. It is to be noted Georgina and LSRCA are aware of and have been aware of, i.e., home where two lives were lost, the problem with the location site since it prohibited reconstruction and sale of the property to third parties.
- xi) And lastly contrary to what is denoted by MNR in their ARC Mapping, now assumed by LSRCA, there is no "flood plain" in Lots 7, 8 and 9 et al in Con. 2, i.e., shielding. Again if the reliable base data is Hurricane Hazel for determination of a "flood plain" the aforementioned commentary is accurate and based on first hand observations, i.e., ground verified as the time of Hurricane Hazel.
- xii) It is to be further noted the CN Railway Line has had and continues to have an extreme damming and water control effect as it relates to the largest portion of the Zephyr Egypt Wetland Complex. The Line still exists and has been substantially strengthened, i.e., improved since Hurricane Hazel. Of note the area around the Baldwin Dam and the Black River do not engulf the whole of the area as a "floodplain"

GREENWORLD FARMING

SYLVETTE RITA BROWN, Trustee In Trust
23621 PARK ROAD
PEPPERLAW, ON L0E 1N0

FEBRUARY 22, 2016

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA

26557 CIVIC CENTRE ROAD
KESWICK, O L4P 3G1

(f) 905.476.8100

Attn: Mr. Harold Lenters, Chairman Planning Board Committee for Official Plan
Clerk of Municipal Corporation

TOWN OF GEORGINA	
FEB 22 2016	
PLANNING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION	
REFER	NOTED
FILE #	

**FORMAL NOTICE TO THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA RE CURRENT
ONGOINGS AS TO 2016 DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN BASED ON ArcGIS MAPPINGS**

1. I have raised serious Objections in writing (interim) and served same on Georgina as to "Draft Official Plan" ("Amended" terminology missing) and Draft ArcGIS Mappings prepared by MHBC Planning, Barrie, On under licence from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.
2. The magnitude of the Objections warrants an open hearing either before the Planning Board Committee and/or the Council-of-the-Whole. The Objections should be pre-published and minutes of such hearing(s) recorded and thereafter published by the Clerk. Record keeping is mandatory.
3. As of late last week speaking with the Clerk's Office there was no date set for the open-hearing of my Objections. Advise forthwith of a date and time.



SYLVETTE RITA BROWN, Trustee

c.c. The Corporation of the Regional Municipality of York Attn: Clerk

(Inquiry as to York Region: Did MHBC Planning do its 2009 Official Plan Amendments?)

Joel Brenner, J.D.

Barrister and Solicitor
Brenner Law Professional Corporation
224-312 Dolomite Drive
Toronto, Ontario, M3J2N2

Telephone: 416-628-1213
Fax: 416-479-0437
Toll Free Fax: 888-343-4254

BY EMAIL

March 4, 2016

Town of Georgina
Georgina Official Plan Amendment Steering Committee

Harold Lenters: hleners@georgina.ca
Andrea Furniss: afurniss@georgina.ca
Jim Dyment: jdyment@mhbcplan.com

Re: 23078 Warden Avenue

Dear Committee Members:


I represent the property owner of the above noted property on legal matter unrelated to your planning committee. I have been requested to submit the attached on their behalf with respect to the upcoming steering committee meeting for the Georgina Official Plan Amendment

On behalf of the property owner for the above noted property, kindly find attached to this email submissions for inclusion in your agenda for your upcoming steering committee meeting, scheduled for March 8, 2016.

Kindly add the attached to your agenda, and kindly forward minutes of the meeting once they have been approved.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours Truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Joel Brenner', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Joel Brenner


Background

1. 23078 Warden Ave was the home of the demised Thane Smelter site. The Community has been mired in a symphony of confusion on how best to move forward, with bureaucrats, politicians, committees, community members, business men and deep-seated interest groups pulling in every direction resulting in nothing, absolutely nothing being done. Nothing will and can be done, notwithstanding any outcomes of any previous or future actions, litigation or ideas.
2. It all comes down to money, and who will pay for the cleanup. A business solution is the only way to move this forward. Governing bodies having jurisdiction have no funds for matters like this.
3. Every 5 years, under Provincial Mandate the Georgina Official Plan process provides an intake window for making amendments or enhancements to "uses" to existing properties ("OPA"). It is understood that after this OPA the Province has mandated that the next intake window will be in 10 years. That is a long time to wait for any solution. In past OPA's the process has demonstrated that the uses can be removed or added, particularly with environmentally sensitive or compromised lands. However, from a zoning definition perspective, uses that were provided under Rural ("RU") as example, are different today compared to 1984. In addition, RU has many site specific special provisions (RU-224). Kindly refer to attached appendices.
4. The subject 20 acre site is zoned M2, and thereby also M1 permitting manufacturing and industrial uses. Kindly refer to appendices to familiarize yourself with specific uses and respective special provisions.
5. When the Thane Public Liaison Committee was active, and working on solutions many were brain stormed. 20 were documented.
6. One solution (page 5 point 14 of appendix) gained significant traction and was, by all accounts "The Solution", being a soils remediation and revitalization operation. It , including but not limited to; created jobs, created spin off local commerce, completely and conclusively revitalized the property in the fullness of time, created a tax base , contributed to the greater good and demonstrated far reaching environmental stewardship. "The Solution" is permitted under the existing zoning.
7. However, it couldn't move forward because an old Georgina wide By-Law, that prohibits the operation of a soil remediation or revitalization business. Yet - the existing site uses provide for a "dry cleaning plant", which uses some of the harshest chemicals known to mankind, exponentially more damaging to the environment than any soil revitalization process.
8. Very recently an application for soil revitalization was made in Ramara. It was processed and completed. They wanted to create jobs, create spin off local commerce, use a property to its fullest potential, augment their tax base , contributed to the greater good and demonstrate far reaching environmental stewardship. They recognized that taking compromised soils from one location and dumping them in another is counter intuitive, simply unintelligent. They observed that this "ancient group think" does not better the environment, nor the greater good.
9. Given all the factors at play, all the research, studies, debate, conjecture and energy expelled over the last 40 years - resulting in nothing being done - it is time to "open a door". This request is to delete the dry cleaning plant use, and replace it with a soil remediation operation as a special provision to the site uses, whereby the By-law can remain in full force and effect, save and except on the subject site. It is the 1st step in moving a solution forward and it will still be years before something could be operational on site.

Respectfully Howard



Zoning Map



Legend

Airfield (A)	Local Commercial (LC)	Extractive Industrial (M3)	Residence (R)
Open Space (OS)	Transitional (T)	Storage Industrial (M4)	Low Density Urban Residential (R1)
Institutional (I)	Shopping Centre Commercial (C4)	Disposal Industrial (M5)	Rural (RU)
Tourist Commercial (C3)	Recreational Commercial (C6)	Estate Residential (ER)	
Highway Commercial (C2)	Restricted Industrial (M1)	Low Density Urban Residential (R1)	
General Commercial (C1)	General Industrial (M2)	Medium Density Urban Residential (R3)	

This map is consolidated to November 6, 2012.
 Map produced by the Planning Division, November 2012.
 Data source:
 Property data provided by the Planning and Building Department Planning Division.

Revised: 11/06/12

SECTION 28 - RURAL (RU) ZONE (cont.)

SECTION 28 - RURAL (RU) ZONE

→ 28.1 PERMITTED RESIDENTIAL USES

- (500-2007-0017) - dwelling legally existing prior to September 10, 2008.
- single family dwelling
- (500-2004-0013) - temporary accommodations for seasonal farm workers

→ 28.2 PERMITTED NON-RESIDENTIAL USES

- aerodrome (private)
- agricultural/aquacultural, conservation or forestry use, excluding mushroom farms and Adventure Games provided that such forestry or agricultural use does not include any recreational or athletic activity for which a membership or admission fee or donation is received or solicited or for which a fee is charged for participation in the activity
- bed and breakfast residence
- clinic, veterinary (animal hospital)
- day care, private home
- day nursery within a church
- farm produce storage area
- home industry
- home occupation
- kennel
- tourist information centre
- accessory buildings, structures and uses to any permitted use

(500-2007-0017) Notwithstanding the permitted non-residential uses listed above, a cemetery, church, and police station shall be permitted uses on lands zoned Rural (RU) and designated 'Rural' in the Sutton Secondary Plan Area or the Pefferlaw Secondary Plan Area.

Furthermore, notwithstanding the permitted non-residential uses listed above, any cemetery, church, parking lot for school buses and commercial vehicles, police station, and bus or truck terminal legally existing prior to September 10, 2007 shall be a permitted use.

SECTION 28 - RURAL (RU) ZONE (cont.)

such forestry or agricultural use does not include any recreational or athletic activity for which a membership or admission fee or donation is received or solicited or for which a fee is charged for participation in the activity.

- farm produce storage area
- accessory buildings, structures and uses to any permitted use.

28.5.199 **PART OF LOTS 16 and 17, CONCESSION 4 (NG) 'RU-223'**
(500-2011-0010) **N/S OLD HOMESTEAD ROAD** **(Map 1)**

Further, notwithstanding Sections 28.1 and 28.2, on land shown in heavy outline and designated 'RU-223' in Schedule 'A', only the following uses shall be permitted.

- one single family dwelling
- bed and breakfast residence
- day care, private home
- home industry
- home occupation
- accessory buildings, structures and uses to any permitted use.

28.5.200 **PART OF LOT 6, CONCESSION 8 (NG)** **RU-224**
(500-2012-0003) **(Map 1)** 

- a) Notwithstanding the requirements of Sections 6.1 (a) and 6.1 (b), a single family dwelling may be erected on land shown in heavy outline and designated 'RU-224' in Schedule 'A', and further indicated in Schedule 'B-68' attached hereto.
- b) Further, notwithstanding the requirements of Section 6.1 (f), respecting the sideyard

SECTION 20 - RESTRICTED INDUSTRIAL (M1) ZONE

→ 20.1 **PERMITTED RESIDENTIAL USES**

- one accessory dwelling

→ 20.2 **PERMITTED - NON-RESIDENTIAL USES**

- any industrial undertaking that is conducted and wholly contained within an enclosed building and is not a prohibited use pursuant to Section 5.42 herein
- commercial use incidental to, and on the same site as, an industrial use
- (500-97-060) - contractor's or tradesman's shop
- dry cleaning plant
- equipment sales establishment
- garage, mechanical
- motor vehicle cleaning establishment
- (500-98-003) - parking lot, commercial
- police station
- printing shop
- public storage building
- service shop, heavy or light
- warehouse
- wholesale establishment
- accessory buildings, structures and uses to any permitted use

20.3 **ZONE REQUIREMENTS - RESIDENTIAL USES**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 6 hereof for a Rural (RU) Zone.

20.4 **ZONE REQUIREMENTS - NON-RESIDENTIAL USES**

GARAGE, MECHANICAL

In accordance with the provisions of Section 13 hereof.

OTHER USES

(a) **LOT FRONTAGE (MINIMUM)** no minimum required

- except that in the case of a lot fronting on Highway 48, the minimum lot frontage shall be 45 metres.

SECTION 20 - RESTRICTED INDUSTRIAL (M1) ZONE (cont.)

HEIGHT OF BUILDING (MAXIMUM) 7 metres

Further, notwithstanding Sections 20.4 (c), (f) and (h), for public storage building indicated as Building #5 in the area designated '1-24' in Schedule 'A' and further shown on Schedule 'B-62' attached hereto, the following shall apply:

FRONT YARD (MINIMUM) 26 metres

INTERIOR SIDE YARD (MINIMUM) 7 metres

HEIGHT OF BUILDING (MAXIMUM) 7 metres

Further, notwithstanding Sections 5.1 (d) and (f), an accessory building or structure associated with a public storage building shall comply with the minimum yard and height requirements for Building #5 as stipulated above.

20.5.25

(500-2011-0006)

PART OF LOT 13, CONCESSION 4 (NG)

'M1-25'
(Map 1)

Notwithstanding Section 20.4 (c), the minimum front yard setback shall be 8 metres.

Notwithstanding Section 20.2, an establishment for the rental and leasing of motor vehicles and trucks shall be a permitted use in addition to those uses set forth therein. Notwithstanding Section 20.4 (i), the open storage of rental cars and trucks shall be permitted subject to the following provisions:

- Such open storage shall only be permitted in the rear yard area between the projection of the north and south walls of the main building;
- Such open storage is not located within the minimum yards with the exception of the rear yard which may be reduced to 3 metres; and,
- Such open storage shall not cover more than 10% of the lot area.

SECTION 21 - GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (M2) ZONE

21.1

PERMITTED RESIDENTIAL USES

- one accessory dwelling

21.2

PERMITTED NON-RESIDENTIAL USES

- all uses permitted in a Restricted Industrial (M1) Zone
- building supply and equipment establishment *
- bulk fuel storage establishment *
- garage, bus or truck
- garage, autobody
- manufacturing or industrial establishment, not necessarily conducted and contained within a building, excluding a salvage yard] *
- motor vehicle sales establishment - commercial and recreational vehicles
- police station
- terminal, bus or truck
- truck driving centre
- welding shop
- accessory buildings, structures and uses to any permitted use

(500-98-003)

21.3

ZONE REQUIREMENTS - RESIDENTIAL USES

In accordance with the provisions of Section 6 hereof for a Rural (RU) Zone.

21.4

ZONE REQUIREMENTS - NON-RESIDENTIAL USES

AUTO BODY GARAGES

In accordance with the provisions of Section 13 hereof for a mechanical garage.

OTHER USES

(a) **LOT FRONTAGE (MINIMUM)** no minimum required

- except that in the case of a lot fronting on Highway 48, the minimum lot frontage shall be 45 metres.

(b) **LOT AREA (MINIMUM)** 4 000 sq metres

SECTION 21 - GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (M2) ZONE (cont.)

21.5.4 PART OF LOT 21, CONCESSION 4 (NG);

'M2-4'
(Map 1)

Notwithstanding Section 21.4 (j), the open storage of goods and materials shall not take place within 30 metres of the westerly limit of Lot 21, Concession 4 (NG) and shall not be permitted unless completely screened from view of the adjacent street by a fence, wall, berm or trees.

For the purpose of this by-law, a fence or wall shall not be considered a structure.

[illegible]

Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 21.4 (f), the minimum easterly interior side yard for an existing non-residential building shall be 4.49 metres.

21.5.6 PART OF LOTS 2 & 3, CONCESSION 4 (NG); (M2-9)
(500-95-019) (Map 1)

Notwithstanding Section 21.1, on lands indicated 'M2-9' on Schedule 'A' to the By-law, the only permitted non-residential use shall be a single family dwelling.

Further, notwithstanding Section 21.2, on lands indicated 'M2-9' the following are the only permitted non-residential uses:

- motor vehicle sales establishment
- a contractor's or tradesman's yard
- a warehouse
- a building supply and equipment establishment
- accessory buildings, structure, and uses to any permitted use

Further, on lands indicated as 'M2-9', a smelter, smelter related uses or bulk fuel storage establishment shall not be permitted.

Thane Options Summary

	Date	Option	Technical Considerations	Financial Considerations	Status
1	June 2008	XCG Report – Excavate and remove slag wastes and impacted soils.	No significant technical issues. Option requires characterization of materials to ensure appropriate disposal and confirmatory sampling to verify remediation. Option completely addresses waste and soil issues, groundwater impacts would attenuate after source removal	Estimated at \$3.9 million (2008) - costs affected by receiving site, transportation costs	No proponent
2	June 2008	XCG Report – Complete Entombment with Leachate Collection	Requires detailed technical design, approvals and long-term site operations and monitoring. Option would result in the creation of a waste management site at the property and leachate collection would also require either treatment or removal of collected leachate. Wastes would be excavated and consolidated while liner is constructed and returned prior to completion of engineered cover.	Estimated at \$2.7 million (2008) with annual operating costs of \$37,500 - leachate treatment and disposal may increase costs	No proponent
3	June 2008	XCG Report – Composite Cover (engineered) with Surface Water Control	Requires detailed technical design for consolidation and capping of wastes. Option would result in the creation of a waste management facility at the site and also require approvals for surface water management	Estimated at \$1.5 million (2008) with annual operating costs of \$32,500	No proponent
4	September 2009	Incorporation of Thane into the Existing Georgina Landfill Site	Options #2 and #3 could be modified to remove the Thane wastes into the Georgina landfill or to expand the landfill onto Thane. This would require amendment to the Town's approval and detailed technical design, but is not likely to affect the long-term monitoring already in place.	Unknown	Town of Georgina has indicated they would not support this option
5	September 2009	Reuse of Thane Wastes by Cement Industry	Many cement facilities are able to incorporate alternative materials into their	Unknown	Not Viable

Thane Options Summary

	Date	Option	Technical Considerations	Financial Considerations	Status
			cement operations in an effort to reduce consumption of raw materials. The Thane material is largely salt and sodium cannot be introduced into cement kilns.		
6	October 2009 - October 2011	Expansion of the Regional Municipality of York's Georgina Transfer Station onto Thane	This option would see the expansion of the existing Georgina Transfer Station onto the Thane property, likely in combination with one of the XCG Options.	Unknown	The Regional Municipality of York has reviewed their expansion plans for the transfer station and will not be considering Thane due to the liability and clean up costs. The Region continues to develop a design for the proposed transfer station using the existing York property.
7	April 2010	Application to Environment Canada's Lake Simcoe Clean-up Fund (LSCUF)	The Thane public liaison committee (TPLC) submitted letters of intent in October 2009 and April 2010 for remedial work at the Thane site. The first application was based on the full site remediation as per Option #1 and the LSCUF objective to address 'other contaminants' in the watershed. After this unsuccessful first application, the second application focused on interim site controls including stormwater management and wetland rehabilitation. This letter of intent was again denied based the lack of specific project details, timing, costs and also that the Thane site is not a nutrient issue.	The LSCUF provides up to 2/3 funding providing that the remaining 1/3 is contributions from other agencies or partners.	The 2012 Federal budget has announced that the program will be continued with details to be announced in the coming months

Thane Options Summary

8	June 2010	Mobile Soil hydrocarbon treatment facility to fund progressive remediation	At the Thane workshop, XCG and others discussed operation of a mobile treatment facility on a portion of the Thane site. A portion of the profits would be used to pay for the progressive removal of wastes from the site (refer to Option #1). XCG attended a PLC meeting to discuss a similar project in Kitchener where XCG was involved.	Estimates discussed at the workshop suggested that operations could fund the complete removal of wastes in 5-10 years.	No Proponent – activity also prohibited by Georgina by-law
9	December 2010	Solar Farm Proposal	A group interested in available lands for solar farm installations contacted the Town of Georgina in relation to their landfill and Thane about use of the properties. Reportedly considerations relating to this site include topography, exposure/orientation of the property and ability to connect either property to the grid. It is not known if this proposal included any site remediation or capping.	Unknown	Unknown
10	January 2011	Reuse of Thane Wastes for Daily or Interim Landfill Cover	This option was discussed with several consultants and municipalities. Some landfill approvals permit the use of alternative covers; however, amendments or monitoring may be required. As the Thane contaminants are also common landfill constituents, the consultants and municipalities noted that the material would present compliance risks for their groundwater monitoring programs. The suitability of the material and risk of dust problems was also raised	Unknown	Not viable

Thane Options Summary

11	January 2011	Reuse of Thane Wastes for Road Salt	This option had been raised historically and was briefly reviewed by the TPLC. The Thane materials contain heavy metals and other contaminants in addition to salt and would not be suitable for road salting. The fine nature of the salt slag and concentrations when compared to conventional salt would also make this a less effective de-icer	Unknown	Not Viable
12	January 2011	Flexible Solar Panel Site Cover – Spectro PowerCap™	This option was identified by the ministry after it had been discussed for another landfill site. There is no proponent or funding source identified and the option would be to place the flexible Spectro PowerCap™ solar panel system over the covered smelter wastes. As this is an American technology, the option is not eligible for Ontario's Feed-In Tariff program. See also Option #2 for related technical considerations for long-term on-site management.	Unknown	No proponent
13	January 2011	Site Capping and Warehouse Use	This proposal would cap off the on-site smelter wastes and construct a refrigerated warehouse, likely for vegetable storage. Reportedly this proponent had consulted with XCG on Option #2 in the XCG report.	Unknown	Proponents may be contacted after the expiry of June 2012 agreement between the owner and G Foch who is a local real estate agent/developer

Thane Options Summary

14	January 2011 Presentation to TPLC	Foch/Mount Albert Pit – Site Remediation and Operation of a Soil Treatment Facility	<p>The proposal was to remove all smelter wastes and impacted soils from the site, re-grade the property and operate a soil remediation facility to recover the costs of the initial remediation.</p> <p>The soil treatment operation was modeled but not affiliated with the Green for Life soil site in Pickering and would require ministry waste processing, air and wastewater approvals. The proponents intended to treat hydrocarbon impacted soils from remediation projects in York Region and the treated soil would be used at the Mount Albert Pit fill site in East Gwillimbury.</p> <p>A Georgina by-law prohibits the operation of soil remediation businesses.</p>	<p>The proposal would borrow at least 50% of the clean-up costs from the Town of Georgina and see these paid back over the life of the operation.</p> <p>The project costs were estimated at \$6 million</p>	The Mount Albert Pit operators are no longer affiliated with the proposal and neither they nor G. Foch are interested in challenging the by-law at the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).
15	August 2011 Pre-consultation with the ministry and Georgina	Orion Eco Solutions Inc. – Synthetic Diesel Production	<p>The proponents propose to progressively remove and remediate the Thane site using profits from the plant they could construct on 1-2 ha of the site. The process applies high temperature and pressure to break down organics to produce a synthetic diesel. The plant is self-sufficient and generates its own energy and operates with no air or water emissions. The plant can use feedstocks such as plastics, rubber, waste oils, waxes, agricultural waste or biosolids.</p> <p>The plant would generate approximately 230 kW. While another plant is proposed in Ontario, this facility and new technology would require a number of approvals from the ministry and other</p>	<p>Costs would depend on the sourcing of feedstocks (note that York residuals are already otherwise committed) and servicing at the site. The proponents indicated that they have current backers for their Ontario projects</p>	Town of Georgina by-law prohibiting waste processing would require proponents to take a challenge to the OMB. Based on the lack of York wastes and Georgina by-laws, the proponents are not pursuing Thane.

Thane Options Summary

			agencies.		
16	<p>August 2011 Pre-consultation with ministry, York and Georgina</p> <p>January 2012 update to PLC</p>	<p>Spill Green™ Addition for site Remediation & Redevelopment in combination with G. Foch Site Re-development</p>	<p>The proposal was to treat impacted soils at the Thane site with Spill Green™ product, grade the property and re-develop the site for a possible commercial use, such as Spill Green's Canadian headquarters.</p> <p>The Spill Green™ product is commercially used for road spills and one of the active constituents is sodium silicate, a common adsorbent, which is effective for use with fuel, oil and acid spills. Testing to date has not demonstrated that the material would address metals, salt or ammonia impacts at Thane. Both the remediation and site redevelopment proposals require significant technical approvals from the ministry, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) and Georgina.</p>	Unknown	<p>G. Foch has entered into an agreement with the site owner to permit access for site investigations and to pursue options for the site without any investment in the site. The current agreement expires in June 2012 and G. Foch remains interested in a number of options for the site.</p>
17	October 2011	Washington State Smelter Remediation Projects	<p>The Washington (WA) State Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has managed a number of similar smelter sites. The secondary aluminum smelters in WA were generally larger operations but have similar issues including groundwater and surface water impacts. The sites have been either encapsulated or excavated (options #1, 2 and 3). The Trentwood site was encapsulated; however, based on monitoring, the site is now being excavated.</p>	The WA DEQ has not released cost information	

Thane Options Summary

18	December 2011	Secondary Smelters & Dioxin Emissions – References from other Jurisdictions	California Environmental Protection Agency - 2007 Fact Sheet advising restricted egg consumption near a former mobile smelting facility in Mojave. The copper smelter had burnt off plastic wire covering and also received some aluminum aircraft parts. Draft USEPA Dioxin Document, notes dioxins can be produced during pre-cleaning (roasting/sweating) and in smelting operations, particularly when delaquering of beverage cans. Source testing results note emissions estimates are limited when comparing facilities, production, pollution control and other factors.	N/A	Dioxin sampling planned at Thane in summer 2012.
19	December 2011	Clean & Green – Site Review and Recommendation for Soil Remediation and Stabilization	Review of on-site monitoring data and Georgina landfill report identified complete excavation as the preferred option. The review identified the need for environmental controls during the construction period and a confirmatory and long-term monitoring program to verify the remediation. Consultants noted no proven in situ treatment available to address metals, salts and ammonia impacts at the site.	N/A	Site peer review – no proponent
20	January 2012	G. Foch – Site Redevelopment Update to TPLC	G. Foch provided an update to the PLC on the options he has investigated for the property including entombment and a 20-year removal plan concurrent with some use of the site, or in combination with 'molecular encapsulation' by Spill Green	Unknown G. Foch has reportedly contacted Municipal Property Assessment	G.Foch agreement expires June 2012.

Thane Options Summary

			(see #16). His current focus has been potential reclassification or removal of the Provincially Significant Wetland Designation at the site. Significant technical approvals from the ministry, LSRC and Town would be required for any of these options (see also #1, 2 and 3)	Corporation in relation to the property assessment value.
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

May 4, 2012

Page :

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECIEVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL, 2015
during public and agency commenting period

	YORK REGION:			
Comment No.	Section	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
2.0 - Vision, Guiding Principles and Objectives				
1		Community & Health Services	2.2.2.4 - To ensure that all land use decisions consider the impact of future development on air, water, soil and climate including the availability of clean drinking water, agricultural lands and products, and natural resources.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
2		Community & Health Services & Transportation Services - Transit Branch	2.2.2.8 - To provide for safe and accessible active transportation linkages between, workplaces, homes, shopping, services, schools, public facilities, points of interest and areas of scenic agriculture or environmental significance, by incorporating good urban design measures such as the provision of walkways, sidewalks, more direct street patterns and adequate illumination of such facilities in communities to be served by transit.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
3		Community & Health Services	2.2.3 Recommend adding a new section - " 2.2.3.2: The health of our natural environment is inextricably linked to the health of our communities. Forests and tree canopy cover contribute to shade, energy conservation, improve air quality, help to mitigate and adapt to climate change, encourage physical activity and improve mental health. "	Do not agree. This is good general information that would be more appropriate as an information box. York Region agrees with comment. Added as information box.
4		Community & Health Services	2.2.10 - Recommend adding a new subsection - " Local agriculture reduces food travel miles, addresses climate change and promotes nutrition, food security and economic prosperity. "	Do not agree. This is good general information that would be more appropriate as an information box. York Region agrees with comment. Added as information box.
5		Community & Health Services	2.2.10.5 - To support the availability of local foods and community gardens for the residents and visitors of Georgina.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
6		Community & Health Services	2.2.11.1 - To improve the health and well-being of the people who live, work and play in Georgina, through the development of strong, livable, safe and resilient urban and rural communities and the provision of a variety of opportunities for housing, employment, learning, social activity, culture and recreation, and active transportation while protecting the natural environment.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
7		Community & Health Services	2.2.12.9 - To support healthy lifestyles and sustainable communities by encouraging low-carbon, zero-waste neighbourhoods , local food and local goods production and consumption, active transportation , and the ability to live, work and play in one community.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
8		Community & Health Services & Transportation Services	2.2.14.7 - Recommend adding the words "multi-modal" in order to better align with YROP and PPS - "To support improved multi-modal transportation linkages between Georgina and the rest of the Greater Toronto Area and to better realign with the YROP and PPS."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
3.0 - Growth Management				
9	Report No. DS Attachm Pages 1	Long Range Planning	Section 3.1 - Include a section which exemplifies how the Town will achieve 5.3.3 of the YROP regarding establishing intensification strategies . Recommend adding a policy section to 3.1 as follows: " The Town, in consultation with York Region, will complete and adopt an intensification strategy based on the York Region 2031 Intensification Strategy. " and " The Town will work in cooperation with the Region to ensure a minimum of 40 percent of all residential development in York Region will occur within the built-up area as defined by the Province's Built Boundary in Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Generally, the Town will direct intensification efforts to the urban area. "	Agree with this revision, but revise last sentence to: " Generally, the Town will direct intensification efforts to the urban area appropriate locations within the Keswick and Sutton / Jackson's Point Secondary Plan Areas". Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

10		Long Range Planning	Section 3.1.4 - In May 2015, the Town recommended a reduction in the current boundary of the Pepperlaw Secondary Plan Area during the Province's review of the Greenbelt Plan. Phase 2 of the Province's review will respond to submissions received on or before May 28, 2015, including the Town's request. The Town may wish to continue with advocacy efforts related to reducing the size of the Pepperlaw settlement area.	Comment noted.
4.0 - General Land Use and Development Policies				
11		Community Planning & Economic Development	Section 4.1 - Land Uses Permitted in all Designations - add a new section or add to section 4.1.1 entitled "Communication Technology" (derived from Newmarket Urban Centres Secondary Plan section 7.3.8) to reflect advanced telecommunication and infrastructure requirements: "All commercial, office, institutional, mixed use, and multiple unit residential buildings will be designed to: a) facilitate advanced telecommunication, such as, building automation systems, a broad range of applications from health services to heating and lighting, leading edge national and international connectivity capability, etc.; and b) provide the infrastructure for the delivery of leading edge communication technologies, including broadband fiber optics to and throughout the building(s) in order to facilitate future advanced telecommunication capabilities."	Agree with this revision. Add a new Section 9.6 "Communication Technology" and add these policies. Change first sentence to: "Where appropriate, the Town will require development All commercial, office, institutional, mixed use, and multiple unit residential buildings will to be designed to:..." . Revision made.
12		Community Planning - Development Engineering	Section 4.4.2 a) & b) - Recommend defining "Regulatory Storm Event" and "Regulatory Flood Elevation"	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
13		Community Planning - Development Engineering	Section 4.4.9 - Suggest adding; This report shall be prepared..." by a Professional (Geotechnical) Engineer " ...	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
14		Long Range Planning	Section 4.7.2 Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food is currently completing a 5-Year review of the Minimum Distance Separation calculation (MDS), as set out in the current MDS documentation. As part of the proposed updated MDS guide, Guideline 7 suggests it is possible for a municipality to exempt existing lots of record from being required to comply with MDS, however, the Province strongly advises against this practice. Furthermore, the Province puts forth some specifications regarding when and how these exemptions can take place. The Town is advised to ensure that MDS is applied to existing lots of record. The proposed updated MDS guide can be found at: http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca/english/landuse/MDS_2015.pdf	Do not agree with this request. The development rights on individual existing lots of record should be maintained. York Region indicated was a suggestion, not requirement. More detail has been included in the MDS section to specify when it can be applied.
15		Community Planning	Section 4.10 - Recommend that an additional policy section be added to 4.10 in order for the Town's Plan to align with the YROP (section 6.5.17) to ensure that rehabilitation measures are carried out to address and mitigate known or suspected hazards for development affected by oil, gas and salt hazards or petroleum operations.	Agree with this revision. Region provided draft wording. Revision made.
16		Long Range Planning	Section 4.10 - An additional policy section is recommended to 4.10 which is similar in nature to YROP (section 6.5.1.5), reflecting the need to comply with the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan: "That outside of the Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt, but within the Lake Simcoe watershed, applications for new mineral aggregate operations and wayside pits and quarries shall comply with the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan."	Do not agree with this request. All of Georgina is within the Greenbelt Plan area. York Region agreed with comment. No revisions required.
17		Long Range Planning	Section 4.10.10 (b). Proposed wording to reflect YROP objectives: "The other alternatives have been satisfactorily considered and found unsuitable in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement ; and .."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
5.0 - Sustainable Natural Environment				

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

18	Long Range Planning	Section 5.1.1.1 (a) - To be consistent with YROP policy 2.2.4, add the following wording: "(a) There will be no adverse effects on key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features as demonstrated through a natural heritage evaluation, hydrological evaluation, or environmental impact study; "	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
19	Long Range Planning	Section 5.1.1.1 - To meet the requirements of YROP 2.2.8 recommend adding a policy to section 5.1.1.1 as follows: "e) That notwithstanding policy 5.1.1.1 (a) of this Plan, development and site alteration is not permitted within fish habitat, except in accordance with federal and provincial requirements."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
20	Long Range Planning	Section 5.1.1.4 - To meet the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan it is recommended the following wording be added: "c) : is consistent with the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan and Lake Simcoe Watershed."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
21	Long Range Planning	Section 5.3.5 To meet the requirements of LSPP policy 6.1 Designated Policies (DP) where only expansions are permitted to existing buildings and structures, it is recommended the following wording be deleted: "New buildings and structures and Expansions to existing buildings and structures shall only be permitted in a vegetation protection zone along the Lake Simcoe shoreline if: ..."	Do not agree with this revision. Keep the word "structures" in order to align with LSPP wording.
22	Community Planning & Water Resources	5.4 - Source Water Protection - Please note that "groundwater recharge areas" should be replaced with their proper name of "significant groundwater recharge areas" .	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
23	Community Planning & Water Resources	5.4.1.1.1.a - A thorough examination of the source water policies was carried out and it is recommended that section 5.4.1.1.1a be removed. This is based upon the fact that DNAPL's are not a significant drinking water threat in IPZ-1 with a Vulnerability Score (VS) of 8 in the case of the Town. The circumstance where it would be a significant drinking water threat in an IPZ-1 with a VS of 10. However, section 5.4.1.1. b) should remain as disposal waste sites are a significant drinking water threat in IPZ-1 with a VS of 8.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
24	Community Planning & Water Resources	5.4.1.1. - Recommend the following policy be added to ensure that all significant drinking water threats are included: "5.4.1.1.c) Agricultural Storage Building used for agricultural source material (ASM) which includes but is not limited to the following materials (i) animal manure including bedding materials, (ii) milk house wash water, (iii) mushroom compost, (iv) regulated compost, (v) animal yard run-off and manure."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
25	Community Planning & Water Resources	5.4.1.1. - Recommend the following policy be added to ensure that all significant drinking water threats are included: "5.4.1.1.d) Meat Plant that generates non-source agricultural source material (NASM)."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
26	Community Planning & Water Resources	5.4.1.1.2 - Recommend the acronym DNAPL be spelled out as the word DNAPL was removed in section 5.4.1.1.1.a - dense non-aqueous phase liquid.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
27	Community Planning & Water Resources	5.4.2.1 - Recommend the following wording be added in order to be consistent with a recent modification to the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan. Need to add the words "where possible" to the policy: "The Town will reduce the risk of contaminating drinking water when designing new stormwater management facilities by directing, where possible the discharge of storm water outside of vulnerable areas ..."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
28	Community Planning & Water Resources	5.4.2.4 - Due to the fact that the Town is within a IPZ-1 with a VS of 8, the discharge rate is different compared to a IPZ-1 with VS of 10 based upon the circumstances. The discharge rate should be where the treatment plant exceeds 50,000 m3/day . Policy reference is SEWG(b)-1 of South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan under the circumstances of where the VS is needed for a significant threat.	This policy has been removed at the request of the Province.
29	Community Planning & Water Resources	5.4.2.5 - Recommend removing the word "major" as the definition of major development is a building size of 500 m ² or more. It is not always the size of the development, but the type of activity proposed that could make a proposed development a significant drinking water threat. There is discretion in the policy which may or may not require the submission of a SWIAMP (source water impact assessment and mitigation plan) or hydrogeological study.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

30		Community Planning & Water Resources	5.4.3.2 - There is a reference to major source water development within this section, however it is not defined in the Plan. Are you going to rely upon the definition of major development or do you want to define it? For your reference in the draft templates for official plan amendments, "Major Source Water Development" was defined as : Consists of (a). The construction of a building or buildings and any other impervious surface (e.g. road and/or parking area) with a cumulative ground floor area of 500 square meters or more; or, (b). The establishment of a major recreational use; Excludes: on-site sewage systems, low density residential, barns and other non-commercial structures that are an accessory to an agricultural operation.	MMAH requested that 'major source water development' be replaced with 'major development.' York Region indicated no concern with request but would like revised wording in the definition of 'major development': "d) in Section 5.4, the following definition applies for major development: consists of 1) the construction of buildings and other impervious surface...." Agree with revision. Revision made.
6.0 - Countryside Area				
31		Long Range Planning	Section 6.2.4 - There may be an incorrect policy reference. Within section 6.2.4 it cites 6.1.11 (farm-gate sales) and we believe it should be referencing section 6.1.12 (sustainable agriculture).	Agree with this revision, policy reference has been revised.
32		Long Range Planning	Section 6.2.15 (h) - It is unclear which applicable policies of the Georgina OP are being referred to in this section.	Agreed that this section is unclear; Section h will be removed. Revision made.
33		Long Range Planning	Section 6.5 - The Greenbelt Plan (Section 4.1.1) does not permit non-agricultural (i.e. 'commercial') uses in Prime Agricultural areas in the Countryside designation, unless the use is agriculture-related (PPS 2014). Outside of settlement areas, existing uses are permitted to expand under certain conditions (Greenbelt Plan - Section 4.5.3). References to 'new' rural commercial areas should be removed from Section 6.5 of the draft OP or clarification should be provided to ensure that proposed commercial uses be agricultural-related (PPS 2014).	Do not agree with this comment. The GBP allows certain non-agricultural uses in rural (non prime agricultural) areas and accordingly, the Draft OP permits such uses in the Rural Commercial Area. York Region will agree to permit new sites but is requesting to include a statement that expansions or new sites must be in conformity with YROP, Provincial Plans etc. and if conforms then must submit studies." Revision made.

**OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period**

34	Long Range Planning	Section 6.6 - The Greenbelt Plan (Section 4.1.1) does not permit non-agricultural (i.e. 'commercial') uses in Prime Agricultural areas in the Countryside designation, unless the use is agriculture-related (PPS 2014). Outside of settlement areas, existing uses are permitted to expand under certain conditions (Greenbelt Plan - Section 4.5.3). References to 'new' commercial recreational development should be removed from Section 6.6 of the draft OP.	Do not agree with this comment. The GBP allows certain non-agricultural uses in rural (non prime agricultural) areas and accordingly, the Draft OP permits such uses in the Commercial Recreation Area. York Region will agree to permit new sites but is requesting to include a statement that expansions or new sites must be in conformity with YROP, Provincial Plans etc. and if conforms then must submit studies." Revision made.
35	Long Range Planning	Section 6.6.3 - Remove the words " or the designation of new sites " as the designation of new 'commercial' recreational areas is not permitted within the Greenbelt Plan area.	Do not agree with this comment. The GBP allows certain non-agricultural uses in rural (non prime agricultural) areas and accordingly, the Draft OP permits such uses in the Commercial Recreation Area. York Region will agree to permitting new sites but is requesting to include a statement that expansions or new sites must be in conformity with YROP, Provincial Plans etc. and if conforms then must submit studies. Revision made.
7.0 - Settlement Areas			
36	Forestry	Section 7.1 - As part of the secondary plan areas where the Town's urban areas are identified, there is a YROP requirement of an urban forest management plan (YROP reference 2.2.50). Wording for your consideration is as follows: "The Town shall develop an urban forest management plan together with York Region that will include canopy cover targets for Settlement Areas, and may include locally significant woodlands."	Agree with revision but suggest the following revision "The Town shall develop an urban forest management plan together with York Region that will include local and regional requirements. "

**OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period**

37	Long Range Planning	Section 7.1 - Recommend adding the following policy " Secondary Plans shall incorporate and reflect new community area policies of the York Region Official Plan to ensure that all new development focuses on an integrated and sustainable approach to planning. "	Do not agree with this revision. No part of the Town is a "New Community" (these are in the whitebelt lands). York Region agrees but believes they are effective policies that should still be considered despite there not being new community areas in Georgina. York Region has agreed to a revised policy: " When reviewing Secondary Plans, the Town will consider incorporating relevant material from York Region's new community guidelines. " Revision made.
38	Long Range Planning	Section 7.1 - In order to meet the requirements of YROP policies 4.3.11, the following additional policy is recommended: " Secondary Plans shall include policies that ensure that ancillary uses on employment lands do not exceed 15% of an employment area. "	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
39	Transportation Planning	Section 7.1.1.e) - Recommend revising this policy as follows: "(e) identification of development phasing, triggers staging and financing of development;".	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
40	Community Planning	Section 7.1 - In urban areas it is encouraged that new buildings establish energy and conservation targets. Consider adding a policy to section 7.1 of your Plan to address this policy area (reference is YROP policy 5.2.21).	Agree with this revision, new "Sustainability" section will be added as Section 8.9, which will include a "Sustainable Buildings" sub-section that re-states Section 5.2.21 (a, b and c) of YROP. Revision made.
41	Community & Health Services	Section 7.1.10 - Recommend adding a new subsection - " Major retail uses are encouraged to be in a mixed use format. "	Do not agree with this revision. There could be compatibility issues and may lead to the loss of employment lands. York Region indicated the subsection was a suggestion and not a requirement. No revisions to be made.
42	Community Planning	Section 7.2 - Maple Lake Estates - It appears that section 7.2 is copied in its entirety from the 2002 Georgina OP. As per section 1.2 of the draft OP, references to other OPAs will not be in effect until after the new OP is approved. For example in section 7.2, OPA 11 is referenced and will be repealed as part of the approval of the new OP. It is recommended to update ministry names throughout this section as some have changed.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

43		Transportation Planning	Section 7.6 - With the adoption of the urban expansion area for the Keswick Business Park and subsequent Secondary Plan, please clarify the intent of section 7.6 and its specific requirements as other secondary plan areas are only referenced in section 7.1 and 7.2 of the draft Official Plan.	Section 7.6 Business Park Study Area and associated policies are being removed from the Plan. Studies have been completed that prove it not to be a suitable extension to the Keswick Business Park. The area contains key natural heritage features. The lands are in natural heritage system and the majority of the lands are in the floodplain.
8.0 - Healthy and Complete Communities				
44		Community Planning	Section 8 - Within this section, we note that there was not a comprehensive section on sustainability compared to other parent OP documents. It is suggested a section on sustainability be included to reflect policy 2.2.2. in the Town's draft OP. For your consideration, a small section on sustainability would provide the Town with policy direction to undertake future sustainability initiatives. Based upon a cursory review of other municipal official plans, we found some examples you could draw from such as the official plans of East Gwillimbury (section 2.4), Caledon (section 3.1) and Uxbridge (section 1.6).	Agree with this revision, and a new "Sustainability" section was added, which includes a "Sustainable Buildings" sub-section that re-states Section 5.2.21 (a, b and c) of YROP.
45		Community & Health Services	Section 8 - Recommend a section on sustainability could also include climate change adaptation, mitigation, vulnerability and resiliency measures and considered as a guiding principle.	Agree with this revision, will be addressed in new "Sustainability" section. New sustainability section added. New climate change objective added.
46		Long Range Planning	Section 8.1.3 - To reduce confusion on housing forms, it is recommended to simplify the policy by deleting the words "be in forms that would" from the policy so it would read as follows: "The Town will target a minimum of 25% of all new housing to be in forms that would be affordable to households of low and moderate income and also be appropriately distributed throughout the Town."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
47		Transportation Planning	Section 8.1.16 - Recommend policy to ensure that sufficient parking is provided for garden suites. Suggested wording is: "(g) - Sufficient parking is available to accommodate the Garden Suite."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
48		Community Planning	Section 8.2 - In order to align with the proposed policy addition in 7.1, it is suggested that a policy be added to section 8.2 of the Plan to encourage the establishment of energy and conservation targets for grade-related and mid-rise developments.	Clarification required on the intent of this comment. York Region indicated that it should be a reference to housing or within the sustainability section. Regional staff confirmed that new ROP will not be changing targets. Revision made in sustainability section.
49		Community & Health Services	Section 8.3.2 - Recommend an additional statement be included that denotes consideration for safe connectivity between the school site and adjacent community, and community infrastructure that supports active transportation within the school catchment area.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

50	Community & Health Services	Section 8.4.3 - Recommend an additional sentence be added to the end of this section: " New community facilities supports energy efficient measures such as preferred parking, idle-free zones and alternative fuel recharging stations. "	Agree with this revision but revise to: "Where appropriate, new community facilities shall support efficient site design measures such as preferred parking, idle-free zones and alternative fuel recharging stations." York Region agrees with the revision. Revision made.
51	Long Range Planning	Section 8.7.1 - Policies in section 8.7.1 align with the YROP policies for New Communities and Sustainable Buildings, however for the Town's consideration a section could be added to 8.7.1 or possibly a sidebar on the New Communities Guidelines. Wording for your consideration is: " Proposed new public and private developments shall put forth best efforts to incorporate York Region's New Communities Guidelines to help ensure that all new development focuses on an integrated and sustainable approach to planning. "	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
52	Transportation Planning	Section 8.7.1.2 - It is suggested that an additional policy be added: " (l) An internal network of pedestrian walkways and sidewalks linking the street network and adjacent active trails networks. "	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
53	Community & Health Services	8.7.1.3 - Recommend the following policy be reworded as follows : "Building and site design should be conducted in such a manner as to increase resiliency and promote adaptation in order to reduce climate change minimize impacts. from and be resistant to climate change. "	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
54	Community Planning	Section 8.7.3. Recommend referencing the Association of Ontarians with Disabilities Act within this section.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
9.0 - Servicing and Infrastructure			
55	Community Planning	Section 9.1.3 -Recommend referencing the Greenbelt Plan as there are implications for expanding or adding new infrastructure within the Greenbelt.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
56	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2 - Add to section 9.2 in order for the Official Plan transportation policies to be consistent with YROP policies 7.1.1 through 7.1.10, which speak to trip reduction, transit-oriented development guidelines and transportation demand management.	Generally agree with this revision, will add the transportation policies but the development guidelines are already addressed in other areas of the Plan. Additional transportation policies added.
57	Community Planning	Section 9.2.1 - Recommend that a section be added to section 9.2.1 for utilities. Wording for your consideration is a follows: " Construction of hydro, telephone, and other cable communication services shall be encouraged to locate in the road right-of-way. All development will be designed to provide for the implementation of leading edge communication technologies, including but not limited to broadband fibre optics. "	Agree with the revision noted in the first sentence and is to be included in new 9.6 Communication Technology. Second sentence is to be revised as follows: Where appropriate , development shall be designed..." and will be included in Section 9.6 "Communication Technology". New section added.
58	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.1.3 - Recommend the following be clarified. Schedule E identifies the Road Class, while the policies of 9.2.1.3 provide a variable right of way for Collector roads between 23 and 26 metres. What document defines the limits of right-of-way for each section of road? This document shall be referenced within the Official Plan.	Agree with this revision, the Zoning By-law includes these right-of-way widths and will therefore be referenced in this section. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

59	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.1.3.b) - Schedule E identifies both local and Regional arterial roads, however; policy 9.2.1.3 (b) refers specifically to Regional arterial roads and should be revised.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
60	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.1.3 (b)- Recommend adding an additional sentence to section 9.2.1.3 (b) regarding Arterial Roads: "Regional arterial roads are designated in Map 12 – Street Network of the Regional Official Plan."	Agree with this revision. Re-word to read: "Regional arterial roads are designated in Map 12 – Street Network of the Regional Official Plan." Revision made.
61	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.1.4 - Recommend additional works be added to the list within this policy such as: sidewalks, bicycle lanes, high-occupancy-vehicle lanes, public transit lanes and transit facilities, boulevards, landscaping and public streetscape enhancements.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
62	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.1.14 - Recommend deleting the reference to "major roads" which is not used elsewhere in the Official Plan and replacing it with "Arterial Roads and Provincial Highways" to be consistent with policy 9.2.1.3.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
63	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.1.11 - Recommend referencing unopened road allowances as follows: "Development shall not be permitted within the planned transportation corridors, or unopened Road Allowances , shown on Schedule E – Roads Plan, if such development could preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purpose(s) for which it was identified."	Agree with this revision, but also include a definition for "Unopened Road Allowance". Revision made.
64	Transit	Section 9.2.1.28 - Recommend this section be revised as follows: "The Town shall work with York Region and the Ministry of Transportation to provide multi-use-paths, sidewalks and street lighting along Regional streets and, where warranted , Provincial highways serviced by transit."	Agree with this revision, but revise to read: "Where warranted , the Town shall work with York Region and the Ministry of Transportation to provide multi-use-paths, sidewalks and street lighting along Regional streets and where warranted Provincial highways serviced by transit." Revision made.
65	Community Planning	Section 9.2.3 - Recommend referencing Schedule E for Transit Routes.	Do not agree with this revision. York Region has agreed to this omission. No revisions required.
66	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.3. - The following additional policy is recommended: "The Town will prohibit traffic calming on any road with an existing transit route, or on any road that may function as a transit route in the future."	Agree with this revision, but revise to read: "Where the Town is considering traffic calming strategies on any road with a transit route, or on any road that may function as a transit route in the future, the Town shall work with the Region to ensure that such strategies will not negatively impact transit operations." Revision made.
67	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.3 - Recommend including the following policy: "The Town of Georgina shall work with York Region Transit (YRT), GO Transit and Metrolinx to maintain and enhance transit services and provide interconnections within the community and between the community and other urban areas of the Town and York Region."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.

**OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period**

68	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.3 - Recommend further consideration be given to define, maintain and enhance existing GO Bus Transit as follows: "The Town shall work with GO Transit and Metrolinx to maintain and enhance existing GO Bus Transit Services within the Town to provide express service to the Central Business District of Toronto, connections to the TTC Subway Network and York Region Viva Network."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
69	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.3 - Recommend the following additional policy be added: "Requiring that within the urban areas, towns and villages, sidewalks be constructed on both sides of all collector and arterial roads and on one side of all roads with a designated transit route."	Agree with this revision, but revise to read: "All new roads, sidewalks and multi-use trails shall be constructed in accordance with the Town's Development Design Criteria". York Region indicated no concerns with this revision. Revision made.
70	Transit	Section 9.2.3.2 - Recommend adding the following: "The Town shall work with York Region to enhance the regional transit system in accordance with the needs of the Town and the policies of the Regional Official Plan. In particular, consistent with service standards and guidelines as adopted by the regional transit system , the Town shall encourage and support the regional transit system to link the communities in the Town with other communities in the Region, and which will provide internal service within each community."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
71	Transit	9.2.3.3 - Recommend adding the following: "The Town shall support transit supportive and pedestrian oriented community design measures, and in particular shall ensure that: (a) arterial and collector roads are designed to accommodate transit facilities; (b) subdivisions are designed to permit effective pedestrian access to transit routes. (c) walking distances to existing or planned transit stops are minimized to the greatest reasonable extent through the provisions of sidewalks, walkways and more direct (e.g. grid-oriented) street patterns in communities to be served by transit."	Agree with this revision, but these policies will be added to Section 7.1 "Secondary Plan Areas". York Region indicated no concern with moving policies to "secondary plan areas." Revision made.
72	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.4 - Recommend that an additional policy be added: "The Town shall support an active and multi-modal transportation network and will work towards urbanizing arterial roads within the urban areas, towns and villages."	Agree with this revision, but this policy will be added to Section 7.1 "Secondary Plan Areas". Also revise to end the sentence after the word "network". York Region agrees with comment but requests detail to be in the secondary plans. Comment noted. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

73	Transportation Planning	Section 9.2.4 -Recommend that an additional policy be added: "The Town shall support the objective of completing missing sidewalk links on arterial streets within urban areas, towns and villages."	Agree with this revision, but this policy will be added to Section 7.1 "Secondary Plan Areas". Also revise to end the sentence after the word "streets". York Region indicated no concerns with proposed revision. Revision made.
74	Community Planning - Development Engineering	Sections 9.3.1.1, 9.3.1.2, 9.3.6.1, 9.3.7.1, 9.3.8.1 and 9.3.9.1 - Development Engineering recommends that the word "sanitary" be added throughout the OP for consistency. For example, York Region shall be notified of any allocation of Water or "Sanitary" Sewer ...	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
75	Community Planning	Section 9.4 - In order to reflect YROP policy 7.4.22 to track decommissioned landfill sites, it is suggested that a policy be added as follows: "The Town will work with the Province to track decommissioned landfill sites and sites contaminated by industrial and commercial activity, and that such sites be rehabilitated to an appropriate use."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
76	Community Planning	Section 9.4.5 - The Town's Plan does support programs for 3-stream waste collection in new buildings, however it recommended that a policy be included to encourage retrofits in existing multi-unit residential buildings as follows: "The Town will work with York Region to support the participation of 3-stream waste collection in existing multi-unit residential buildings."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
77	Community Planning	Section 9.4.3. In order to ensure waste disposal facilities will be rehabilitated, we recommend that a policy be added to reflect YROP policy 7.4.23.	Do not agree with this revision. This issue is regulated by the Province. York Region agreed to comment. No revisions required.
78	Community Planning - Development Engineering	Section 9.5.5 - Consider adding the word "enhanced" to the sentence: Best Management practices shall be applied to meet or exceed "enhanced (Level 1)" ...	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
79	Community Planning - Development Engineering	Section 9.5.6 d) and e) - Consider adding the word "conditions" to the paragraphs that contain: between pre development and post development "conditions" .	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
10.0 - Development Review			
80	Community Planning	Section 10.1.2.1 - Submission Requirements - Under Environmental Considerations there is an incorrect name of a study. Please replace "Source Water Protection Plan" with "Source Water Impact Assessment and Mitigation Plan" in order to be aligned with section 5.4.2.5.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
81	Community Planning	Section 10.1.2.1 - Submission Requirements - Within sections 6.7.7(a) there is a reference to the requirement of a Servicing Study and (c) Traffic Report and in section 7.3.9.d) a Traffic Analysis and in (f) a Functional Servicing Analysis. These studies are not currently listed in the submission requirements - section 10.1.2.1. We recommend these studies either need to be added or the studies as listed in section 10.1.2.1 be amended to match the studies listed.	Agree with this revision, the Plan will be revised to ensure consistent names of all studies. Revisions made.
82	Community Planning - Development Engineering	Section 10.1.2.1 - Submission Requirements - Under Engineering Considerations, recommend using the words "Detailed Servicing Plan" instead of "Detailed Service Plan" , and that the word "report" be added to the "Stormwater Management Plan" so it is "Stormwater Management Plan/Report" .	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
83	Community Planning	Section 10.1.2.1 - Submission Requirements - Recommend adding the "Needs and Fiscal Impact Study" as it is cited in section 11.4.2.8 and "Contaminant Management Plan" as it is cited in sections 5.4.4.1 and 12.5.23 in the draft OP to be consistent with the list of studies.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
11.0 - Implementation			

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

84		Long Range Planning	Section 11.1 - Recommend an additional policy which speaks to compliance with Existing Use policies of the Greenbelt Plan (section 4.5). For your consideration is suggested wording to be for potential policy: " 11.1.1.(e) Comply with Existing Use policies of the Greenbelt Plan. "	Do not agree with this revision. These policies are already included in other areas of the Plan (11.1 and 5.9). York Region indicated no concerns. No revisions required.
85		Community Planning	Section 11.2.6.1 - As noted above, it is recommended that a new sustainability section be included and that the following be added to the list in order to align with this new section: " Encouraging green building techniques. "	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
86		Community Planning	Section 11.14. - Under the Asset Management and Capital Works Program, it is recommended citing the Region as a partner as part of the All-Pipes program.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
12.0 - Interpretation				
87		Transportation Planning	Section 12.5.81 - "Planned Corridors" - Recommend that the Regional Transportation Master Plan and Pedestrian Cycling Master Plan, and subsequent amendments be included within the definition.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
88		Community Planning & Water Resources	Section 12.5.94 - "Significant Groundwater Recharge Area" - Water Resources recommends using the definition found in the OPA templates provided to municipalities in order to be consistent with the source protection plan definitions and the YROP. The following is the template definition: " Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA) - The area where an aquifer is replenished from (a) natural processes, such as the infiltration of rainfall and snowmelt and the seepage of surface water from lakes, streams and wetlands, (b) from human interventions, such as the use of storm water management systems, and (c) whose recharge rate exceeds a threshold specified in the Clean Water Act. "	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
Schedules and Tables				
89		GIS	GENERAL COMMENTS TO SCHEDULES: 1. Consider dashed lines around hamlet areas in order to give them more context 2. Add Regional road numbers on the map 3. When printing the maps ensure the colour in the legend matches with the colour on the schedule (examples A-2 and B2) 4. Street name font size is too small in some cases (i.e.. A2, B1 & B2 both East and West)	1 - Do not agree with this revision. Would be confusing with the other line types. 2 - Agree with this revision. Revision made. 3 - Agree with this revision. Revision made. 4 - Agree with this revision. Revision made.
90		Community Planning	Schedule A2 - Recommend Regional Forest Tracts be added to the schedule.	Do not agree with this revision. This is a matter of ownership rather than land use. York Region indicated no concern with comment. No revision required.
91		GIS	Schedule A2 - Please note that on Metro Road North by Crescent Beach there is a "white" area. What land use is associated with this area? Another white area appears outside of the Keswick Secondary Plan area, north of Old Homestead Road and east of the Queensway.	Agree with this revision, the white area beside Crescent Beach is supposed to be Rural. The white area beside the Secondary Plan should be Agricultural. Revisions made.
92		GIS	Schedule B1 East/West - It is recommended that "Wetland" should be the same colour as on Schedule B2 to reduce confusion. In order to differentiate between all of the shades of greens, it is recommended that the "Wetland" be a bright teal/turquoise, "Woodlands" a forest green and the combination "Woodland/Wetland" be an olive green. Typically yellow is used to represent low density residential.	Agree with this revision, the colours will be adjusted for greater clarity. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

93	GIS	Schedule B3 - Please note that the colours in the legend do not match up with the colours on the map for IPZ-2.	Agree with this revision, the colours will be adjusted for greater clarity. Revision made.
94	Community Planning	Schedule B3 - Please revise the legend for Significant Groundwater Recharge Area - there should be an "s" added to " Areas " and for Highly Vulnerable Aquifer an "s" should be added to " Aquifers ".	Further discussion with York Region GIS indicated changes not required. No revisions required.
95	GIS	Schedule D - Suggest making the lines thinner on this schedule. Also remove words on the map that are cut off such as " BEL " for Belhaven and " Boyer's Si " for Sideroad OR put the entire name on the map.	Agree with this revision, these changes will be made throughout all Plan schedules. Additional street names will also be added. Revision made.
96	Community Planning - Development Engineering	Schedule D - Recommend adding " Sanitary " to "Area not to be serviced with Municipal Water and Sanitary Sewer" in order to be in alignment with the recommendation in section 9.3.1.1.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
97	Community Planning	Schedule E - Recommend adding the future interchange at Highway 404 and Pollock Road to the map.	Agree with this revision, this, as well as all the other EA approved interchanges, will be added. Revision made.
98	Transportation Planning	Schedule E - Recommend that Pollock Road between Warden Avenue and McCowan Road be identified as a Collector Road. This is consistent with Glenwoods Avenue to the south.	Agree with this revision. Similar comments made by Operations and Engineering Department. Revision made.
99	Transportation Planning	Schedule E - To be consistent with the approved Environmental Assessment for the extension of Highway 404 to Highway 48/12, an interchange shall be identified at Pollock Road. This will further assist the Town in supporting the recommendation for interchanges at both Glenwoods Avenue and Pollock Road.	Agree with this revision, this, as well as all the other EA approved interchanges, will be added. Revision made.
100	Transportation Planning	Schedule E2 - The top figure depicts the ferry corridor to Georgina Island, however it is not included in the legend and should be adjusted accordingly.	Agree with this revision, the ferry route will be identified on the legend. Revision made.
101	Transportation Planning	Schedule E2 - Although it is recognized that the intention of the map was to label "Lake Drive N" that runs parallel to Metro Road between Deer Park Road and Varney Road, the label for "Lake Drive N" appears to be related to the "pink" Regional Road. Consideration should be given to removing the label or adjusting the priority of the Local road so that it is visible on top of the Regional Road.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
102	GIS	Schedule F - There are some missing sections identified in York Region's Cycling Network - west of Hadden Road along Highway 48.	Agree with this revision, the Region is providing mapping layer. Revision made.
103	Transportation Planning	Schedule F - Remove proposed Lake to Lake corridor south of Ravenshoe Road along Leslie Street as it is not identified in the Lake to Lake Feasibility and Design (2013).	Agree with this revision, the route will be adjusted based on Regional direction. Revision made.
104	Transportation Planning	Schedule F - Recommend that the Lake to Lake Feasibility and Design Study network extend along the unopened road allowance for 2nd Concession. The map currently depicts the network (blue dashed line) extended to west of the unopened road allowance for Yonge Street and easterly to Leslie Street. The correct alignment should extend from Lake Drive south to the unopened road allowance of 2nd Concession and should be adjusted. The Region does not have any objections to the green "Proposed Cycling Network" extending from 2nd Concession to the western limits of Ravenshoe Road and from Leslie Street / Queensway South to Lake Drive South.	Agree with this revision, the route will be adjusted based on Regional direction. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

105		Transportation Planning	Schedule F - Recommend the Additional Gateway connections be shown where cycling corridors connect to East Gwillimbury via the Lake to Lake, and potential connections to Simcoe County via Ravenshoe Road.	Agree with this revision. Additional gateway connections are to be displayed. Revision made.
106		Long Range Planning	Schedule G - Aggregate Resource Priority Area - Please confirm that the Schedule G mapping is consistent with the most current provincial data. It appears that Schedule G may be inconsistent with or does not reflect Map 9 - Mineral Aggregate Resources of the YROP-2010.	The Town has confirmed that the aggregate mapping used is the most up-to-date MNR aggregate mapping. No revisions required.
Terminology & Typographical Errors				
107			Ensure correct ministry name(s) is cited throughout document. Example: Section 11.1.1. should be OMAFRA and not OMAF and Section 10.1.4.5. Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
108			Section 12.2 - There should be a reference to recognize the multiple schedules in the Plan - example A2 broken into east and west; also applies to E2.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
109			Section 4.4.1 (b) spelling error - floodproofing.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
110			Section 9.5.11 - Capitalize the MESP.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
OTHER AGENCIES:				
	Agency	Section	Comments	
111	SIMCOE COUNTY	Entire Plan	No comment.	Comment noted.
112	ENBRIDGE GAS	Entire Plan	"Enbridge Gas Distribution does not object to the proposed application(s)."	Comment noted.
113	YRDSB & YCDSB	8.3.2	Under this section it should be indicated that both School Boards exercise prudent avoidance with respect to uses such as: a. commercial, industrial and agricultural uses; b. woodlots and storm water management ponds; c. railway lines, arterial roads and airports; and d. utility transmission corridors, including gas pipelines and hydro corridors.	Do not agree with this revision. These are school board policies. No action required.
114		8.3.2	The School Boards encourage facility partnerships with eligible partners that meet the respective Board's partnership criteria and policies in both new and existing schools. For new schools, eligible partners are responsible for design and construction costs, and the partnership must not compromise the scheduled opening date of the school. The School Boards also supports partnerships in existing schools that are underutilized or have pupil spaces available. Eligible partners are responsible for costs to lease space, as well as any applicable capital costs.	Agree with this revision, but add "under appropriate agreements" after the word "facilities" at the end of the first sentence. Revision made.
115		8.3.3	The Schools Boards support this policy, and would like to advise that under current Board Purchase and Sale Agreements, we can assign the Purchase and Sale Agreement to the coterminous school board. It would be possible to amend future Purchase and Sale Agreements to also include the Town of Georgina. If land is owned by the Board and is declared surplus by the Board, under provincial legislation, the coterminous school board would be given the first opportunity to acquire the land.	No action required, move Section 8.33 to Section 11.7. Section moved. No action required.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

116		8.4.3	The School Boards supports sustainable design...However, the Board's funding for new schools is allocated by the Province. The allocation for each project is fixed. LEED Certification will exceed the Provincial benchmark. The Board will not be able to build schools which exceed this benchmark.	Noted. This policy was not intended to apply to school sites. Will be revised to add the words "excluding educational facilities," after "uses" at the end of the first sentence in 8.4.1. Revision made. Similarly, in Section 8.4.4 add the words "large-scale, municipal" after "New" in the first sentence. Revision made.
117		8.7.1.2 (b)	This policy is problematic for the School Boards. The School Boards have considerable experience in the development and layout of school sites to optimize both pedestrian and vehicular traffic in and around the school sites. Key elements to this layout are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We locate our barrier free (handicapped parking) spaces close to the front door of the building. (for security and student safety reasons we have all visitors enter through the front doors) - Some "Front" parking minimizes the penetration of cars into school property and provides an opportunity for a pickup and drop off loop, generally reserved for busses. - Schools that contain child care centres may have special requirements for parking and pick-up and drop-off of students at the front of schools. - We try to preserve as much space at the rear of schools for student play areas, as well as maximizing green space, particularly where a school site is campused with a neighbourhood park. - Provincial benchmark funding does not provide for underground parking construction. 	Agree with this revision, add the words "and where appropriate, the Town may require" after the word "applications" in the first sentence. Revisions made. In subsection (b), add "of the building" after the word "underground". Revisions made.
118	INFASTRUCTURE ONTARIO	4.1.1(b)(iii)	We request that the reference to transmission systems be removed, due to the fact that it is difficult to buffer or screen large transmission corridors which generally run through rural areas. Instead we recommend the following wording for Policy 4.11(b)(iii): "buffering or screening of electricity distribution systems may be required, and is to be at the expense of the proponent"	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
119		Entire Plan	We also request that all references to "electricity transmission and distribution systems" be changed to "electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems".	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
120		Definitions	We request that 'Infrastructure', 'Utility' and 'Hydro Corridor' be defined, since it is unclear in the proposed draft Official Plan whether the terms refer to electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems. Hydro Corridors are also shown on Maps, but are not defined.	Agree with this revision, use PPS definition for "infrastructure"; KBP definition for "utility"; and a definition provided by I.O. for "hydro corridor". Revisions made.
121		Definitions	We further request that 'electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems' be included in the definition of utility.	Do not agree with this revision, however will add a definition for "Electric Transmission and Distribution Systems". Also revise title of 4.1.1 (a) to "Public Uses and Utilities". Revisions made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

122		Entire Plan	All references to corridors used for the transmission and distribution of electricity should be referred to as "hydro corridors";	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
123		Entire Plan	All reference to electricity infrastructure and facilities should be referred to as "electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems".	There are no references to "electricity infrastructure and facilities." No action required.
124	DURHAM REGION	9.2.1.9	Revise "Highway 404 and York Durham Line," with "Highway 404/Lakeridge Road interchange",	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
125		9.2.1.13	This policy is constructive in terms of corridor protection for the Highway 404 extension, but with the Planned Transportation Corridor designation so wide, it may provide some unnecessary frustration for screening development applications.	Agree with this revision. Revise the width of the corridor to 200m on Schedule E. Corridor revised to reduce width.
126		9.2.3.1	This policy identifies working "with GO Transit and Metrolinx to maintain and enhance existing GO Bus Transit services." Through consultation on Durham Region's ongoing update to its Transportation Master Plan, the Region has heard several comments from residents in the Township of Brock in favour of reinstating GO Bus service (or some type of inter-regional connection) to/from Beaverton through Georgina and Newmarket. Perhaps a similar desire for this service exists for Georgina residents, and consideration should be given to strengthening this policy to address inter-regional connections.	Agree with this revision, revise Section 9.2.3.1 to include "and connections with adjacent municipalities in York Region and Durham Region" at the end of the sentence. Revision made.
127		Mapping - E	Ravenshoe Road from east of Highway 48 to Lake Ridge Road should be identified in the map as a "Regional Road". (in purple). Lake Ridge Road should also be identified as a Regional Road (perhaps in a different shade of purple) but with a notation such as "Planned Right-of-Way widths are set out in the Durham Region Official Plan." The Regional Road numbers and "flowerpot" shields should be illustrated on this schedule. The width of the yellow band designating the "Planned Transportation Corridor" for the Highway 404 extension is very wide. Alignment approved in 2002 as part of EA. Consider a thinner line.	Agree with this revision and will fix this draw order issue. Revision made. Agree with this revision, add a 4th asterisk. Revision made. Agree with this revision, a review of appropriate road symbols will be undertaken. Revision made. Agree with this revision, revise width of the corridor to 200m on Schedule E. Revision made.
128		Mapping - F	Please note that cycling gateways do not connect to any cycling facilities planned in Durham as part of the Regional Cycling Plan or by the area municipalities.	Do not agree with this revision. These policies are from the Region of York Official Plan. No revision required.
129		Schedule H4	The Region questions why Udora's boundaries are being moved north of Old Shiloh Road/Victoria Road. It is suggested that the boundary be maintained south of the road right-of-way, as it is an easily identifiable and definitive boundary line.	Do not agree with this revision. Boundaries were previously determined through extensive consultation process. No revision required.
130	LSRCA	4.4.2	We suggest that Subsection (a) be deleted and replaced as follows: (a) It has been determined by the Town and LSRCA that there is an acceptable risk to public health or safety and property.	Do not agree with this revision; not comfortable with the wording "acceptable risk". No revision required.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

131	5.4.3	We recommend that Section 5.3 (Lake Simcoe Protection) of the Official Plan be amended to include a policy framework on SGRA and ESGRA. In doing so, this policy addition would help implement 6.38-DP of the LSPP.	SGRA is addressed in Section 5.4. "Ecologically significant groundwater recharge areas" on Schedule B3 will be identified and separate policies will be created for these areas. Revisions made.
132	5.6.1	The East Holland River, West Holland River, Maskinonge River, and Black River Subwatershed Plans (2010) and the Pefferlaw River Subwatershed Plan (2012) were undertaken by the ... In addition, Designated Policy 8.4 of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan states that municipal Official Plans shall be amended to ensure that they are consistent with the recommendations of the subwatershed evaluations prepared under 8.3-SA. On this basis, we recommend that a comprehensive policy framework on Subwatershed Plan conformity be included within Section 5.6. The LSRCA would be pleased to assist the Town in the creation of this Section in this regard.	Agree with these revisions, the policy will be revised based on wording provided by the LSRCA. New subwatershed Areas subsection added.
133	5.8	We have provided below a LID policy framework in order to assist the Town. Alternatively, the LID section could form part of Section 4 - General Land Use and Development Policies. "5.8.1 Goals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect and/or enhance the quality of ground water and surface water through stormwater management best practices • To protect and/or enhance the quantity of groundwater through surface water recharge via stormwater management best practices • To promote sustainability by employing Low Impact Development (LID) strategies and techniques through Ontario's land use planning system 5.8.2 Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce stormwater runoff to pre-development conditions as close to the source as possible • To ensure that development within the municipality contributes to the protection or enhancement of water quality and quantity through the implementation of LID techniques such as enhanced swales, rain-gardens, and permeable surfaces • To minimize changes in water balance through the infiltration of clean water by utilizing infiltration galleries, soak-away-pits, and perforated pipes • To ensure that development within the municipality promotes a culture of water conservation including water re-use and rainwater harvesting • To prevent increases in contaminant loads, including phosphorus, chlorides and suspended sediments, to Lake Simcoe and its tributaries by utilizing LID principles • To promote aesthetic enhancements within the watershed through the use of greenroofs and other landscape architectural practices that are integrated with LID 5.8.3 Definition LID is defined as a stormwater management strategy that is intended to mitigate the impacts of increased runoff and pollution by managing runoff as close to its source as possible. LID comprises a set of site design strategies that promote infiltration, filtration, evapotranspiration, rainwater harvestation, and stormwater detention. In doing so, the volume and intensity of stormwater flows are reduced while nutrients, pathogens, and metals are removed from runoff. 5.8.4 Policies 5.8.4.1 An application for major development within the municipality shall be accompanied by a LID Evaluation as part of an overall Stormwater Management Report. This Evaluation shall be prepared by a	Agree with these revisions, will be added to objectives and 9.5 (SWM) as appropriate. New LID subsection created.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

Evaluation as part of an overall stormwater management report. This Evaluation shall be prepared by a qualified professional to the satisfaction of the municipality and local conservation authority prior to any planning approvals or the issuance of permits under the Regulations passed through the Conservation Authorities Act. For the purposes of this policy, major development is defined as a proposal with a proposed impervious area of greater than 500m².

5.8.4.2 The LID Evaluation must demonstrate that the quality and quantity of surface and groundwater in the area will be maintained and/or enhanced using LID techniques. The Evaluation must a/so demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts on the associated aquatic features and their ecological function that depend on the contributing surface or groundwater including wetlands, watercourses, and fish habitat. The LID Evaluation shall be prepared in accordance with the following:

- I. Municipality's Comprehensive Stormwater Management Master Plan prepared in accordance with 4. 5-SA of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan (2009)
- II. Subwatershed Evaluations under 8.3-SA of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan
- III. Designated Policies 4. 8 to 4. 11, and 6.40 of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan
- IV. Policy 1. 6. 7 of the Provincial Policy Statement (20 14)
- V. LSRCA 's Technical Guidelines for SWM Submissions

5. 8.4. 3 In particular, the LID Evaluation shall assess the suitability of the following techniques as part of the development proposal:

- i. rainwater harvesting to promote water re-use;
- ii. infiltration galleries to maintain water balance and reduce runoff;
- iii. enhanced swa/as to help improve water quality;
- iv. green roofs to provide evapotranspiration and aesthetic benefits; and,
- v. natural/landscapes to minimize water use and consumption.

5. 8.4.4 Proper agreements shall be established in order to ensure that the LID strategy or technique will be employed and maintained in perpetuity. The following agreements or legal instruments where appropriate shall be required as a condition of approval for any draft plan of subdivision or condominium, site plan under Section 41 of the Planning Act, or consent and minor variance applications,:

- i. subdivision or consent agreement;
- ii. condominium agreement;
- iii. site plan agreement;
- iv. purchase and sale agreements; and,
- v. covenants under the Conservation Land Act.

Further, Council may enact by-laws under the Municipal Act to help implement the approved LID strategy. Existing fill or site alteration by-laws may be amended or updated to include the LID requirements.

5. 8.4. 5 The municipality may pass a by-law under the Municipal Act that would establish a stormwater utility fee based on the percentage (%) of impervious surface of a property. The by-law may also allow for a reduction or elimination of the fee for landowners where sufficient LID strategies have been employed and maintained to the satisfaction of the municipality in consultation with the conservation authority.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

134		5.9	We recommend that the Town's Official Plan contain policies that support the requirement for ecological offsetting through the development process. We would be pleased to assist the Town with appropriate wording, in this regard.	Agree with this revision. Policies included in new subsection.
135		6.3.1	The definition of key hydrologic features should be amended by deleting the word "known" in front of permanent and intermittent watercourses in order to better reflect the Greenbelt Plan.	Agree with this revision, remove these definitions from this section as they are already correctly defined in the Definitions Section. Revision made.
136		9.5.5	The phrase "Level 1" should be replaced with the term "enhanced" in this policy in order to reflect current terminology.	Agree with this revision, replace with "Enhanced protection level" and add definition as per LSPP: "means the level of protection for stormwater management works specified in Chapter 3 of the MOE's Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual, 2003 that corresponds to the end-of-pipe storage volumes required for the long-term average removal of 80% of suspended solids." Revision made.
137		11.16	We recommend that the following environmental monitoring policy be added to this section as follows: "11.16.3 The Town in consultation with the conservation authority, Region, and other interested groups and organizations will encourage the establishment of environmental monitoring programs in order to measure the effectiveness of the environmental policies within this Plan."	Agree with this revision, and will revise the Section to read as follows: "In order to monitor and measure the performance of this Plan, the Town shall develop measuring and reporting tools to monitor progress towards objectives, targets and policies targets established in this Plan. Such tools shall be developed in consultation with York Region, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority and appropriate Town Committees , along with the production of monitoring reports that measure the performance of the Plan" Revision made.
TOWN DEPARTMENTS / DIVISIONS:				
	Department	Section	Comments	
138	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION	4.1.1	Specify "broadband fibre optics" as a public use.	Agree with this revision, will add "broadband fibre optics" after "utility services" in first sentence. Revision made.

**OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period**

139	4.1.1. (a)(i)	Revise the wording to include "and lands" after "municipal and regional uses".	Agree with this revision but state "including uses relating to partnerships that provide for community betterment." Revision made.
140	2.2.13 / 2.2.14	Provide policy direction for the implementation of leading edge communication technology: - Construction of hydro, telephone, and other cable communication services shall be encouraged to locate in the road right-of-way. - All development will be designed to provide for the implementation of leading edge communication technologies, including but not limited to broadband fibre optics. Urban design within (a new development area) will: Ensure that new development provides for the capability to implement leading edge communication technologies, including broadband services, in order to attract and maintain investment, facilitate research and development and knowledge based initiatives, and support health services.	Agree with this revision, but revise wording to "Where appropriate, All development will shall be designed to provide for the implementation of..." Agree with this revision. New section created: 9.6 Communication Technology
141	9.1	Communication Technology i. All commercial, office, institutional, mixed use, and multiple unit residential buildings will be designed to: a) facilitate advanced telecommunication, such as building automation systems, for a broad range of applications from health services to heating and lighting, leading edge national and international connectivity capability, etc.; and b) provide the infrastructure for the delivery of leading edge communication technologies, including broadband fiber optics to and throughout the building(s) in order to facilitate future advanced telecommunication capabilities. ii. A dedicated broadband fibre optic conduit, including appropriately sized wiring, shall be installed from the municipal right of way to each development block or building(s) as well as distributed internally to each unit within the building(s) in order to ensure access to advanced communication technology, when it becomes available.	These policies will be included in the Secondary Plans (in accordance with Broadband Planning Language template)
		iii. Applications for development will be required to provide a Communication Implementation Plan that demonstrates how communication technology will be designed and implemented and demonstrate that the conduit and wiring meets or exceeds the minimum industry standard.	
142	2.2.2.8	In order to draw increased attention to the importance of linkages I recommend the inclusion of the following: "Linkages along the shoreline of Lake Simcoe that support Tourism, and in particular promote active transportation between the major beachfront areas and the business community should be encouraged".	Agree with this revision, addin 9.2.4, with the replacement of "should" with "shall." Revision made.
143	2.2.6.3	Insert the following at the end of the existing policy " and in the case of new development attempts should be made to incorporate public access to Lake Simcoe and active transportation linkages along the Lake Simcoe Shoreline".	Do not agree with this revision. This issue is addressed in other parts of the Plan. No action required.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

144	2.2.8.1	The employment forecasts for 2016 and beyond are unrealistic given that the 2016 forecast includes 900 jobs within the Keswick Business Park. See Table 2, Page 22	Agree with this revision, this Table will be revised to reflect the comment. Revision made.
145	2.2.8.4	While employment growth relative to population growth provides an opportunity to work and live in the community, it is important that additional efforts to attract value added employment be undertaken. Suggest that wording be revised to incorporate the word "value added" before employment growth.	Do not agree with this revision. This definition exists in its more conventional context as an agricultural term. No action required.
146	2.2.10.4	Insert the words "create jobs" after "agricultural lands"	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
147	2.2.10.5	Insert an additional sentence as follows: To support the development of Agri-Tourism and the establishment of Rural event venues.	Agree with this revision, add to the end of 2.2.10.3, revised to read: "To and support the development of Agri-Tourism and the establishment of Rural event venues." Revision made.
148	2.2.14.6	Insert an additional sentence as follows: And, to support these uses particularly where they have the ability to provide an economic impact in the community.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
149	4.6.2.1	In the case of a "Home Industry" it may be appropriate to have a Home Industry located within the attached garage depending on the nature of the business. Has consideration been given to amending (a) to include "attached garage".	Do not agree with this revision. There are separate home industry policies. No action required.
150	6.2.1	Has consideration been given to permitting outdoor storage facilities for recreational vehicles (ie. Boats) within the Rural Designation. It would appear that these uses would currently require an amendment to the OP.	Agree with this revision, add "Outdoor storage facilities for recreational vehicles" as a permitted use in Section 6.2.1; also add associated policy requiring a ZBA and re-state the tests of 6.5.3 a-i. Revision made.
151	8.6.1.1	This policy provides that the Municipality may pass a by-law to designate additional areas within Georgina as a CIP area without further amendment to the Official Plan. The CIP has been well received and expect that the use of a CIP will be a tool to encourage investment to the Keswick Business Park.	Agree with this revision. No action required.
152	11.2.6.1	(d) add a reference to also encourage the provision of active transportation linkages	Do not agree with this revision. This has been addressed in subsection f. Have included "other community facilities" in this section as well.

**OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period**

153		12.5.8	Based on two inquiries received, has consideration been given to allowing "glamping (glorified camping) and tenting" as a limited form of accommodation, and accessory to an agri-tourism use.	Do not agree with this revision. Tenting and camping are included in the "On-farm diversified uses" definition, which is permitted in both PA and Rural Areas. No action required.
154		Schedule "H1"	Has consideration been given to including the remaining lots on the south side of Bethel Sideroad, just east of Warden Avenue and the land parcel on the south west corner of Warden Avenue and Old Homestead Road being within the Hamlet area.	Do not agree with this revision. The Hamlet Expansion analysis/process did not identify expansions to occur in the Belhaven Hamlet. No action required.
155	PLANNING DIVISION	7.3.6	Revise at the end should state: "6.4.3 and 6.5.3 respectively", not "6.4.3 and 6.5.5 respectively"	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
156		4.8	Add a new policy regarding the Municipal Council Support Resolution / IESO processes for FIT and LRP programs. Also add a policy regarding the processing fee for same.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
157		5.1.1	Add box around heading.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
158		2.2.14	Add Georgina Arts Centre & Gallery mission statement to sidebar: "Let's involve the community with the Arts through exhibitions, education, programming and partnerships".	Agree with this revision. Added to side bar.
159		6.2.16	Review and relocate appropriate Rural Special Provisions to the Agricultural Protection Area section.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
160		Entire Plan	Add diagrams / info boxes where appropriate.	Agree with this revision. Info boxes and illustrations added.
161		Throughout Plan as identified by LSRCA	Add remaining LID comments as provided by LSRCA	Agree with this revision, as indicated and provided by LSRCA above. New LID policies included in Section 9.5
162		5.3.7	Determine if the hamlet of Virginia should be included in this. (Virginia is subject to settlement policies in the LSPP, not the shoreline built up area policies).	Staff have determined that the Hamlet of Virginia will be kept in this policy, as per the LSPP. No action required.
163		4.7.2	Ensure proper date is used (currently states "June 1, 2015"). This date should be the date of the final 2015 MDS Guidelines.	Policy not indicates as of the date of adoption of the Plan.
164		5.3.3	Why is exception only for low-intensity recreational uses, as noted in 5.3.1 (g), as opposed to all of 5.3.1.	Agree with this revision, will revise to match LSPP. Revision made.
165		11.4.2.7	Replace "...any abutting residential lot..." with "the average area of the abutting residential lot..."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
166		11.4.2.7 c and e	Replace the "Section 11.1.1" references to "Section 12.3".	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
167		11.4.3.2	Replace the "Section 11.1.1" reference to "Section 12.3".	Agree with this revision. Revision made.

**OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period**

168	4.10.3	Add "Parkland Area" to list of designations that do not permit new or expanded mineral aggregate operations.	Agree with this revision. Revision made. In addition, the GBP permits extraction within the Protected Countryside (including Speciality Crop Areas), subject to specific criteria (4.3.2). "Specialty Crop Area" in this list. Specialty Crop Area removed from list.
169	6.3.1.8	Replace "...or if the proposal..." with "...and if the proposal..."	Agree with this revision, revise the policy by deleting all words after the word "species". Revision made.
170	Entire Plan	All references to CA's "watershed development policies" need to be changed to "Guidelines for the Implementation of Ontario Regulation 179/06"	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
171	Table of Contents	Add "East" and "West" schedules to list of schedules. Add section numbers to Tables for greater clarity.	Agree with these revisions. Revision made.
172	Definitions	Add definition for climate change.	Agree with this revision. Definition included.
173	Mapping - E2	Update to include "Private Roads" and make all noted editorial changes.	Agree with this revision. Private roads added.
174	Mapping - A2, B1, B2	Ensure Provincially Significant Paradise Beach – Island Grove Wetland Complex is correctly identified as per February 19, 2015 letter/attachments from MNR.	Agree with this revision. Mapping revised.
175	Mapping	Create Special Policy Areas Schedule / Appendix	Agree with this revision. Special provisions map made.
176	Mapping	Reassess Rural Commercial designation on Part Lot 1, Conc 4 (sliver at Baseline and Woodbine); the area appears to extend into Significant Woodland areas as identified on LSRCA mapping.	Agree with this revision, revise/reduce the limits of area proposed to be designated Rural Commercial Area. Revision made.
177	Mapping	The faint water lot shown above Wynhurst Beach should be removed.	Agree with this revision.
178	Mapping	Confirm accuracy of names and locations of all beaches.	Agree with this revision.
179	Mapping - A2	Fix designations along Trivetts Road; shown as Rural but the proposed designation Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area.	Do not agree with this revision. Placed in special provision.
180	Mapping - A2	Do not agree with this revision. Further qualifiers not necessary. No revisions required.	Agree with these revisions. Revision made.

**OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period**

181		Mapping - A2 West	Add "Old Homestead Road" label.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
182		Mapping - A2 East and West; B1 East and West; B2 East and West.	Re-order schedules to be west to east, rather than east to west.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
183	RECREATION & CULTURE DEPARTMENT	8.2	"Open Space" under this heading generally refers to public open space, whereas "Open Space" under Zoning By-law (item 8.2.4) specifically speaks to privately-owned lands. This term may need qualifiers (private vs public).	Do not agree with this revision. Further qualifiers not necessary. No revisions required.
184		8.2.2 (b)	Add "...and York Region's "Lake to Lake Cycling Route and Walking Trail".	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
185		8.2.3	Add "...to enhance <u>and complement</u> the natural environment..."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
186		8.2.4	See Item 8.2, above re: "Open Space" designation.	Do not agree with this revision. Further qualifiers not necessary. No revisions required.
187		8.2.4	Strengthen wording "...to preserve and enhance" with the following: "No clearing of understory permitted, no grass cutting or pruning or removal of dead wood, brush or fallen trees so as to preserve the integrity of natural area".	Do not agree with this revision. Not appropriate in Official Plan. No revisions required.
188		8.2.5, 8.2.6, 8.2.7	Omit the word "park(s)" from "Village Green", for consistency with tertiary documents.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
189		8.2.7 (c)	Reference to "special open space areas" needs to be clarified in context of "Open Space".	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
190		8.6.2	Add item (h) Derelict or neglected waterfront locations.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
191		8.7.3.4	Add "...where signage exists, shall be in accordance with Accessibility Act (AODA)	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
192		10.1.2.1	Add to Financial Considerations: Property appraisal for confirming park levy in lieu of parkland dedication, to calculate 1 day before building permit issuance.	Agree with this revision. "Property Appraisal Form" now listed.
193		11.6.3.1	Add: "Agreements must be prepared jointly with developers, without Town mediation on their behalf."	No action required. The Town may be of assistance if required.
194		11.7.6	Include "...and/or 2 percent parkland dedication..."	Agree with this revision but revise to not reference percentages. Removed 5% reference.
195		12.5	Add definition for "Open Space" per 8.2 above.	This is a zoning matter. No action required.
196	LIBRARY SERVICES	8.4.1	Add "public libraries" to the list of community facilities, and add "self-directed learning to the list of need to be met.	Agree with this revision and will revise the wording to read "Community facilities include facilities designed to meet the recreational, social, self-directed learning , and cultural needs of residents, including public libraries , places of worship..." Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

197	FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES	8.5.1	Revise wording as follows: "The Town shall ensure the efficient and effective allocation of fire station sites and emergency services through the Town in a planned effort to keep pace with growth in consultation with the York Regional Police, the York Region Emergency Medical Services, the Town Fire Department and adjacent municipalities."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
	PUBLIC:			
	Contact	Property or Section	Comments	
198	Howard Friedman, HBR Planning Centre 66 Prospect Street, Unit A, Newmarket, ON L3Y 3S9	25 High Gwillim Drive	<p>a) Revise KSP Boundary on all of the OP Schedules to match the boundaries of the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>b) Maintain the current Rural designation on site as opposed to the proposed Agricultural Protection Area designation. The Plan indicates that the boundaries of the Agricultural Protection Area are approximate and that refinements to these boundaries may occur through an Agricultural Assessment Study. Requesting confirmation that their clients lands that are Agricultural Protection Area can be refined if a favourable Agricultural Assessment is submitted.</p> <p>c) Remove "Area Not to be Serviced with Municipal Water and Sewer" identification from the area of the subject site.</p> <p>d) Maintain the "Community Improvement Area" designation as per the existing OP, over the area of the subject site.</p>	<p>a)The property requested to be shown in the KSP will not be included in the boundary as per the KSP schedule land use schedule.</p> <p>b) Do not agree with this revision. The Agricultural designation is based on the Region's OP. The policy regarding the boundaries being approximate has been removed as a result of comments made by the Province.</p> <p>c) Do not agree.</p> <p>d) "CIP Area" removed due to new policy permitting future designation of a CIP project area by by-law within any area of the Town</p>
199	315197 Ontario Limited 842 Trivetts Road	842 Trivetts Road	Re-designate the entire property to Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area (or maintain the current Lakeshore Residential Area designation), rather than a portion to Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area and the remainder to Environmental Protection Area.	Portion of lands being placed in a special provision to allow landowner to proceed with an Official Plan Amendment for the creation of one or more lots (and subject to associated policies).
200	William Joannou (agent for 315197 Ontario Limited) 30 Furnival Road Toronto, ON M4B 1W3 wjoannouaci@gmail.com	842 Trivetts Road	Re-designate the entire property to Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area (or maintain the current Lakeshore Residential Area designation), rather than a portion to Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area and the remainder to Environmental Protection Area.	
201	Marion Witz 1 Isleview Road marion@elizabethgrant.com	1 Isleview Road	Re-designate site to Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area as opposed to the proposed Rural designation, because the site is on municipal services	Agree with this revision and have confirmed that water and wastewater services were extended to the property, so this property should be designated Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area. <u>Revision made.</u>
202	The Alderville First Nation	Entire Plan	The Alderville First Nation appreciates "the fact that the Town of Georgina recognizes the importance of First Nations Consultation and that your office is conforming to the requirements within the Duty to Consult process."	No action required.

**OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period**

203	Southlake Regional Health Centre	Entire Plan	"Southlake will require Council's continuing support with respect to supporting local share fundraising and to supporting our efforts to secure necessary funding approvals from the provincial government to help meet the needs of our growing population."	No action required.
204	Michael Smith, Michael Smith Planning Consultants	Entire Plan	Binder identifying typos and other suggested editorial revisions.	Staff will review and incorporate these editorial revisions as needed. Appropriate revisions made.
205	Keith MacKinnon, KLM Planning agent for Maple Lake Estates Inc.	MLE Lands	Wish to emphasize that MLE lands are designated Towns & Villages in GBP and YROP, and should continue to be recognized accordingly as part of the OP review.	No action required. MLE lands continue to be recognized as Urban Residential Area.
206	Anthony Usher, Anthony Usher Planning Consultant	7.2 and 9.3.6.1	Remove these Sections and all other references to MLE.	Do not agree with this revision, see Attachment 9 to Report PB-2015-0073.
207		Table 1	Remove reference to MLE, and add MLE's population to Keswick.	Do not agree with this revision. No action required.
208		Mapping - A2, B1 and B2	These schedules show the northeast corner of MLE as within the Greenland System, consistent with the Regional Greenlands System mapping in the Regional Plan. Except in that northeast corner, the wetland and woodland on the MLE property are not included in the Greenland System.	Greenlands System is being displayed as identified in the York Region Official Plan.
209		Mapping - A1	Show MLE as Countryside Area.	Do not agree with this revision. No action required.
210		Mapping - A2	Designate MLE as Environmental Protection Area as appropriate, and any remainder as Rural Area.	Do not agree with this revision, see Attachment 9 to Report PB-2015-0073.
211		Mapping - A2	Include all of MLE in Greenland System based on the criteria in the preamble to section 5.1, and modify the Greenland System accordingly on other schedules.	Do not agree with this revision, see Attachment 9 to Report PB-2015-0073.
212	L. Michon, 26862 Woodbine Ave. and A. Bevand & M. Bevand	MLE Lands	Wish to support the development for various reasons as outlined in letter.	No action required.
213	Stefano Giannini, Janet Rosenberg & Studio Inc.	Baldwin Hamlet; all mapping.	Review potential for greater expansion of the Baldwin hamlet , Prospect of signalized intersection at Highway 48 and Smith Blvd.	Do not agree with this revision. The area was previously analyzed and the determination was made not to include a greater expansion; just the minor 'rounding out' as proposed by the Draft OP. Any new traffic signals would have to be approved by MTO.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

214	Rob Grossi	"The property that fronts on Lake Drive to the north, Trivetts Rd to the west, Metro Road to the south and has an irregular eastern boundary behind some existing residential properties and vacant lots." (municipal address not provided).	Opposes any new designations "that would allow any changes that would allow any additional growth or lot creation in the area that was originally designated as the Willow Beach and Surrounding Lakeshore communities."	The Official Plan contains appropriate policies to guide development in this area as appropriate. Special provisions have been put in place for three properties to allow landowner to proceed with an Official Plan Amendment for the creation of one or more lots (and subject to associated policies).
215	Lauren Capilongo, MGP Planning, agent for Great World Properties Limited and 1170898 Ontario Ltd.	26061 Woodbine Avenue and Part of Lot 23, Concession 4.	Maintain the current land use designations on the two properties, being Commercial Recreational Area and Rural Commercial Recreation.	Do not agree with this revision. Based on all available information, including LSRCA mapping, the sites are identified to contain numerous natural features including PSW, watercourses, floodplain, significant woodlands, and are within the regulated limited of LSRCA.
216	Chad John-Baptiste, MMM, agent for Nizza Enterprises	2354 Ravenshoe Road	Recommend that the Town include all lands within the KBPSA into the settlement area boundary on the basis of a "minor rounding out" of the KBP and expands the settlement area boundary as part of the Official Plan Review. YROPA would follow.	Do not agree with this request. The KBSPA and associated policies have been removed due to flood plain and natural features. Greenbelt Plan also does not permit expansion into NHS.
217	Ducks Unlimited Canada	5.1.1 and 5.2	There is no policy guiding development within and around natural heritage and hydrologic features in Settlement Areas (Urban Areas, Towns and Villages). DUC recommends including policy in the OP that protects Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) within Urban Areas, Towns and Villages from all forms of development (as prescribed by the 2014 PPS). The OP should also include policy to guide development that may impact unevaluated or locally significant wetlands within these areas - for example through a mitigation sequence that would first avoid wetland features, then minimize impacts to the feature, and compensate for loss as a last resort. Secondary plans may include more detail in terms of the designation of natural heritage features, but it is important that the OP provide this overarching guidance. Maintaining a robust urban natural heritage system can contribute to the health and well-being of communities by providing green space, areas for recreation, water and air quality improvement, and flood control.	No action required. The Secondary Plans address Settlement areas and will be reviewed accordingly.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

218

6.3	<p>a) Include Environmental Protection Area policies in Section 5, 'Sustainable Natural Environment'. It is unclear why EPA is included within the Countryside Area, but it may lead to confusion when policies outlined in the Greenlands system also apply to Environmental Protection Areas.</p> <p>b) Consider including a statement detailing the values that natural heritage features like wetlands provide and the reason why it is important to protect them (see page 2 of this submission for an example).</p> <p>c) Consider including a statement detailing the values that natural heritage features like wetlands provide and the reason why it is important to protect them (see page 2 of this submission for an example).</p> <p>d) Ensure terminology is consistent throughout the Official Plan. Specifically; o Section 6.3.1 uses the term 'Vegetative Buffer Zone' around NH features; however in most other areas, the OP refers to 'vegetation protection zone'. DUC recommends consistently applying this latter phrase, which is used in the Greenbelt Plan. Other instances where this inconsistency occurs include sections 5.3.5 and 5.3.7(c). o Every reference to the width of the vegetation protection zone should start with, minimum 30 metres, according to the Greenbelt Plan. The word minimum is missing from the first paragraph of section 6.3.1, and sections 6.3.1.5 and 6.3.1.12.</p> <p>e) Clarify policies indicating when an Environmental Impact Study would be triggered for development applications adjacent to features designated as Environmental Protection Area (EPA). Because the EPA section is not in the Natural Environment section, it is not immediately clear whether policy 5.1.1.4 (that a development application within 120m of a NHS or hydrologic feature would trigger an EIS) also applies in section 6.3. This would be clearer if the EPA section was included under Natural Environment, but if the EPA section remains as is within the Countryside Area section, consider simply repeating policy 5.1.1.4 in the EPA section so it's clear these policies still apply.</p> <p>f) Consider adding a statement to section 6.3.1.6 that if and when new natural heritage or hydrologic features are identified in future through a development application or other subsequent study, those features will immediately be subject to the policies of the OP and designated without the need for an Official Plan Amendment (in addition to providing the minimum 30 metre vegetation protection zone).</p> <p>g) Clarify policies for 'Wetland and Woodland' features identified in land use schedule B1. In some instances, the policies for wetlands and woodlands differ in the OP (particularly if the woodland is not deemed significant) – for example section 6.3.1.13, which informs building a new structure on an existing vacant lot of record. Ensure that where 'Wetland and Woodland' features are identified (i.e. a forested swamp), it is the wetlands policies that apply.</p> <p>h) 6.3.1.13 - add "within a minimum 30 metre vegetation protection zone"</p> <p>i) Under section 6.3.1.14, referring to development or site alteration of a 'minor' nature, consider providing a definition of 'minor', or at least including a few examples of what is considered a 'minor' development, to ensure objective and consistent assessments of these types of applications.</p>	<p>a) Agree with this comment. Structure has been revised to include EPA in the Sustainable Natural Environment section.</p> <p>b) This would be more appropriate as an information sidebar. Information added.</p> <p>c) This would be more appropriate as an information sidebar. Information added.</p> <p>d) Do not agree with using minimum 30 metres. 30 metres was used when mapping the EPA designation. The use of the word "minimum" implies that it could be more than 30 metres.</p> <p>e) The EPA applies to the natural features and generally doesn't permit development. Therefore a policy regarding associated studies would not be appropriate. Structure has been revised to include EPA in the Sustainable Natural Environment section.</p> <p>f) Agree with this comment. Section 6.3.1.6 will be revised accordingly and moved to the end of 5.1.1.</p> <p>g) Both wetland and woodland policies would apply. No action required.</p> <p>h) See above response (d)</p> <p>i) Determining whether the refinements would be minor would be done in consultation with the</p>
-----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

219		9.1 and 9.5	Specific to Stormwater Management (SWM) policies, DUC urges the Town of Georgina to include consideration for green infrastructure approaches to SWM, in particular by 1) encouraging retention and restoration of existing natural wetlands and, 2) encouraging the installation of naturalized stormwater management ponds wherever feasible and appropriate. Naturalized SWM ponds offer increased flood control and water filtration capabilities, and for a fraction of the long-term maintenance costs of conventional SWM ponds.	No action required. This comment has been addressed by the inclusion of a LID section.
220	Gord Mahoney, Michael Smith Planning Consultants	Orchard Beach Golf and CC	<p>Mapping - Schedule A2 - The area of the subject land in question and currently designated Agricultural Protection Area on Schedule A2 - Land Use Plan (West) be re-designated to Commercial Recreation Area to match the remaining land use designation of the golf course.</p> <p>Mapping - It would appear that the Natural Heritage System boundary in the Greenbelt Plan differs from what is shown in the Region's Official Plan and the Town's draft Official Plan. Request that the boundary of the Greenlands System be revisited as it appears to include holes number 3 and 9 of the golf course.</p>	<p>Agree with this revision. The limits of the Commercial Recreation Area have been revised to match the golf course.</p> <p>Do not agree with this request. An analysis of the Greenlands System has not been conducted. The system was obtained from the Region's Plan.</p>
221	Paul Harpley, South Lake Simcoe Naturalists	Entire Plan	Numerous large-scale suggestions as documented in July 31, 2015 submission, including: strengthening wording around alternative energy initiatives, lack of detailed information and process on developing further the original Greenlands Strategy, reducing size of Pefferlaw and Sutton's Jackson Point	Environmental policies and mapping have been improved. OP implements Source Water Protection and LSPP. Policies and designations within the Secondary Plan areas are not included in this review. Policies on monitoring and implementation have been included. Renewable energy projects are under Provincial jurisdiction, however, a new renewable energy section has been included in the Plan that speaks to submission requirements and preferred site locations.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

				Sutton/Jackson's Point Secondary Plan was approved by the OMB in 2013. Pepperlaw boundary can only be minimized as part of the Greenbelt Review.
222	Jeff Bolichowski, Armstrong Strategy Group	2.2.2.5	Extend climate resiliency building practices to small residential through the use of Site Plan Control and Urban Design Guidelines.	New policy added in Section 11.5.5 stating that the Town may require plans and drawings for residential buildings containing less than 25 units.
223		7.1.1	<p>Include Urban Design Guidelines with each Secondary Plan, including lists of preferred exterior materials that are sustainable, resilient and will build an enduring community character.</p> <p>Delineate a list of preferred exterior building materials. Use brick, stone and engineered stone as the primary building materials, with others, such as stucco, wood, vinyl siding, decorative concrete or glass considered as accents or when used in combination with the primary building materials.</p> <p>Draft a series of Residential Urban Design Guidelines to cover new home builds not included within the existing Secondary Plan areas.</p>	Matter for Secondary Plans. No action required.
224		7.3.3	<p>Wording change – “compatible with existing land usage within the community, and demonstrating an extremely high standard of sustainable architectural design consistent with Urban Design Guidelines, may be permitted as....”.</p> <p>Delineate robust Urban Design Guidelines with favoured exterior cladding materials carried all around the building to ensure an appearance and character consistent with the character of Georgina’s hamlets.</p>	This section is referencing lot size and frontage, not design. No action required.
225		7.3.9	The list of required studies include an Urban Design Review to ensure resilient, high-quality exterior cladding materials on all four elevations, and architectural detail on the rear as well as the front façade. Materials used for the front facade should be carried around the building where any facades are exposed to the <u>neighbouring/public view at the side or rear.</u>	This section is referencing lot size and frontage, not design. No action required.
226		7.3.10	Add “as well as considering a consistent community look and feel.”	Agree with this revision but wording revise to "long term character of the community." Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

227	7.4.4	Wording additions – "...and with any relevant Secondary Plans and Urban Design Guidelines.	Do not agree with this revision in this section. No action required.
228	7.5.5	Wording additions – "...and with any relevant Secondary Plans and Urban Design Guidelines.	Do not agree with this revision in this section. No action required.
229	8.1.2	<p>Include in the list of action items: "enforcing Urban Design Guidelines delineating a high standard of exterior character and design, including high-quality cladding and resiliency against extreme weather events and climate change."</p> <p>Draft Urban Design Guidelines ensuring a high standard of home construction, including building materials chosen for their functional and aesthetic quality, sustainability, ease of maintenance, long-term durability and fit with the community's cultural heritage. Also encourage site designs that conserve energy, addressed at the development application stage and during the preparation of designs, with design, orientation, construction and landscaping intended to minimize interior heat loss and retain solar energy in the winter and minimize solar penetration in the summer.</p>	Not appropriate in this section. No action required.
230	8.7.1.1	Include the following action items: private and public developments which are designed to high standards of exterior design, utilizing high-quality materials and architectural styles which contribute a sense of place and are resilient against extreme weather events, also being consistent with applicable Urban Design Guidelines.	Some revisions made. See section 8.7.1, 8.7.3, 2.2.12.9 (g)
231	8.7.1.1	Include "exterior cladding materials that will build an enduring, climate resilient character" as one of the considerations.	Some revisions made. See Sec. 8.7.1(g) and 8.7.3
232	8.7.1.2	<p>Include the following action item:</p> <p>- built form shall utilize high-quality building materials and a high standard of architectural design consistent with all applicable Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>"...shall minimize the impacts of noise, wind, extreme weather events and shadows..."</p>	Some revisions made. See Sec. 8.7.1(g) and 8.7.3
233	8.7.1.3	Utilize Urban Design Guidelines to delineate appropriate building materials suitable for withstanding extreme weather events.	Section 8.7.3(g) states that the Town encourages and supports private and public developments that are resilient to climate change.
234	11.5.1.3	In order to promote proper planning, all urban dwelling units should be subject to site plan control. As such, we recommend eliminating bullet point a and related language.	11.5.1.3 will all be deleted (all exemptions to site plan control). New site plan by-law will capture specific development through staff delegated authority.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015
during public and agency commenting period

235	Gary Foch (submitted after the end of the commenting period)	22869 Woodbine Ave	The landowner has submitted material (conceptual site plan) for commercial uses on the property, with a request to ensure the draft Official Plan would permit such a use on the property.	Do not agree with this request. KBPSA and associated policies to be removed due to flood plain and features. Greenbelt Plan also does not permit expansion into NHS. The property is being placed in the Rural designation. The landowner may submit the appropriate studies to support an application for a rural commercial use.
-----	--------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS Received ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN, APRIL 2015

Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for commenting

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
1	28-Aug-15	Gord Mahoney, Planning Consultant	On behalf of his client, A & T Homes, they are seeking to have three amendment provisions specific to lands on s/s Lake Dr. E. and E/S Trivetts Rd, noted in the Town's Draft Official Plan: a) To permit lot creation by way of Plan of Subdivision; b) To permit a Plan of Subdivision application to be submitted along with an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment and, c) To change the current land use designation adjacent to trivetts road from 'Lakeshore Residential Area' to 'Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area'.	Lands fronting on east side of Trivetts Road have been placed in a special provision to allow landowner to proceed with an Official Plan Amendment for the creation of one or more lots (and subject to associated policies)
2	30-Sep-15	MMAH and partner Ministries	Residential intensification target and designated greenfield area density target needs to be incorporated, as identified by the York Region Official Plan	Agree with this revision. Targets would be for Keswick and Sutton/JP. Revision made.
3			Add policy that an intensification strategy be developed in cooperation with the Region to achieve the Town's intensification target in accordance with Growth Plan 2.2.3.6 Additional policies should be added to reflect the intensification strategy policies of the Growth Plan Policy 2.2.3.6	Agree with this revision. York Region has provided suggested wording. Revision made.
4			Add the following new policy in Section 8.8 to address the protection of marine archaeological resources: "The Town may require a marine archaeological assessment to be conducted by a licensed marine archaeologist, pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act , to determine if there is a high potential for partially or fully submerged archaeological resources that are of cultural heritage value and if such resources will be impacted by shoreline or waterfront developments."	Agree with this revision. Also included Marine Archaeological Assessment to the list of complete application studies. Revisions made.
5			Recommend that the term 'preserve' if used in the context of cultural heritage be replaced with 'conserve' to be consistent with the PPS (Section 2.2.2.6, 7.3, 7.4, 8.8.3, 8.8.7, 8.8.11, 8.8.26 and 11.2.6.1)	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
6			Use "cultural heritage value or interest" wording as opposed to "buildings and features of historical significance", "buildings or structures of historical cultural or architectural merit", "documentation that is of architectural and historical significance to the Town of Georgina" etc. (sections 8.8.16, 11.2.6.1, 11.8.2)	Agree with this revision. Revisions made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
7			To add the reference to Ontario Regulation 359/09 in the opening paragraph of OP policy 4.8 such that it reads: "Renewable energy projects, such as wind turbines, solar panels, geothermal and other similar sources are exempted from municipal approval under the <i>Planning Act</i> and are subject to Ontario Regulation 359/09 - Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V.0.1 of the Environmental Protection Act and the Province's Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009 and any amendments made thereto."	Agree with this revision. Revisions made.
8			Modify policy 5.3.2 to include: "The minimum vegetation protection zone in a shoreline built-up area is 30 metres from the Lake Simcoe shoreline, or larger if determined appropriate by an evaluation required by Section 5.3.3. For areas of Lake Simcoe Shoreline outside of existing settlement areas and outside of shoreline built-up areas, the vegetation protection zone shall be 100 metres from the Lake Simcoe shoreline. "	Agree with this revision. Policy found in Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan 6.2.6 and York Region Official Plan 2.2.15.17. Revisions made.
9			Recommend revising or removing the term "shoreline built-up areas" such that it conforms with the LSPP definition and to reflect the EPA designated areas (Section 12.5.92)	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
10			Recommend expanding draft policy 5.3.7 a)(iv) such that it aligns with the protection level of features those Lake Simcoe Protection Plan sub-policies 6.26 d, e and f provides.	Agree with this revision. Policy found in Lake Simcoe Protection Plan 6.26 (d,e,f). Revision made.
11			Expand Section 5.4.3 and include additional policies to address the expansion of settlement area boundaries and the requirement for an EIS for major developments that are in proximity to or within significant groundwater recharge areas. In addition, the term "major source water development" should be replaced with the term "major development" which is a defined term in the OP and conforms with the terminology in the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan.	Agree with this revision. Policy found in Section 2.2. of PPS and LSPP 6.36, 6.38, 6.39 and 6.40.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
12			Revise draft OP Policy 9.3.1.2 such that it reads: "All proposals for sewer and water infrastructure proposals shall be subject to the water and sewer infrastructure policies of the Greenbelt Plan and the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. "	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
13			Add a new policy to Section 11, or other appropriate sections of the OP, to include the conditions set out in LSPP 4.20 as part of all subdivision and site plan agreements.	Agree with this revision (LSPP 4.20). Revision made.
14			Recommend adding to the introduction paragraph in Policy 5.4 to clarify that only certain designated areas as described in Ontario Regulation 284/07 are required to have source water protection plans.	Agree with this revision. York Region provided suggested wording: "The Source Protection Plan policies in this section pertain to vulnerable areas only and may include prohibited future land uses." Revisions made.
15			OP Policy 5.4.1.1.1 should be modified to add the following prohibited uses as per LUP-1 of the South Georgian Bay - Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan: large (more than 10,000 L) on-site sewage systems, agricultural and non-agricultural material storage facilities, road salt storage facilities, snow storage facilities, fuel storage, outdoor confinement or farm animal yard	York Region disagrees with this revision. No action required.
16			Recommend removing draft OP policy 5.4.2.4 - risk management plans authority is assigned to Risk Management Official, therefore not appropriate in OP.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
17			Replace the term "major source water development" with "major development" in policies 5.4.2.5 and 5.4.3.2.	Agree with this revision. York Region has requested revised wording in the definition of Major Development: "d) in Section 5.4, the following definition applies for Major Development: Consists of: 1) the construction of a building or buildings and any other impervious surface (e.g. road, parking areas, sidewalks) with a cumulative ground floor area of 500 square metres or more; or ii) the establishment of a major recreational use. Revision made.
18			Revise draft OP policy 5.4.4.1 to include 'Intake Protection Zones', as follows: "An application for major development within Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Intake Protection Zones , as displayed on Schedule B3 - Source Water Protection, involving the manufacturing, handling and/or storage of bulk fuel or chemicals (activities prescribed under the Clean Water Act), shall be accompanied by a Contaminant Management Plan, as deemed necessary by the Town, in consultation with York Region's Risk Management Office."	York Region does not agree with this revision. There is already sufficient policy to deal with intent and if this is occurring, SWIAMP would capture this. No action required.
19			Recommend adding to the 'complete application' requirements in the draft OP to provide a compliance letter issued by the Risk Management Official, or another requirement that would trigger the submission of information on proposed activities.	Agree with this revision. Suggestion from Planning Act and Section 2.8 of PPS. Revision made.
20			Delete the word "assisted" and replace with "affordable" in policy 8.6.1.7(a) such that it reads: "Participation in Provincial and Federal government Community Improvement programs and application for respective grants for the construction of community improvements and assisted affordable housing, and for the restoration of heritage buildings..."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
21			Revise wording in draft policies 8.1.12(a) and 8.1.13 is recommended such that an accessory apartment is authorized in a single detached, semi-detached, and/or townhouse dwelling as per the Planning Act.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
22			In Section 8.1.12(b), further clarification is recommended to clearly explain under what circumstance would require a minor variance and/or rezoning.	Agree with this revision. Revisions have been made to clarify.
23			Add a new sub-policy (f) to draft OP policy 8.1.12 such that it reads: " (f) accessory apartments shall not be permitted within existing homes located on hazardous land or within a hazardous site. "	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS Section 3.1. Revision made.
24			The OP should include mapping and policies to address "hazardous forest types for wildland fire."	New subsection has been added. Town will be utilizing MNRF's mapping as a screening tool.
25			To add the following new term and definition for "Hazardous forest types for wildland fire" in Section 12.5 of the draft OP: " Hazardous forest types for wildland fire: means forest types assessed as being associated with the risk of high to extreme wildland fire using risk assessment tools established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, as amended from time to time. "	Agree with this revision. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
26			Remove the word "generally" and add the term "site alteration" in the first sentence of policy 4.4.2, such that it reads "New development and site alteration will be generally prohibited in areas that are subject to flooding." Additional policy modification is also required in Section 4.4.2 to be consistent with policies 3.1.2 and 3.1.4(b) of the PPS (need to address inland river flooding and to ensure that development in the floodplain is only permitted in accordance with the PPS)	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
27			Recommend adding a policy to Section 11.4.1 to reiterate that no new lot creation is permitted in hazardous areas as per referenced sections of the PPS.	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS 3.1.2 (a, b,c). Revision made.
28			Remove draft policy 4.10.3(d) to conform with the Greenbelt Plan and be consistent with the PPS (Aggregate extraction is permitted as an interim use in Specialty Crop Areas)	Agree with this revision. Policy obtained from PPS 2.5.4 and GBP 5.3. Revision made.
29			Revise policy 4.10.8 e) to permit the depth of extraction for pit operations from 2.5 metres to 1.5 metres above the water table (from Aggregate Resources of Ontario Provincial Standards)	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
30			In policy 4.10.9 (a)(i) of the OP, replace the term "wetlands" with "significant wetlands" and provide the associated definition within Section 12 of the OP.	Agree with this revision. Policy obtained from PPS 2.5.4.1 and GBP 4.3.2.8 c). Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
31			Add a sub-policy to draft OP policy 4.10.10 to include rehabilitation of Specialty Crop Areas similar to Greenbelt Plan Policy 4.3.2.8 c.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
32			Modify sub-policy 4.10.10(b) such that it reads: "The other alternatives have been satisfactorily considered by the applicant and found unsuitable. The consideration of other alternatives shall include resources in areas of Canada Land Inventory Class 4 through 7 lands, resources on lands identified as designated growth areas, and resources on <i>prime agricultural</i> lands where rehabilitation is feasible. Where no other alternatives are found, prime agricultural lands shall be protected in this order of priority: <i>specialty crop areas</i> , Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2 and 3 lands; and,"	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS 2.5.4. Revision made.
33			Add a new policy to OP Section 4.10, to address comprehensive rehabilitation, as well as, a new definition for "comprehensive rehabilitation."	Agree with this revision. Policy obtained from PPS 2.5.3.2. Revision made.
34			Recommend adding a policy to Section 5.1.1 such as: " The full range of existing and new agriculture, agriculture-related and secondary uses and normal farm practices are permitted on lands within the Greenlands System. New buildings or structures for agriculture, agriculture-related and secondary uses are not subject to Section 5.1.1 but are subject to Section 6.3 "	Agree with this revision. Policy obtained from GBP 3.2.2, 3.2.4 and 4.5. Revision made but with further clarification that only when permitted by the underlying land use designation.
35			In Section 5.1.1 (a) replace the word "adverse" with "negative" and add the words "or their functions" at the end so it reads: " There will be no negative effects on <i>key natural heritage features</i> or <i>key hydrologic features</i> or their functions. "	Agree with this revision. Policy obtained from GBP 3.2.2.3 a) Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
36			Add a sub-policy(b) to draft OP policy 5.1.1.4 such that it reads" "(b) is a minimum of 30 metres from the key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features identified in Section 6.3.1; and, c) is established to achieve, and be maintained as natural self-sustaining vegetation."	Agree with this revision. Policy from GBP 3.2.4.4. Revision made.
37			Section 6.3.1 needs to include the following key natural heritage features: sand barrens, savannahs and tallgrass prairies and alvars.	Agree with this revision. Policy obtained from GBP 3.2.4. Included remaining features to the list of key natural heritage features.
38			Section 6.3.1 needs to include "lakes (and their littoral zones)" to the list of key hydrologic features.	Agree with this revision. Policy from GBP 3.2.4. Included remaining feature to the list of key hydrologic features.
39			Add "fish habitat", "seepage areas and springs" and the qualifier "significant" to the woodlands to the 30 metre vegetative buffer zone components in the third bullet of Section 6.3.1	Agree with this revision. Policy from GBP 3.2.4.4. Revision made.
40			To clarify draft OP policy 6.3.1.4 such that the Town will need to be satisfied with the change in designation as a result of the refinement cannot include an Urban Area designation.	Agree with this revision. Policy from Growth Plan 2.2.8. Revision made to indicate that the refinement cannot include designations in a settlement area and will default to the Region's rural or agricultural designations.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
41			Add the word "significant" before the word "woodlands" in Section 6.3.1.5	Agree with this revision. Policy from GBP 3.2.4.4. Revision made.
42			Delete policy 6.3.1.14 (notwithstanding clause related to the requirement for an Environmental Impact Statement). It is recognized that Section 10.1.2.3 provides for scoping of an EIS.	Agree with this revision. Recommendation from GBP. Revision made.
43			Revise draft OP policy 6.3.1.17 by adding the following sentence: "The removal, modification or destruction of the natural features, functions or linkages shall not provide the rationale for removal of these lands from the Environmental Protection Area designation. The impacted area shall be restored. "	Agree with this revision. Policy from YROP 2.2.4.7. Revision made.
44			Policies to be added to Sections 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 that designation of new sites for "Rural Industrial Area", "Rural Commercial Area" and "Commercial Recreation Area" is prohibited in specialty crop areas and prime agricultural areas (Agricultural Protection Area). Policies also need to be added to Section 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 to indicate that any new sites for industrial and commercial uses will need to meet the test of being resource-based, serving the rural resource or agricultural sectors.	Staff do not agree with this comment since the GBP allows certain non-agricultural uses in rural (non prime agricultural) areas and accordingly, the Draft OP permits such uses in these areas. Further discussions with York Region have resulted in revising policy to state in initial paragraph that expansions or new sites must be in conformity with YROP, Provincial Plans etc. and if conforms then must submit the following studies..." Also added policy to clarify that designation of new sites is prohibited in Agricultural Protection Area and Specialty Crop Area designations

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
45			Revise the preamble of sub-section 6.6.3 and preambles of subsections 6.4.3 and 6.5.3 such that it reads: "Expansions of a Commercial Recreation Area designation or the designation of new sites shall require an amendment to this Plan and the Zoning By-law, and shall conform with Provincial policies and plans and the York Region Official Plan. The following studies..."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
46			Add policies which require that applications to establish or expand 'major recreational uses', such as golf courses, marinas and outdoor playing fields, are subject to Section 4.1.2 of the Greenbelt Plan.	Agree with this revision. Policies have been added to the Commercial Recreation designation.
47			Delete 'conference centre' from the list of "as of right" permitted uses in Subsection 6.6.1 a).	Agree with this revision. "Conference Centre" has been deleted.
48			Further clarification is recommended to determine what is considered as a "minor or straight forward" development application. It is suggested that the final two sentences of policy 10.1.2.3 be replaced with the following: "Scoping shall be done by the Town, the relevant conservation authority, and other relevant agencies in consultation with the applicant at the preconsultation meeting in accordance with the policies of this Plan. Such scoping will reflect the type of development being proposed and the sensitivity and characteristics of the area within and surrounding it."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
49			In Section 12.5.74, revise the definition for the term 'negative impacts' such that it reads: "Means: a. In regard to water, degradation to the quality or quantity of surface or ground water, key hydrologic features or vulnerable areas, and their related hydrologic functions, due to single, multiple or successive development or site alteration activities; b. In regard to fish habitat, the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat, except where, in conjunction with the appropriate authorities, it has been authorized under the Fisheries Act, using the guiding principle of no net loss of productive capacity; and c. In regard to other natural heritage features and areas, degradation that threatens the health and integrity of the natural features or ecological functions for which an area is identified due to single, multiple or successive development or site alteration activities."	Agree with this revision. Definition from Greenbelt Plan. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
50			Revise the definition for the term 'development' or include a policy to Section 6.3 Environmental Protection Areas such that it excludes the three uses as described in the definition for the term 'development' of the Greenbelt Plan (facilities for transportation, infrastructure and utilities by public body, activities or works under the Drainage Act or existing agricultural practices)	Agree with this revision. Definition in Greenbelt Plan and PPS. Definition revised.
51			Add the following sentence to the end of the definition for the term "significant woodlands" in Section 12.5.98 of the OP: "These are to be identified using criteria established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry."	Agree with this revision. Definition in Greenbelt Plan. Revision made.
52			A definition for significant wetlands is required to ensure conformity with the Greenbelt Plan. "Significant Wetlands: means an area identified as provincially significant by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry using evaluation procedures established by the Province, as amended from time to time."	Agree with this revision. Definition in Greenbelt Plan. Revision made.
53			Provide clear direction as to whether or not MDS will be applied in the following circumstances/options: 1) Where a new lot is proposed with an existing dwelling, and that dwelling is located on a lot separate from the subject livestock facility (MDS Guideline 8) 2) Application of MDS to cemeteries (Type A or B, MDS Guideline 38) 3) Application of MDS after a catastrophe (MDS Guideline 11) The OP may also be expanded to clarify whether MDS will be applied differently in Agricultural designations vs. Rural designations	Agree with this revision. Direction has been included in all 3 circumstances. Do not need to address catastrophe that destroys a dwelling because policy 4.7.2 exempts the Town from applying MDS 1 to buildings or structures on an existing lot.
54			Replace the term "Agricultural Code of Practice" with "MDS Formulae and Guidelines" , wherever the term is used in the OP.	Agree with this revision. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
55			Recommend deleting definition 12.5.41 Farm Related Commercial/Industrial Use and replacing all instances in the OP of the term 'farm-related commercial/industrial use' with the term 'agricultural-related use.'	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
56			In policy 6.1.5, remove the phrase "agriculture and farm related" and replace with the term "agricultural" such that it reads: "The fragmentation of agricultural parcels of land and the creation of non-viable farm operations shall not be permitted. The creation of parcels of land for agriculture and farm related agricultural uses of less than 40 hectares in agricultural areas, and less than 16 hectares in the Specialty Crop Area, shall not be permitted."	Agree with this revision. Policy from GBP 4.6. Revision made.
57			Remove and replace the terms "Farm-related" and "Non-farm" with "Agriculture-related" and "Non-agriculture" such that it reads: " Farm Agriculture-related severances are permitted under certain conditions, in accordance with the provisions of Section 11.4.2.4. Non-farm Non-agriculture related severances of the agricultural land base will not be permitted, unless in accordance with Section 11.4.2.5."	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS 2.3.4.1 and GBP 4.6. Revision made.
58			Recommend modifying sub-policy 6.1.10 c) as follows: "Applications for the development of farm-related commercial/industrial agricultural-related uses shall: c) Incorporate appropriate separation distances from farm operations in accordance with the Minimum Distance Separation Formulae, where merited by a higher density of human occupancy or activity or significant visitation by the broader public to an agricultural area. in the Agricultural Code of Practice as required by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs... "	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS 2.3.3.3, 3.1.2, 3.1.2, MDS Guidelines. Revision made.
59			Policy 6.1.17 is to be removed since the refinement of prime agricultural areas is only permitted as a one-time opportunity at the time of the Greenbelt conformity.	Agree with this revision. Policy from GBP 3.1.3.1. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
60			Add a new policy in Section 6.7 clarifying that parkland uses are not permitted within the Agricultural Protection Area, aside from existing areas designated for such uses.	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS 2.3.6 and GBP 3.1. Revision made.
61			Recommend revising Draft OP Policy 11.4.1.1. f) as follows: "Decisions of the Committee of Adjustment should carefully consider shall comply with the Minimum Distance Separation Formulae in the Agricultural Code of Practice as required by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food when considering a consent application which would affect agricultural lands."	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS 2.3.3.3 and 1.1.5.9 and GBP 3.1.3. Revision made.
62			Recommend modifying 11.4.2.4 and 11.4.2.5 as follows: 11.4.2.4 "Severances for agriculture, forestry or conservation uses, which support the respective goals, objectives and policies of this Plan will be permitted. Land consolidations for these uses will be encouraged. Therefore, when a consolidation occurs, and as a result of the consolidation an existing dwelling becomes superfluous, a lot containing the existing dwelling may be severed from the consolidated parcel, in accordance with the general requirements for severances... Where severance of a farm parcel is required to permit consolidation, the Council and the Committee will give consideration to the agricultural viability of the resultant parcel. 11.4.2.5 "Within the Specialty Crop Area and Agricultural Protection Area, severance of a residence surplus to a farming operation s a result of a farm consolidation may be permitted in instances where a farmer owns and operates the agricultural operation on a number of land holdings in the Town which may or may are not be contiguous. A condition of severing such surplus dwelling shall be the prohibition of the construction of a new dwelling on the retained lot of farmland in perpetuity through a rezoning or other municipal approaches. Council and the Committee will give consideration to the agricultural viability of the resultant farm parcel. The new residential lot will be limited to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and appropriate services.	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS 2.3.4.1 and GBP 4.6.3. Revision made.
63			If the Town wishes to permit severances for agricultural-related uses, it has not clarified this in the OP.	Policies have been clarified to not permit severances for agricultural-related uses.
64			Recommended that the term 'biomass' be added to the definition of 'Agricultural Uses', as follows: "Agricultural Uses: means the growing of crops, including nursery, biomass and horticulture crops; raising of livestock; raising of other animals for food..."	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS 6.0. Revision made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
65			Recommend modifying draft OP policy 7.6.4 and indicate on Schedule E, that the proposed interchange is subject to an EA amendment process and MTO's approval. We suggest revising Policy 7.6.4 such that it reads: "Schedule E - Roads Plan identifies a proposed additional interchange at Highway 404 and Glenwoods Avenue. It is the intent of the Town, in conjunction with York Region to promote early development of this identified interchange pending York/Municipal EA Amendment and Ministry of Transportation's approval. "	Agree with this revision. Policy from YROP 7.2.5.4. Revision made.
66			To modify draft OP policy 9.5.10 to include the Ministry of Transportation's Drainage Guidelines as follows: "In the consideration of development adjacent or in proximity to a Provincial Highway, the stormwater management report and plan prepared in accordance to Ministry of Transportation Drainage Guidelines , shall be reviewed and approved by the Ministry of Transportation."	Agree with this revision. Revision made.
67			Identify rural/agricultural areas located within the secondary plan areas of the "Towns and Villages" within Schedule A-2. Revise the draft OP schedules to conform with the York ROP in terms of displaying the full extent of the Regional Greenlands System in rural areas and settlement areas.	Staff do not agree with this comment since the designations in the "Towns and Villages" have no status in the Parent Official Plan. The Secondary Plans will have to comply with the York Region's OP in terms of displaying the Regional Greenlands System and the agricultural and rural designations.
68			Provide GIS shapefiles for the proposed EPA and Greenlands System designations for MNRF's review.	York Region has provided shapefiles for MNRF's review.
69			Integrate climate change adaption and mitigation strategies, and work with the Region to develop action plans that supports the York Region Sustainability Strategy: Towards a Sustainable Region.	Agree with this revision. New 8.9 sustainability section and climate change subsection added.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
70			Policies in Section 11.14 of the draft OP should be expanded to address public service facilities being coordinated and integrated with land use planning so that they are financially viable over their life cycle, which may be demonstrated through asset management planning.	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS 1.6.1. Revision made.
71			Section 4.1.1 b) of the draft OP dealing with electricity transmission and distribution system should be expanded to include protection of corridors and rights of way for electricity generation facilities and transmission facilities.	Agree with this revision. Policy added.
72			Policies should be developed which identify how and when Aboriginal communities will be engaged in planning matters and the OP should specifically direct that Aboriginal communities will be engaged in matters related to cultural heritage resources and archaeology.	Consultation with Aboriginal communities is already discussed in Section 8.8. Additional policy added in public consultation section.
73			Recommended that a policy be included supporting co-location of public service facilities in Section 8.4 of the draft OP dealing with Community Facilities.	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS 1.6.5. Revision made.
74			Recommend including a policy within the implementation section of the plan that recognizes inter-departmental relationships as well as external relations within the decision making process.	Agree with this revision. Policy from PPS. New Decision Making sub-section added.
75			Consideration of implementing a Development Permit System. At a minimum, a policy in support of the use of this Planning Act tool is recommended.	New policy included that speaks to how the Town may establish a DPS.
76			Few typographical errors to be corrected.	Agree with these revisions. Revisions made.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
77	09-Oct-15	ACI Architects Inc. for 315197 Ontario Limited	On behalf of the owner of 824 Trivetts Road. Maintain the current Lakeshore Residential Area designation or change to Services Lakeshore Residential, rather than the proposed Environmental Protection Area	Portion of property to be in special policy area in the EPA designation that permits application for OPA (and subject to associated policies). Remainder of property also to be in EPA designation.
78	14-Oct-15	Michael Baskerville, Manager of Engineering, Georgina	<p>a) Section 4.10.13 - Where portable asphalt plants are a possibility, consider simplified site plan approval requirement.</p> <p>b) Section 5.3.1 - First line, " development or site alteration outside of Settlement Areas is not permitted in Lake Simcoe", is a word missing?</p> <p>c) Section 5.3.7 - Is this intended to include everything? Seems excessive.</p> <p>d) Section 5.3.7 (e) - The taking of water in excess of 50,00 litres per day requires a permit from MOECC. Should it be mentioned as a requirement?</p> <p>e) Section 5.6.1 - Was a subwatershed plan done for the Pfefferlaw Brook? Not listed here.</p> <p>f) Section 8.7.1.4 - Should this clause be incorporated into secondary plans? And expand to include salt management plans for private roads and commercial/industrial development and the use of only qualified contractors?</p>	<p>a) This can be addressed in the Site Plan Control By-law.</p> <p>b) Direct wording from the LSPP</p> <p>c) This policy is from the LSPP</p> <p>d) Policy included that must meet regulations and obtain any required permit</p> <p>e) Now referenced.</p> <p>f) Obtained from Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan. Keswick Secondary Plan will have to comply</p>
			<p>g) Section 8.7.2.1 - Should this clause be incorporated into secondary plans? eliminate reference to "an area that has minimal ambient levels of light at night" and simply be imposed everywhere in public and private developments including road streetlights?</p> <p>h) Section 9.2.1.3 (c)(i) - A minor arterial road with a 30 metre ROW is identified in the KSP. Should it be mentioned here or will the KSP remove the minor road?</p> <p>i) Section 9.2.1.3 (iii) - Is there a need to recognize 18 metre ROW's. State conditions for the use or approval of the lesser ROW.</p> <p>j) Section 9.2.1.6 - Encourage the extension of the 404 to Pollock Rd.</p> <p>k) Section 11.5.1.3 - Suggest all exemptions to site plan control be removed. New site plan by-law will capture specific development through staff delegated authority.</p>	<p>g) Studies only applied when an area has minimal light levels. Added: "to determine potential impacts in relation to abutting properties"</p> <p>h) Will remain as 36-45 m to be consistent with Region</p> <p>i) Do not require conditions in OP. Guidelines can be created.</p> <p>j) Encourages to Glenwoods to help facilitate the development of the business park.</p> <p>k) Exemptions removed.</p>

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
			I) Schedule E - Break down into sub plans to show street names/designations (ie public & private). Show future 404 extension and future interchange. Upgrade Pollock as Collector between Warden and Kennedy.	I) Private roads, interchanges and collector road displayed.
80	14-Oct-15	Bell	<p>Section 12.5 - Consider adding definitions (Infrastructure, Utility(is)) to clarify intent of Official Plan and to align with PPS explicitly with respect to communications/telecommunications:</p> <p>Section 4.1.1 (a) - Use of terms "infrastructure" and "utility(is)" to provide greater clarity that telecommunication services can be provided and are permitted in all land use designations.</p> <p>(i) - Replace " gas, telephone and cable television transmission utility services", "communication/telecommunication facilities and utilities"</p> <p>(ii) - Replace "public utility facilities" with "infrastructure and utilities"</p> <p>Section 9.1 - The term "infrastructure" is not defined by Official Plan, as such when coupled with the additions of definitions to section 12.5, will provide greater clarity.</p>	Agree with these revisions. Definitions have been added and revisions made.
81	14-Oct-15	MMM Group Limited, on behalf of Nizza Enterprises	Settlement Area Boundary expansion request for consideration of the lands located at 2354 Ravenshoe Road. Inclusion of all lands in the KBPSA into the settlement boundary is requested.	Staff do not support this request. KBPSA and associated policies to be removed due to flood plain and natural features. Greenbelt Plan also does not permit expansion into NHS.
82	14-Oct-15	Sylviette Brown	Request to be kept apprised of all or any changes applicable to 23621 Park Road and adjoining properties.	Included on interested parties list to review all correspondence related to OPR. No action required.
83	14-Oct-15	Aird & Berlis	Expand the range and mix of uses, including retail uses, permitted in the KBPSP.	YROP does not permit this. Also a matter for the KBPSP. No action required.
84	19-Oct-15	Sylviette Brown	Ascertain how OP will secure health, safety and welfare of the inhabitants of Zephyr Creek Bridge on Park Road and the Fill Site on Smith Blvd.	OP does not directly deal with health and safety issues (deals with general land use). The Town's by-law on fill would address fill sites.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
85	18-Nov-15	Michael Smith (agent for Gloria and David Mott) 326 Deer Park Drive.	Include a special provision permitting the existing accessory apartment in the detached garage.	Agree with this revision. Will include special provision as the apartment has been existing for several years, and no complaints have been made to the Municipal Law Enforcement Division. Revision made.
86	13-Jan-16	York Region - Water Resources	Add new policy in Section 5.4 Source Water Protection (add in Section 59 requirements as per Draft ROPA policy): "That any planning or building application proposed for a land use other than low density residential in Intake Protection Zone 1 will require a Section 59 notice issued by the Risk Management Official as appointed by York Region Council as part of the complete application requirements under the Planning Act, Condominium Act and Ontario Building Code Act.	Agree with this revision but suggest being more specific by stating that residential buildings that are 4 storeys or less are exempted unless fuel is located underground. York Region agrees with comment. Revision made.
87	22-Jan-16	Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority	Not supportive of a Settlement Area Expansion to the Keswick Business Park by including the Keswick Business Park Study Area lands and to re-designate the lands on 2354 Ravenshoe from Agricultural Protection Area to Employment. Conformity with the Growth Plan and GBP and consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement has not been demonstrated.	Agree with these comments. KBPSA overlay designation and associated policies have been removed.
88	29-Jan-16	DKGK (22869 Woodbine Ave.)	Incorporate the KBPSA into the urban boundary and re-designate the lands to allow for various commercial/employment uses.	Do not agree with this request. The KBPSA and associated policies will be removed due to floodplain and natural features. Greenbelt Plan also does not permit expansion into NHS.
89	08-Feb-16	Rockford Consulting Group (East side Pugsley Ave.)	Permit development on the east side of Pugsley Ave.	Lands fronting on the east side of Pugsley have been placed in a special provision to allow landowner to proceed with an Official Plan Amendment for the creation of one or more lots (and subject to associated policies)

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
90	10-Feb-16	Sylviette Brown, 23621 Park Road	a) Draft Official Plan requires serious amendments prior to being adopted as final b) Concerns with wording and mapping as it pertains to Lot 7W, Con.2 and neighbouring properties south to north, Ravenshoe Rd to Old Homestead Road and west to west, Zephyr-Egypt Wetlands to Black River c) Written objections will be formalized. Advise of next Council meeting where written and oral submissions can be made.	a) Concerns outlined in Comment 90 were reviewed. b) LSRCA reviewing schedules c) Letter advising of April 20th public meeting sent on March 31, 2016
91	16-Feb-16	Sylviette Brown, 23621 Park Road	a) Object to mapping due to glaring errors in mapping of land and water depictions. b) MNRF has not completed its mapping and accompanying text on wetlands on Pt. Lt. 7W (and Pt.Lot 7S) Con.2. c) The textual content as to agriculture is too vague and broad for meaningful interpretation (see Farming and Food Protection Act) d) B1 - ANSI farm forest erroneously denoted woodland wetland on pt. lot 7W, Con.2 e) B2 - Wetland south of Zephyr Creek Streamway is erroneous f) B2 - Potential for flooding in Brown Hill, immediately east and west of Black River North & south of Ravenshoe) g) B2 - Smith Blvd. east of Park Road Fill Site which represents a major development is in Greenlands System with major wetland depicted immediately to the east	a) Mapping being reviewed by Town staff, York Region, MNRF and Conservation Authority b) MNRF reviewing Greenlands and EPA designation. Updated MNRF mapping obtained in last few years was provided to York Region to update on OP Schedules. c) Context is provided in definitions (i.e. agricultural uses). d) LSRCA reviewing mapping. e) LSRCA reviewing mapping. f) LSRCA reviewing mapping. G) LSRCA reviewing mapping.

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments


Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
			<p>h) B2 - Exaggeration of wetland on south side of Zephyr Creek streamway, exaggeration of greenlands system, contaminated fill on Gokkurt property (wetland and greenland system should not be present)</p> <p>i) All maps - Frog Street should be depicted as unimproved road allowance in certain portions and major bridges should be displayed</p> <p>j) Misuse of terminology "wet land" vs. "wetland", no soil or vegetation analysis done on EPA, internal farm drains marked EPA, attention to EPA in south-east corner of farm</p> <p>k) A2 - Beamlight LP mostly in EPA but not denoted on map as a major development</p> <p>l) C - errors in areas south of Old Homestead Road to Ravenshoe Road and east of Park Road to Wier Sideroad and west of Park Road to Black River</p>	<p>h) LSRCA reviewing mapping.</p> <p>i) Road details are only displayed on Road maps to avoid crowding on other schedules.</p> <p>j) Terminology from PPS, MNRF reviewing EPA designation</p> <p>k) Large renewable energy projects now displayed on A2 - Land Use Plan</p>
			<p>m) No portions of Lots 5 and 6 Con 3 are denoted hazardous lands despite significant groundwater charging areas as per aerial mappings, where did these groundwater charging areas go?</p> <p>n) Pt. Lot 7S Con 2 is fully denoted "hazardous land" but is not inundated with any drainage water except small seasonal tributary and has never been flooded</p> <p>o) Sustainability of land not addressed by Draft OP or draft mappings</p> <p>p) Need to ensure proper terminology ("wetland", "wet land", "hazardous lands") as they all have different meanings</p> <p>q) Fill site on Smith Blvd. as been ignored in the mapping (site is hazardous). A2 - Beamlight LP mostly in EPA but not denoted on map as a major development. Earthlight LP is at risk of harm to the facility and community.</p> <p>r) Drain from Frog Street is denoted hazardous lands but is no longer functional</p>	<p>l) LSRCA reviewing mapping.</p> <p>m) York Region reviewed updated groundwater recharge mapping. LSRCA reviewing mapping.</p> <p>n) LSRCA reviewing mapping.</p> <p>o) New sustainability section, enhanced environmental mapping</p>
			<p>s) The east drain of Park Road in Con. 2 and 3 has not been denoted "hazardous lands" and should be due to the corrosive road toxins the drain picks up</p> <p>t) There is no flood plain in Lots 7, 8 and 9 et al in concession 2</p> <p>u) The area around the Baldwin Dam and the Black River do not engulf the whole of the area as "flood plain"</p>	<p>p) Terminology from PPS and Provincial Plans</p> <p>q) Renewable energy projects displayed on Schedule A2. LSRCA reviewing mapping.</p> <p>r) LSRCA reviewing mapping.</p>

OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN
Received after July 31, 2015 deadline for comments

Comment No.	Date Received	Commenter	Comments	Preliminary Staff / Consultant Response
				<p>s) LSRCA reviewing mapping</p> <p>t) LSRCA reviewing mapping</p> <p>u) LSRCA reviewing mapping</p> <p>Note that Policy 5.3.1.3 indicates that the boundaries of the EPA designation and features mapping is approximate and minor refinements can be made through an Environmental Impact Study.</p>
92	22-Feb-16	Sylviette Brown, 23621 Park Road	Requesting to speak before Council in regards to comments submitted (advise of date and time)	Notice sent on March 31st advising of date/time. Opportunity to speak at the public meeting will be available.
93	04-Mar-16	Joel Brenner, 23078 Warden Avenue	Best option for Thane Smelter site is a soils remediation and revitalization operation, but is unable to move forward due to an existing by-law that prohibits the operation of a soil remediation or revitalization business. Requesting to delete one of the current permitted uses on the site (dry cleaning plant use) due to large amounts of chemicals used in its operation. Requesting to replace the dry cleaning plant use with a soil remediation operation as a special provision to the site uses, whereby the By-law can remain in full force and effect, save and except on the subject site.	Comments are related to provisions in the Zoning By-law. Prohibited uses in proposed Official Plan continue to include uses that involve the recycling and/or the storage of contaminated materials. A request of this nature should be subject to a more thorough review through an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.

**Lake
Simcoe**

**SUBJECT
PROPERTY**





February 14, 2013

Mr. Harold Lenters
Director of Planning
Town of Georgina
26557 Civic Centre Road, RR 2
Keswick, Ontario, L4P 3G1

Dear Mr. Lenters

Subject: Maple Lake Estates I 19T -87055 and Plan 65M-2903
Conformity with the York Region Official Plan 2010

The Town has asked for a letter outlining the Region's position regarding the Maple Lake Estates I development and its conformity to the new Region of York Official Plan – 2010 (ROP 2010).

As you are aware, Maple Lake Estates I has long standing development approvals. Subdivision draft approval was issued by the OMB (confirmed by Cabinet) in 1988, zoned in 1987 and the plan of subdivision registered in 1992. The lands have been designated as Towns and Villages on both Map 5 of the 1994 ROP and on Map 1 of the new ROP-2010. This designation is in accordance with the Greenbelt Plan.

The ROP 2010 contains transition policies 8.4.24 and 8.4.25 dealing with Greenbelt transition which are in accordance with the Greenbelt Plan policy 5.2.1. These policies recognize the existing approvals through the municipal Greenbelt conformity exercise. Policy 8.4.25 permits the same recognition as it applies to zoning by-laws.

In our opinion, Policy 8.4.24 and 8.4.25 along with the pertinent Greenbelt transition provisions, recognize the current Georgina OP and zoning approvals, and provide for the development of the site in accordance with these approvals.

Sincerely

Valerie Shuttleworth, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Director, Long Range Planning
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer
Telephone 905-830-4444 ext. 1526
Email valerie.shuttleworth@york.ca

Heather Konefat, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Director, Community Planning
Transportation and Community Planning Branch
Telephone 905-830-4444 ext. 1502
Email heather.konefat@york.ca

KESWICK BUSINESS PARK STUDY AREA

Town of Georgina Official Plan Schedule A Land Use Plan

LOT 4

Woodbine Avenue

CON 4


Legend

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Regional and Municipal Boundary | Environmental Protection Area 1 |
| Municipal Boundary | Environmental Protection Area 2 |
| Shoreline | Environmental Protection Area 3 |
| Provincial Highway | Parkland Area |
| Municipal Road | Estate Residential Area |
| Hydro Corridor | Agricultural Protection Area |
| Railway | Commercial Recreation Area |
| Proposed Highway 404 Alignment | Rural Commercial Area |
| Proposed Additional Highway 404 Interchange | Rural Industrial Area |
| Provincially Approved Highway 404 Interchange | Serviced Lakeshore Residential Area |
| Secondary Plan Area | Lakeshore Residential Area |
| Hamlet Area | Rural Area |
| Keswick Business Park Study Area | Urban Residential Area |
| Referral / Deferral Area | Waste Disposal Site (closed) |

LOT 1

CON 3


Ravenshoe Road



0 100 200 400 600 800 Metres



SUBJECT
PROPERTY



Client: Nizza Enterprises		
Title: Keswick Business Park Environmental Constraints		
Prepared by:  MMM GROUP		
14-12224-002-P01	Scale as Shown	Review:
January 2016	Figure: 3	
© Queen's Printer for Ontario		

ML0000201214_12224-002-P01 - Keswick14_12224-002-P01 - KGPSA CP ReviewMapping\BMD\Constraints4.mxd



Friday, January 22, 2016

Harold Lenters, MCIP, RPP
Director of Planning and Building
Town of Georgina
26557 Civic Centre Road
Keswick, Ontario
L4P 3G1

Dear Mr. Lenters;

Re: Settlement Area Boundary Expansion – Keswick Business Park
Official Plan - Municipal Comprehensive Review
Town of Georgina, Region of York

The Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) has reviewed the Planning Justification Report prepared by MMM Group Limited in July 2015. We understand that the purpose of this Report is to justify a settlement area boundary expansion for four properties located within the Keswick Business Park Study Area through the Town's current Official Plan review process. It is also the intent of the Planning Report to justify the re-designation of lands on 2354 Ravenshoe Road from "Agricultural Protection Area" to "Employment".

Based on our review of this Report, we offer the following comments:

Greenbelt Plan

Section 2.1 of the Planning Report identifies that the subject lands contain natural heritage features including a provincially significant wetland and an unevaluated wetland. These key natural heritage features are contiguous to the Maskinonge River which is located to the east of the properties. Together, the Maskinonge River and associated key natural heritage features form part of the Greenbelt's Natural Heritage System (NHS) according to Schedule 4 and our interpretation of Policy 3.2.2.6 of the Greenbelt Plan. Given that Policy 3.4.4.1b) of the Greenbelt Plan states that any proposed settlement area expansion shall not extend into the Natural Heritage System, it is our interpretation that conformity with this Provincial Plan has not been demonstrated.

.../2


Mr. Harold Lenters, MCIP, RPP
January 22, 2016
Page 2 of 2

Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)

The subject lands also contain a significant flood prone area from the Maskinonge River according to existing flood plain mapping and the Flood Plain Analysis prepared by MMM Group. Both the Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement [Policies 2.2.8.2h) and 1.1.3.8 respectively] identify that a planning authority shall apply the policies of Section 2 (Wise Use and Management of Resources) and Section 3 (Protecting Public Health and Safety) of the PPS in determining the most appropriate direction for expansions to the boundaries of settlement areas. Based on the site's natural heritage features and the existence of the Greenbelt's NHS on the subject lands in addition to the existing natural hazard lands (flood plain), we believe that this would not be the most appropriate direction for any settlement area expansion. In fact, given that the majority of the subject lands is non-developable due to these environmental constraints including those lands immediately abutting the existing settlement area, it would appear that any boundary expansion at this location would create an undesirable "leap-frogging" over natural features and natural hazards to a small potentially developable area. For these reasons, we believe that conformity with the Growth Plan and consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement has not been demonstrated.

If you have any questions regarding these comments or should you wish to meet to discuss, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Charles F. Burgess, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Planning

/cfb

copy: MMM Group Limited, Christina Addorisio
 Town of Georgina, Andrea Furniss
 LSRCA, Rob Baldwin, Marianne Maertens, Shauna Fernandes, Kevin Jarus



Woodbine Avenue

SUBJECT
PROPERTY

Ravenshoe Road

Report No. DS-2016-0029
Attachment '15'
Pages 1 of 1





Properties Subject to Special Provisions

Report No. DS-2016-0029
Attachment '16'
Pages 1 of 1









Schedule F1: Keswick Land Use Plan **TOWN OF GEORGINA**

0 250 500 1,000 1,500 2,000 Metres

Report No. DS-2016-0029
 Attachment '19'
 Pages 1 of 1



Town of Georgina Official Plan Schedule A Land Use Plan

**SUBJECT
PROPERTY**


Belhaven



Beach

Report No. DS-2016-0029
Attachment '20'
Pages 1 of 1

Keswick Beach



Legend

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Regional and Municipal Boundary | Environmental Protection Area 1 |
| Municipal Boundary | Environmental Protection Area 2 |
| Shoreline | Environmental Protection Area 3 |
| Provincial Highway | Parkland Area |
| Municipal Road | Estate Residential Area |
| Hydro Corridor | Agricultural Protection Area |
| Railway | Commercial Recreation Area |
| Proposed Highway 404 Alignment | Rural Commercial Area |
| Proposed Additional Highway 404 Interchange | Rural Industrial Area |
| Provincially Approved Highway 404 Interchange | Served Lakeshore Residential Area |
| Secondary Plan Area | Lakeshore Residential Area |
| Hamlet Area | Rural Area |
| Keswick Business Park Study Area | Urban Residential Area |
| | Waste Disposal Site (closed) |

Produced by:
Planning Division
Planning and Building Department
Copyright: The Town of Georgina
November, 2013