

Climate Change			
#	Name	Comment	Response
1	Bridget Doyle and Catherine Daw on behalf of the CCAT Board of Directors	<p>Key Priorities of CCAT (Climate Change Action Team):</p> <p>Climate Lens: Ensure consistent application of Climate Lens across all town departments. Apply it to all projects, developments, and planning processes. Advocate for adopting a Climate Lens policy.</p> <p>Green Development Standards (GDS): Integrate GDS into new developments and planning processes. Use resources from FCM and Clean Air Partnership.</p> <p>Community Efficiency Funding (CEF) Program: Urgently initiate CEF for retrofitting housing and reducing emissions. Emphasize the need for timely action to secure available funds.</p> <p>New Developments: Advocate for gas-free new developments. Support net-zero builds and densification with natural space investment.</p> <p>Transportation: Promote clean transportation, electrification, and cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>Infrastructure: Implement Climate Lens for community infrastructure. Incorporate climate projections in planning and support Natural Asset Valuation.</p> <p>Parks: Support rewilding and ecological restoration in parks. Advocate for ecosystem restoration for biodiversity.</p>	<p>The Official Plan includes a comprehensive set of policies that respond to a host of community priorities, including responding to climate change. The Official Plan is not, however, a Climate Change Action Plan, and should not be considered as such.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The new Official Plan identifies an appropriate approach to climate change based on: > Ensuring new development achieves enhanced levels of efficiency/density, in an appropriate urban structure; > Promoting mobility options, including support for transit and Active Transportation; > Protecting the Natural Heritage System, and its associated ecological functions; and, > Providing policies that promote green building technologies and protecting the urban forest. <p>Most of these comments are outside of what can be controlled through a land use planning document but have been forwarded to the Town's Climate Change Coordinator for consideration in the Town's Climate Action Plan initiatives.</p> <p>Reference to standards added to related policies such that the OP recognizes the potential for province-wide standards in the future.</p> <p>Climate "lens" language amended to climate "framework".</p>
		<p>Upholding Treaties & Truth and Reconciliation: Ensure Indigenous rights guide climate action. Use climate planning for Truth and Reconciliation with engagement with Indigenous groups.</p> <p>Capacity: Advocate for a full-time Climate Change Specialist position. Consider additional support or higher-ranking positions for enhanced effectiveness.</p>	<p>See Indigenous consultation record.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

Increased Height in Downtown Core			
#	Name	Comment	Response
1	Jerry Libryk	<p>Specific comments in opposition to the proposed change in building height restrictions in Collingwood's Heritage Conservation District from the current three storeys to six storeys</p> <p>Comments provided included opposition to building height increase in general.</p> <p>General sentiments of preserving architectural heritage, especially at major intersections.</p>	<p>The issue has been considered. Changes to Section 5.3.1.3 (e). have been implemented to recognize lower height limits in the Downtown Core until such time as a Downtown Master Plan is completed, though the policies do set the stage for potential height increases recognizing the benefits of moderate density increases downtown to support economic vitality, transit, active transportation, mixed use, and the ability for households to live in the same neighbourhood in which they work.</p>
2	Ernie & Judy McCay		
3	Karen and Colin Lauder		
4	Laurel Lane-Moore and John Moore		
5	Nancy Havens		
6	Anne Godwin		
7	Glen & Lyn Godovitz		
8	Ted Crysler		
9	Hugh Munro		
10	Diane Staniforth		
11	L. Spode		
12	Annette Snowdon		
13	Ralph Sneyd		
14	Gordon Sheppard		
15	Monty Richardson		
16	Al Workman		
17	Tom and Joanne Sinclair		
18	Sally Potts		
19	Andy Andruchiw		
20	Margaret Mooy President, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, Collingwood Branch	<p>(Summarized) Representing the Board of Directors for the Architectural Conservancy, Collingwood branch, we are strongly opposed to allowing buildings with heights of 6 storeys within the downtown core.</p> <p>Strengthen language around built heritage and Downtown Collingwood Heritage Conservation District in Plan.</p> <p>Parks and Open Spaces - If you look at the map of the downtown area, there are very few green spaces. Cash-in-lieu of parkland should be discouraged. The green space is needed for a healthy community. The town should lead the way in preserving the natural environment.</p> <p>Parking/Transportation Management - It is difficult to encourage underground parking within our Heritage District: the water table is very high and blasting the shale rock impacts the structural well-being of the surrounding century old properties. Encouraging parking on our boulevards also creates a multitude of problems: trees are cut down, green space is covered by pavement or stones, sight lines are impacted.</p> <p>Promoting Environmental Sustainability and Adapting to Climate Change - To address the above goals, there should be more specifics included, such as having a strong programme of preserving the green space and tree canopy not only throughout the town; but especially in the downtown core and abutting century old residential areas. Trees are being cut down without any seemingly concrete plan to replant. Flower beds have been cemented over. This affects the cultural landscape of the heritage neighbourhoods as well as the Downtown Heritage Conservation District. It also affects the potential of flooding when there is a decreasing amount of green space to absorb precipitation. (Permitted parking on the boulevards, not only detracts from the heritage culture of the neighbourhood, but is also against environmental best practices of maintaining green spaces.</p>	<p>See comments on 5.3.1.3 e) above.</p> <p>A number of the suggested policy adjustments have been made. Official Plan clearly articulates the importance of the Heritage Conservation District.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Official Plan provides general guidance on parks and tree canopy preservation, which other Town documents would address more specifically (Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan and Urban Forestry Management Plan).</p>
21	Richard Lex	<p>(Summarized) Building height in the Downtown Heritage District. The proposed change in the official plan to allow six storeys or more in the Heritage District is extremely concerning. Those kinds of building heights would destroy the character of our historic downtown and would also result in pressure to demolish historic buildings to be replaced with modern structures. The result could also result in facadeism - a very poor alternative to our authentic built heritage downtown. In order to protect the Heritage District for future generations the current height limit of 3 storeys needs to be maintained.</p> <p>There needs to be explicit mention of the heritage district in some of the vision statements as shown below.</p> <p>Improvements and tightening up of some of the language around the Heritage District rules as identified in the District Plan. For example phrases such as "shall be informed by" vs "conform with".</p>	<p>See comments on 5.3.1.3 e) above.</p> <p>Some policy adjustment made as suggested.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>Add the words "built heritage" and "Downtown Collingwood Heritage Conservation District" to various policies, including Community Vision, Value 4, Section 5.3.1.1</p> <p>5.3.1.1.a) ii. Promote economic revitalization within the context of historic preservation, recognizing the potential for adaptive re-use, redevelopment and intensification. Existing buildings shall be conserved and renovated wherever practical; Not exact enough - change to: Existing buildings shall be conserved and restored according to the Downtown Collingwood Heritage District Plan (2008)</p>	<p>Many comments overlap with Architectural Conservancy of Ontario noted above. Some policy adjustments made. Official Plan clearly articulates the importance of the Heritage Conservation District.</p> <p>Policy adjustment made.</p>			
22	Cathy de Ruiter	<p>Questions:</p> <p>5.3.1.2 (e) iii. - Prohibited Uses - prohibits new low-rise residential - does this apply to a replacement? ie. a house is demolished, can it be replaced? No, the prohibition does not reply to replacement which would have options available as legal non-conforming uses. The prohibitions apply to new uses.</p> <p>Section d) provides further guidance: d) Where existing residential uses in Low-Rise Buildings legally existed as of the date of approval of this Plan exist within the Downtown Core Designation, they may be recognized in the Zoning By-law and reconstruction, extensions and/or the construction of accessory buildings on their existing lots of record may be permitted in accordance with any other applicable policies of this Plan. Additional Residential Units, home-based businesses and short-term accommodations are also permitted, subject to the provisions of the Zoning By-law. v.- prohibits new gas stations - does this apply to a replacement? ie. Circle K at the corner of Hurontario St. & Fourth St. W.</p>	<p>This would be subject to policies related to non-conforming uses, assuming it is permitted by Zoning or if the use can be demonstrated as legal non-conforming.</p>			
		<p>Height I am very concerned with the potential of 6 storey + buildings in the Heritage District in particular. Section 5.3.1.3 e) iii. states "shall be informed" I am not sure what that means. Could you clarify please?</p> <p>It means that the Downtown Heritage Conservation District Plan takes precedence if there are height restrictions, which would be further implemented in the Zoning By-law.</p>	<p>See previous response provided for Section 5.3.1.3 (e).</p>			
		<p>Parking l) i. Private Parking - would the potential plans for 144 Pine St. be an example?</p> <p>Would you be referring to 136 Pine Street? If so, there are no formal plans/applications for the property at this time. If you have concerns about private parking, please share your opinions in comments.</p> <p>5.3.1.4 Cultural Heritage g) v. Building Entrances - would the Rexall Building be an example of what will not be allowed?</p> <p>These policies would require building entrances to face the street.</p>	<p>Policy applies generally. Not referring to any specific property.</p> <p>In general, building entrances should face the street. This policy would apply to new construction or renovation that requires a Planning Act application and not to existing buildings.</p>			
23	Ted Crysler	<p>Height greater than 3 storeys in the downtown district will undermine the heritage district. There is room near the downtown core to build such mid-rise and high rise buildings, all of which would be walkable or bikeable to the downtown. There is no need to destroy the beauty of the downtown with new mid-rise or high-rise buildings. This should be removed from the official plan and a cap on height of 3 storeys should be applied to the Downtown Core as is currently the case and as set out in the Downtown Heritage Conservation District Plan.</p> <p>I also do not believe that there should be mid-rise or high-rise buildings on the waterfront. Do not repeat the mistake that Toronto made, cutting itself off from the waterfront with tall condo buildings.</p> <p>In Section 5.3.1 (a)ii., there is a sentence that states: "Existing buildings shall be conserved and renovated wherever practical." I think this should refer to the Heritage Plan as well, and we should say that the buildings will be "restored", not "renovated". So it would look something like: "Existing buildings shall be conserved and restored in accordance with the Downtown Heritage District Plan." Something that has happened elsewhere is the façade of the building remains, but the rest of the building is torn down. We need to avoid that outcome, as the built heritage is important and should remain whole. Ensuring we focus on restoration and not renovation will help with that, in addition to capping the height at 3 storeys in the downtown.</p>	<p>See previous response for Section 5.3.1.3 (e.)</p> <p>Taller buildings provide enhanced opportunities to create view corridors. Low-Rise and Mid-Rise have the potential to block views. The OP does not permit High-Rise built form in the Downtown Core Designation.</p> <p>Agree. Change implemented.</p>			
24	Sally Potts	<p>See chart below: Responses provided by Town Staff.</p>				
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>No:</td> <td>Wording</td> <td>Question</td> </tr> </table>	No:	Wording	Question	
No:	Wording	Question				

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		3.6 b iv	Where the information is available, the range of economic uses to which the resource might be put in accordance with the land use policies of this Plan.	The wording does not seem clear.	
		3.6 c	The Town may prepare a Cultural Heritage Master Plan	Other sections of the OP are more definitive (ie. Transportation Plan) Is it possible to make it more concrete.	
		3.6 i	Council may require the owner of such lands to carry out studies	Again...who will determine the difference between "may" and "should" Staff identify the requirement for Archaeological Assessments or Heritage Impact Studies through the development process. Development applications are circulated to local Indigenous Nations. The reference to 'Council' mirrors the legislative requirements that Council makes the decisions via staff recommendations. Is it worth asking that the Heritage Committee be involved in this. Given that a developer may not have to complete a study, it would be helpful to have the HC and the local Indigenous community consulted at the very least? Transparency would be welcomed by all.	
		5.1.1.8	Where short-term accommodations, including bed and breakfast establishments, are permitted as a home industry or home occupation, they shall only be permitted in the principal residence of the short-term accommodation owner,	Will the issue of Airbnbs be dealt with later? The Town has been consulting the community on this matter (led by the By-law Department) and these policies are in line with staff recommendations to date. The Official Plan has limited ability to regulate STA's, where the Zoning By-law and proposed Licensing Program are more effective tools.	
		5.2.5.3	The Town is considering the future of the Grain Terminals and surrounding lands.	Helpful to see this potential amendment. I'm wondering if this should go in the Appendix so that it would be easier to amend? We would prefer leaving this placeholder policy here, as it requires a future planning process to implement a Grain Terminal vision.	
		5.3.1.2	xiv. Residential Apartments, including Additional Needs Housing, in Mid-Rise or High Rise Buildings;	Appears to contradict the introduction of the section? Primarily mid-rise? Who will determine where these go? I'm not sure I see a contradiction, the policies permit both Mid and High-rise built form, but the intention is that it is primarily in mid-rise form.	
		5.3.1.2	Appreciated the list of banned developments		
		5.3.1.3 b	Seems to be encouraging high rise	If that's the case, perhaps change the intro to the section? Policies permit both built forms.	
		5.3.1.4h	Visual Character ...shall require the visual improvement of character of all existing and future development within the DCC...	Does that mean that all businesses must improve their frontage? Seems unclear or unnecessary? Agree that this policy could be softened, as the Town can't compel improvements beyond maintenance.	
		App. 1 Pg. 6	Cultural Heritage	Pg. 6 Why is 660 Sixth Street on this page? This is a listed Heritage property. Agreed that the location of it is confusing, and will be relocated to the Heritage Register in a final draft for clarity.	
			The section on tree canopy is welcomed. Is it possible to have something related to the boulevard beautification / encouraging native plantings. Other jurisdictions in Ontario have moved towards this.		
25	Mark Palmer	I would like to first specifically voice my support for the proactive approach for intensification within the Downtown Core and both Mixed-Use Corridor Designations. In particular, I support the proposed height specifications presented in Section 5.1.8.2 (Mid-Rise Buildings).		Acknowledged and agreed.	
		For the time being, please consider the following comments. I would also appreciate a response before the fall 2023 Public Information Centre as well: 1) Section 5.3.3 (The Mixed-Use Corridor II Designation) – There are no references to building height details with similar information included in Section 5.3.1 (The Downtown Core Designation) and 5.3.2 (The Mixed-Use Corridor I Designation). Therefore, does the building height details in Section 5.1.8.2 (Mid-Rise Buildings) apply for Section 5.3.3? If not, what building height details should be included in Section 5.3.3 ?; 2) Section 5.3.1 (The Downtown Core Designation) maximum building height specification is different from what is stipulated in Section 5.1.8.2 (Mid-Rise Buildings) . Please explain the reason for the difference; and, 3) In Section 5.3.1.3 (The Downtown Core Designation – General Development Policies), street and/or intersection named references related to the "key entry points" should be included to avoid confusion and interpretation. This includes naming the Market Lane - Hume Street intersection as one of the "key entry points" to the Downtown Core Designation (as there is now wayward signage at this location), as well as other gateway (street corridor or intersection) locations entering the Downtown Core Designation too.		Responses provided by Town staff in a dedicated meeting.	
		Finally, I would like to voice my support for the Rapid Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) initiative. I became aware of this program when I recently constructed my own ADU. I was able to share (with staff later on) my personal and professional insights, as well as other best practices taking hold within other municipalities. I congratulate the inclusive process that Town staff have taken already in soliciting feedback through the Engage Collingwood – Official Plan Update portal.		Acknowledged, but not related to the OP.	

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

Golf Course Redevelopment		
Name	Comment	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Elizabeth Ellis > Dave and Pamela Dickson > Michael Deslippe > Carol Comish > Dave Carter > Donald Avery > Dave Dickson, President of Fairway Blue condo > Peter Walsh > Tony O'Neil > Robert May > Kevin Marshman > Michael Hafeman > Scott Fitzgerald > Helena Hutton > Tom and Joanne Sinclair > L. Haldenby 	<p>Generally opposed to the conversion of the existing Cranberry Golf Course to any other land use.</p> <p>More specific concerns about the wording of:</p> <p>Section 5.2.5.3 (e).</p> <p>Section 5.6.4.1</p>	<p>Importantly, an Official Plan cannot limit a landowner's ability to make application for an Official Plan Amendment. However, an Official Plan Amendment requires a "complete" application that includes a host of technical studies in support of the Amendment, including Environmental Impact Study, as well as other hydrological and/or hydrogeological studies. Following the submission, there is a full statutory public process and a decision of Council. Following the decision of Council, if the Amendment is adopted by Council, it would then be sent to the County for approval. Any approval is also appealable to the Ontario Land Tribunal. The application is also appealable to the Ontario Land Tribunal by the applicant, should it be refused by Council.</p> <p>Further, an Official Plan Amendment is only one step in the development approval process. Subsequent approvals for rezoning (also a public process) would be required, as well as Draft Plan of Subdivision/Condominium, and potentially Site Plan Approval.</p> <p>In response to the comments the policies have been adjusted</p>
		<p>In response to the concerns raised specifically about the wording of Section 5.2.5.3 (e), the wording has been adjusted to clarify the intent of the municipality pertaining to golf course conversion in the context of the proposed Provincial policy, legislative changes, and County OPA 7.</p> <p>With respect to the final sentence of section 5.6.4.1 (a), the wording as written is correct. The preparation of the analysis of species at risk is mandatory for all development and may be scoped based on the scale of the proposal.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

Transportation and Active Transportation			
#	Name	Comment	Response
1	John Housser	<p>"Local Roads n) Local Roads are existing and proposed roads of 2 traffic lanes which are intended primarily to provide access to abutting properties. Local Roads should be designed to discourage the movement of through-traffic and generally function as distributor roads. Local Roads shall generally have a minimum right-of-way width of 20 metres."</p> <p>On review. The OP addresses future plans for developing Transportation System but fails to address the historical problems created by the evolution of Collingwood over the last decades. Of particular interest is the growth of THROUGH TOWN, THROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD TRAFFIC. Some residential intersections are now seeing over 5000 vehicles per day (Cedar and Second Street). There are more troubling residential intersections mainly in the older grid neighbourhoods This is not part of the vision of the Official Plan. Specifically noticeable are the intersections of High and Sixth, and High and Third.</p>	<p>The policy framework has been reviewed and modest revisions made to the wording, which could be supported by existing studies and/or good engineering practices.</p> <p>Issues of this level of detail need to be considered through the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan. Pending the results of the Master Plan, future updates to the OP may be substantiated.</p>
2	Darlene Craig	<p>Please find below an email exchange between Engineering Manager West and myself regarding whether Sixth Street east of High Street is a residential street. During Mr. West's Council presentation regarding his design recommendation for the redevelopment of Sixth Street, he states numerous times that this section is a 'preferred route for large trucks'. He does not state that through truck traffic should be restricted, as Section 6.1.8 b)ii) in OP Draft 2 states.</p> <p>Sixth Street was designated a collector road many years ago and has over 100 residential homes with abutting driveways between High and Hurontario Streets. Is it therefore, not considered a residential street? What is the definition of a residential street? What is the definition of a residential area, as mentioned in Section 6.1.8 b)? Please strengthen and clarify these definitions in the next draft of the Official Plan, so as to avoid any misconceptions.</p> <p>There is a 2006 Home Depot Site Plan Agreement that includes a requirement for them to help pay to remove the existing lights at the Home Depot exit and move to Third & High. (I was unable to access it, apparently because of privacy laws)</p> <p>In the 2020 budget there was \$3 million set aside to move fully functioning Home Depot lights approx. 100 meters to Third. The estimate is probably double that now.</p>	<p>Issues of this level of detail need to be considered through the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p> <p>Pending the results of the Master Plan, future updates to the OP may be substantiated.</p>
3 4 5	Darlene Craig Jack and Sue Marley Diane Neely Mary Roth	<p>Remove red-dotted 'future collector' road in the RDC (20 High Street) on Schedule 6 until new development plans are finalized and substantiated by a Transportation Study.</p> <p>Citizen concerns are an indication of a larger problem: Collingwood has never had a MTP. The road designations on Schedule 6 are based on incomplete and outdated traffic studies from 2012 and 2019.</p>	<p>Not appropriate to remove without justification. To be considered through the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan. Pending the results of the Master Plan, future updates to the OP may be substantiated.</p>
6	Kenneth Swain	<p>A. Official Plan Draft 2 continues the functionally rooted definitions of Arterial Roads and Collector Roads with no apparent volume based criteria or element imbedded in either. In the case of the former, the purpose or function is the conveyance of traffic between major traffic generating areas and/or other Arterial Roads, whereas, Collector Roads are designed to carry traffic from Local Roads to Arterial Roads and/or distribute traffic to Local Roads.</p> <p>The preponderance of traffic on Arterial Roads is thoroughfare in nature with neither its seminal nor end point being Local Roads which, in the case of Collector Roads, is an essential characteristic.</p> <p>B. A visual tracking of traffic on Third Street between High Street and Hurontario shows a current Arterial functioning of Third Street as Official Plan Draft 2 contemplates such term. This deduction would be conclusively determined if appropriate traffic tracking procedures and analysis were to be put in place.</p>	<p>Issues of this level of detail need to be considered through the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p> <p>Pending the results of the Master Plan, future updates to the OP may be substantiated.</p> <p>Third Street has been discussed previously, see comment matrix in Report P2023-24. Issues of this level of detail need to be considered through the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>And yet, the physical characteristics of Third Street are at cross purposes with those which should attend roads having an Arterial function. More specifically, with 67 driveways on or immediately adjacent to Third Street and 9 north / south intersections it is folly to ignore the likelihood of traffic chaos, property damage and personal injury or worse.</p> <p>D. Third Street (together with Ontario Street, but especially Third Street) presently serves a thoroughfare function and, accordingly, is functionally Arterial as such term is contemplated in Official Plan Draft 2. It is fundamentally ill suited to do so presently and especially so as ultimately implied by Official Plan Draft 2.</p>	Issues of this level of detail need to be considered through the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.
7	Paul Frayne Sept 4, 2023	<p>Please see my comments on Draft 2 of the Official Plan. Thank you for providing this opportunity for community engagement.</p> <p>1. All road classifications, active transportation routes, cycle pathways on schedule 6 should be finalized after the completion of the Mobility and Transportation Master Plan</p> <p>2. The Active Transportation Plan - Schedule 5 - should be completed after the completion of the Mobility and Transportation Master Plan.</p> <p>3. Schedule 5 - neighbourhood bikeway - as shown in blue - all future bikeway routes should prioritize separated bike lanes and/or best current design for this bike route. Paved shoulders or painted on bike symbols are not adequate/safe cycling route infrastructure.</p>	<p>Agreed. Schedules 5 and 6 may be updated via an Official Plan Amendment following the completion of the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p> <p>The Master Mobility and Transportation Plan will include an Active Transportation component.</p>
		<p>4. Traffic calming policy should be developed with the Mobility and Transportation Master Plan. This policy should include citizen collaboration and proactive steps to ensure safe streets. Traffic calming features should be visually included in the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan - and referenced in the OP.</p> <p>5. Complete Streets Vision - this should be specifically defined with visual examples. Citizens need to see how our streets will be designed for all users. Citizens need to see with examples what a safe street is.</p> <p>6. Vision Zero - needs to be a goal stated in the OP (and define in the Master mobility and Transportation Plan)</p> <p>7. Speed reduction is key for any sustainability goals as outlined in the Official Plan. Active Transportation, prioritizing walking and cycling will not happen with high speeds on residential streets. Speed reduction should be completed in conjunction with the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan. A speed of 30km on residential streets - with supporting traffic calming infrastructure is critical for the success of many of the sustainability and safety visions as outlined in the OP.</p>	<p>This request has been forwarded to Town staff working on the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p> <p>Vision Zero and speed reduction should be addressed in the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan and a high level policy reference has been included in the OP.</p>
		<p>8. Complete streets vision - should be a visual guide in the Draft Plan. Citizens will benefit from visually seeing the future of safe active transport options in Collingwood and what a Complete street actually is.</p> <p>9. The Community Safety Zones around school are not adequate now. The zones should be extended by at least one or two blocks. The speed should be reduced to 30km with traffic calming throughout the community safety zone.</p> <p>10. Safe street crossings - this should be specifically defined using the best current practice. Visual examples should be included to inform citizens.</p> <p>11. All future road re-design/construction (including 6th street) - must be built to support safe and sustainable active transportation.</p> <p>12. The proper (safe) use of local roads is a major issue in Collingwood. Local roads must have safe speeds (30km) and traffic calming throughout. Proactive road design - with citizen engagement - is critical to ensure local roads are meeting the overall goals of this draft plan. Overall goals are = safe, prioritizing active transport, healthy people, healthy environment, climate goals.</p>	<p>Not an appropriate level of detail in an Official Plan. The detailed standards associated with complete streets should be articulated in the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p> <p>Not an Official Plan issue and is being addressed by Engineering Services through a separate report.</p> <p>Not an Official Plan issue and should be dealt with through engineering standards.</p> <p>The OP sets the stage for this concept, details to be articulated through the Master Transportation Plan and/or engineering standards.</p> <p>Not an Official Plan issue and is being addressed by Engineering Services through a separate process.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

	10/27/2023	<p>Concerning the 2nd draft of the OP:</p> <p>I live in Collingwood with my wife and our 7 year old son. I am very concerned that the current version of the OP does not address the unsafe transportation issues that Collingwood faces.</p> <p>If we want a sustainable and prosperous vision for our community we must address the transportation problems listed below. The OP will not as written allow citizens and the Town to fix and create the overall community that we all want to see.</p> <p>I would like to walk and cycle on my street with my son and feel safe. I would like our residential communities to develop as true community spaces where people interact - not where vehicle speed and volume limit community health and prosperity.</p> <p>Laneways, Local Streets and Minor Collector Streets service residential neighbourhoods. They have a high number of driveways, they serve the people using multi-modal transportation; walking, wheeling, transit, and vehicles. They are designed for "access". The safety of a neighbourhood street is only achieved with Traffic Calming, lower speed limits and by limiting through traffic.</p>	<p>Issues of this level of detail need to be considered through the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p> <p>Pending the results of the Master Plan, future updates to the OP may be substantiated.</p>
8	Darlene Craig + Jeanette Beck	<p>1. The Draft 2 of the OP would serve its citizens by expanding the Road Classifications</p> <p>2. The Town has never had a Master Transportation Plan. As a result the a town wide transportation analysis has never been completed. Historical road designations, incomplete and outdated traffic studies have resulted in poor traffic management. This is especially noted in existing residential neighbourhoods, confusing road signage, erratic speed limits, inadequate and dangerous pedestrian crossings. Also the lack of a goods management strategy is negatively impacting our community. The Master Mobility and Transportation Plan will be a thorough study and realignment which reflects current best practices. Why burden this policy document by including such flawed Schedules as #6?</p>	<p>The Town has had two studies completed, which may meet the definition and intent of master plans. Nonetheless, the OP has been updated to refer to them as-"studies" and reflect that a Master Mobility and Transportation Plan is ongoing.</p>
		<p>The Draft 2 of the OP should not include the outdated and inaccurate Schedule 6.</p> <p>3. The Town is committed to produce policies that support environmentally sustainable development. A multi-modal transportation system is an important component of this commitment. The future design of our road network and reconstruction of existing roads to accommodate multi-modal transportation solutions are not separate solutions. Recreational trails are only one component of a multi-modal transportation network. A successful active transportation network is achieved when the transportation network is analyzed in its entirety. Therefore they need to be considered together in the new transportation policy document.</p> <p>The Draft 2 of the OP should refer to the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p>	<p>Schedule 6 may be updated via an Official Plan Amendment upon the completion of the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p> <p>The OP sets the stage for this concept, details to be articulated through the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan and/or engineering standards.</p> <p>Wording has been left general for the purposes of the OP but may be updated to reflect the title of the document, once completed.</p>
9	Darlene Craig	<p>In Ron Palmer's, July 31st, 2023 Council presentation regarding Transportation Schedule 6, he makes many references to "prior" and "various" Master Transportation Plans.</p> <p>He is quoted saying, "Schedule 6 draft is not tremendously different from your existing plan because it reflects work that has been carried out in prior Transportation Plans."</p> <p>In the Appendix A, Transportation section, the document states, "A new TMP has not been developed for the Town." "The town is committed to carrying-out an update to the Transportation Master Plan (budget2023)."</p> <p>There needs to be public transparency. These are all very misleading statements, as they make the assumption that there is an old/existing TMP that is to be replaced with a new TMP.</p>	<p>All of these statements are factual.</p> <p>There are two existing studies that have informed Schedule 6, which may meet the definition of a master plan. Nonetheless, the OP has been updated to refer to them as "studies" and reflect that a Master Mobility and Transportation Plan is ongoing.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>Does the consultant not realize that Collingwood does not have an existing Transportation Master Plan (TMP)? That there has never been a Transportation Master Plan developed for Collingwood.</p> <p>The OP Draft 2 Update, Schedule 6 is relying on two outdated, vehicle-centric Transportation Studies from 2012 and 2019, as well as, various Traffic Impact Studies (TIS) sanctioned by developers to support their Draft Plan Approvals.</p> <p>Collingwood is committed to carrying-out its first-ever TMP for the Town. No changes to Transportation Schedule 6 should be preemptively made until such time.</p> <p>Please wait to make any Schedule 6 changes, such as the road reclassifications of Campbell Street, Cambridge Street, Old Mountain Road and Third Street (west of High Street) until they can be further substantiated through a thorough Town of Collingwood's Transportation and Mobility Master Plan.</p>	<p>There are two existing studies that have informed Schedule 6, which may meet the definition of a master plan. Nonetheless, the OP has been updated to refer to them as "studies" and reflect that a Master Transportation Plan is ongoing.</p> <p>Schedule 6 will be part of the Official Plan until such time as it is adjusted by an Official Plan Amendment, supported by the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p>
10	Kathleen Chin	<p>I am writing to express my concern that Third Street could be extended past High Street to Mountain Road, before the Master Mobility and Transportation plan is completed. This would also include moving the traffic lights from the Home Depot entrance south to Third Street.</p> <p>It does not make sense to me that we would want to increase traffic through the Tree Streets residential neighbourhood. We should be encouraging pedestrian and bicycle traffic in this area and more cars will increase the risk to pedestrians and cyclists. But in any case, any changes should be put on hold until the Master Mobility and Transportation plan is completed to ensure that there are strong reasons for these changes.</p>	<p>Third Street has been previously discussed, see comment matrix in Report P2023-24. Issues of this detail are to be addressed in the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan.</p>
11	Jack and Sue Marley	<p>Schedule 5 Active Transportation Plan is a draft illustrating a yellow highlighted line showing a "Future Improvement" from High Street curving west at Third St and continuing on to join up with Cambridge near Mountain Road.</p> <p>I cannot find anywhere in the Active Transportation section or the Complete Streets conversion where this "Future Improvement" is discussed or proven.</p> <p>Action requested: Kindly remove this section of the yellow highlight from Schedule 5</p>	<p>To be considered through the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan. Pending the results of the Master Plan, future updates to the OP may be substantiated.</p>
12	Safe Streets Collingwood	<p>The MMTP should incorporate the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streets need traffic calming, shade, wind protection and greenery, frequent safe pedestrian crossings etc. • People feel safe on streets that are designed to protect people outside of their cars; restrict volume and speed. • Successful streets make successful neighbourhoods. <p>In order to clarify the policy goals of providing Active Transportation in this OP, it would be beneficial to differentiate roads from streets. This should include differentiating the number of lanes and the public ROW right-of-way widths. (see attached notes to Section 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways • Arterial Roads • Major Collector Roads • Minor/Local Collector Streets • Local Streets • Laneways <p>Private streets must also anticipate Active Transportation as part of their design and maintenance.</p>	<p>Agreed. Good list of topics to be addressed in the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan, comments will be shared with staff working on that project.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>The traffic patterns generated by the widespread use of traffic apps, such as Google maps and Waze, need to be given strong consideration when implementing safety policies relating to active transportation, such as speed limits, cross walks, bike lanes etc. These apps - not the OP - will determine the fastest route for all vehicles to travel through our neighbourhoods. Therefore it is imperative that historical and outdated maps and the wording in Section 6 is updated to mitigate through traffic and ensure safety for all neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The wording under the Transportation Section 6, including a complete and updated Schedule 6, needs to reflect our current policies of an environmentally sustainable transportation network.</p> <p>As words matter, the following vocabulary, which is currently being used in the context of transportation policies, should be included in Section 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Ages and Abilities • Active Transportation • Complete Streets • Traffic Calming • Safe pedestrian crossings • Community Safety Zones 	<p>Agreed. Good list of topics to be addressed in the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan, comments will be shared with staff working on that project. Many high level policies already exist in the OP incorporating these term where they are appropriate for a land use planning document.</p>
		<p>Also as words matter, all sections of the OP, not exclusive of Section 6, should incorporate current best practice concepts such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision Zero • Active Transportation • Multi-Modal • Complete Streets • Roads versus Streets (not stroads) • Mobility • Safety & Accessibility (for all ages and abilities) • 15-minute communities (especially insight of all the new planned subdivisions) <p>In conclusion, as the goal of the OP is to provide a general policy framework for the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan, to holistically integrate vehicular movement and active transportation, then the wording needs to be modified.</p>	<p>Agreed. Good list of topics to be addressed in the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan, comments will be shared with staff working on that project. Many high level policies already exist in the OP incorporating these term where they are appropriate for a land use planning document, with vision zero having been added in the most recent version. The OP applies to all ages, abilities, genders, socio-economic backgrounds, and other human rights classifications, clarifying policy added.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

General Comments			
#	Name	Comment	Response
1	Doug Linton Chair, Affordable Housing Task Force	<p>We are disappointed with the absence of a clear definition of 'affordable housing' within the OP, replaced in some instances by the term 'attainable housing.' We understand that this change in terminology is beyond the Town's control, as it aligns with modifications to the overarching Provincial Planning Statement, which no longer includes "affordable housing" as a defined term and lacks policies supporting direct municipal action through Official Plans. However, we continue to advocate for the widely accepted definition of affordable housing, where housing costs should not exceed 30% of a household's gross, pre-tax income. Regardless of the terminology, defined parameters, universally agreed to and used to establish housing policy, are vital.</p> <p>While we maintain that supply alone is not the sole solution to improving affordable housing, we acknowledge its crucial role in housing affordability. Consequently, the AHTF fully supports and encourages the OP's intensification efforts in key nodes, corridors, and existing neighborhoods throughout Collingwood. Recognizing the significance of intensification in promoting affordability, we endorse the concept of responsible growth within our existing urban areas. The accommodation of intensification in taller buildings along major transportation corridors will enhance housing options, affordability, walkability, and transit use. Additionally, permitting a broader range of residential dwelling unit types in existing neighborhoods traditionally reserved for low-density single-detached dwellings will contribute to a well-rounded, inclusive, and people-centric community.</p> <p>Lastly, the AHTF expresses concern regarding the inefficient use of land associated with overbuilding (monster homes), which occupy lots that could be better utilized for multi-residential units addressing housing affordability in our community. While we acknowledge that size-related policies may be addressed during the Zoning By-Law phase, we recommend that the OP incorporate verbiage within the affordable housing toolkit policy section to signify the Town's intent to explore sizing provisions within the Zoning By-Law.</p>	Some minor wording adjustments have been made given the recent Provincial announcement to consider re-instating an income based definition of affordable housing, however the Official Plan goes about as far as it can on this issue within the parameters of current and expected Provincial legislation.
2	Jan Ferrigan	<p>For the most part, the Draft Plan seems like a good plan for Collingwood's future. I have the following comments and questions about the draft plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in section 2.2, Value 1 is Protection of the Natural Heritage System. Is the ranking at Value 1 the result of previous public engagement? If so, would it be more consistent to list Promoting Environmental Sustainability and Adapting to Climate Change higher in section 3.1 c)? 	The order of the listing of Community Values (now Community Priorities) does not imply their level of importance. They are all equally important. Text has been added to clarify this issue.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I really like the concept of 15-Minute Community. Could 15 Minute Communities in Collingwood be required to contain i. Retail Commercial Store, with a particular emphasis on pharmacies and food stores, and/or a Farmer's Market; and any three of the other services and facilities?. There are some new developments in Collingwood and elsewhere that may contain some of the services and facilities listed, but without any commercial space available for food in the form of a supermarket, restaurant, Farmer's market and/or cafe, communities do not feel truly walkable. This seems to be addressed in 3.7 g) iii. "Ensure that all neighbourhoods include permission for small-scale convenience retail and other appropriate neighbourhood serving uses." but it is unclear if "permission" means that retail will be within each neighbourhood or if this simply means there is potential for retail. Potential does not always lead to a result. Will many subdivisions continue to be built without retail properties within walking and cycling distance? • 3.5 h "Appropriate landscaping, but avoiding landscaping that might create blind spots or hiding places" sounds contraindicatory to preserving natural heritage. Would wooded areas be considered hiding places? 	<p>The concept of a 15-minute community has been changed to a "Complete Community". It is difficult to "require". It is more appropriate to "permit", and that is included in the land use policies for residential neighbourhoods.</p> <p>They key difference is landscape in this context is meant to imply "human-made" elements rather than natural heritage features.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does "no net-loss" tree preservation refer to no net-loss of biomass/actual tree canopy or number of trees. e.g. if a very large tree is cut down, will it be sufficient to replace with a younger much smaller tree resulting in net loss of biomass/total tree canopy? • 6.1.3. e) vii "Incorporate suitable travel surfaces appropriate for the intended type of traffic (pedestrians/bicycles/snowmobiles etc.), and be of a material that requires little maintenance;" Would it be possible to change to " an environmentally sustainable material that requires little maintenance" to be consistent with climate change and sustainability goals? • The public transit system section does not mention changing the way public transit is implemented i.e. moving away from driving large, mostly empty buses along set routes and having public transit only used by a small segment of the population. There was an initiative to create a more responsive, modern transit system where passengers could request service and not necessarily wait long periods at stops and ride buses through streets and stops where no passengers were waiting and take long periods of time to get to a destination. Is a new way of running the transit system still being pursued? Should that be noted in the plan? • Are the developments in the circled areas already approved? If not, would it not be possible to preserve a buffer area of wetland habitat in this area for recreational value, water protection and wildlife protection? Several wildlife species currently use this area including otters, egrets, herons, spotted sandpiper, American toad (for breeding) and many others. See https://inaturalist.ca/observations?place_id=any&subview=map for some verified observations. 	<p>Wording has been adjusted to refer to tree canopy in Urban Forest (j) vi.</p> <p>Wording change made.</p> <p>Not an Official Plan issue, comment has been forwarded to appropriate staff.</p> <p>There is a process to consider and conserve/plant appropriate buffers in proximity to Natural Heritage features through site specific applications. Further, all development must consider endangered species/species at risk, which may include a scoped study based on the scale of the proposal.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

3	Kevin Tone	<p>I would like to see major decisions that the Town Staff and Council need to make, be scrutinized through a Climate Lens. Examples of this would be planning for the infrastructure to provide the electrification of our transit vehicles...as well as a short timeline for NOT allowing natural gas heating in new family homes, entire subdivisions and low, mid and high rise buildings.</p> <p>I am very pleased with many facets of the Draft Plan, such as...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reducing urban sprawl with the condition of 50% of future growth being within Designated Growth Areas of the existing footprint of the Town and intensification through higher buildings. -Lots of mentions about the commitment to improved Transit, and expanded safe Active Transportation routes that all help to reduce automobile gridlock/pollution. 	<p>See previous comments on climate change lens. Issues of Natural Gas is not an issue for the Official Plan and are controlled by the Ontario Building Code.</p> <p>Acknowledged and agree.</p>
		<p>I would like to pass on my observations for specific areas of improvement...Since this is a plan for almost 30 years; in my opinion Schedule 5 which shows the planned future bike friendly routes, is missing the following components.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In regards to this 2nd Draft of the Official Plan and the future Downtown Master Plan, please add bike/pedestrian friendly routes on all the Collector roads in the Downtown area as shown on Schedule 6; along with a few more additions (Ste. Marie from Hume St. to Huron St.; Pine St. from 4th to Side Launch Way; 4th from Pine to Ste. Marie; 2nd from Pine to Hurontario, Simcoe from Hurontario to St. Paul and Hurontario from Side Launch Way to Hume.) -It would also be great to have either stoplights or a bike/pedestrian crossing at Huron St. from the North end of Ste. Marie (and/or St. Paul St.) for safe access to the Public Piazza Park in the Side Launch Way area. <p>Plan for 2 more new bike/pedestrian friendly routes to run from 1st St. to 3rd St. at existing and future stoplight crossings. One on Spruce St. and the other at the proposed stoplights at Birch St. Both of these would provide access to the planned bike/pedestrian friendly 3rd St., as well as to the waterfront parks and other amenities north of 1st St. and to the Georgian Trail connection for safe travel to all the commercial areas on 1st St. and Balsam St..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Is there any way to build a connecting trail from the South end of the Walnut Trail (at Campbell St.) to Findlay Dr..? 	<p>Issues at this level of detail are to be considered in the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan, which, when complete, may form the basis for a future Official Plan Amendment.</p>
4	Knowles M.	<p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.2 COMMUNITY VALUES - The Community Based Strategic Plan clearly highlights the residents' desire for a healthy and complete community....., well connected for all modes of travel, and prioritizes active transportation. The OP Draft 2 takes these clear desires and priorities and then shows them as Values 9, 10, and 11 – the last three values on the list. The placement of these values is not consistent with the stated desires of the Town residents. • Some of the language concerning plan implementation is too “flexible”, leaving too much room for plans to not be implemented. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 3.2 PROVIDING HOUSING OPTIONS - The Town shall prepare an Affordable Housing Master Plan but the Town shall encourage.....the provision of attainable housing. The Town will need to do more than just encourage the provision of affordable housing if it wishes to make the Affordable Housing Plan a reality. o 3.5 ENSURING HIGH QUALITY URBAN DESIGN – h) Adequate lighting should read shall be designed as opposed to should be designed, where possible. o 3.7 PROMOTING ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILTY AND ADAPTING TO CLIMATE CHANGE - b) should read that “the Town shall develop” as opposed to “the Town may develop” a Climate Change Action Plan. • I agree with the need for higher density housing in town, however a maximum height of 12 stories definitively seems excessive and out of character for a town of Collingwood's size. 	<p>The order of the listing of Community Values (now Community Priorities) does not imply their level of importance. They are all equally important. Text has been added to clarify this issue.</p> <p>The wording is appropriate.</p> <p>The wording is appropriate.</p> <p>The wording is appropriate.</p> <p>12 storeys is a maximum height that is not permitted Town-wide and is limited to strategic growth designation and subject to extensive compatibility policies.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In numerous locations within the draft plan, the references to “parking” seem only to deal primarily with vehicle parking with little mention of bicycle parking requirements. Both types of parking are required to ensure that the Town succeeds with its active transportation goals. • Schedule 5 – There are numerous inaccuracies in this map with the main one being that the legend uses terminology that is inconsistent with the new OTM Book 18 terminology. Since all future on-road active transportation facilities should be designed using the new OTM Book 18 standards, it is critical that the Schedule 5 map accurately reflect the correct terminology. In addition, the designations shown on the map for Sixth Street (High Street to Hurontario Street), Third Street, and Ontario Street are not correct and disagree with the Town’s Cycling Plan. Other minor corrections can be obtained by contacting the Trails and Active Transportation Advisory Committee. • Section 6 – I would recommend modifying the term “Master Transportation Plan” to be “Master Transportation and Mobility Plan”. In addition, I believe that the road designations of Arterial, Collector, and Local are very traditional designations that are no longer sufficient to categorize the road infrastructure within the Town – particularly considering the rapid expansion of active transportation infrastructure and how it would likely vary between categories due to traffic volumes and speeds. It should be modified to include Arterial Roads, Major Collector Roads, Local Collector Streets, and Local Streets. 	<p>Wording changed to identify bicycle parking</p> <p>Schedule 5 may be amended following the completion of the Master Mobility and Transportation Plan</p> <p>Agreed. Changed to Master Mobility and Transportation Plan</p>
5	<p>MHBC</p> <p>Kory Chisholm, Partner</p> <p>Shayne Connors, Intermediate Planner</p>	<p>On behalf of our Client, the Downtown Collingwood Business Improvement Area (BIA), please find enclosed preliminary comments regarding Draft 2 of the Town of Collingwood’s Official Plan Update.</p> <p>1. Downtown Commercial Core Protection Policies Regarding the Sale of Alcohol</p> <p>We note that the current Town of Collingwood OP contains protection policies that prohibit retail outlets for the sale of alcoholic beverages outside of the Downtown Core designation. We further note that these protection policies have been carried forward in Draft 2 of the Town of Collingwood OP. We support these policies being carried forward; however, it is understood that supermarkets are now provincially permitted to sell certain types of alcoholic beverages. As such, we request that these protection policies be slightly revised in Draft 2 of the OP Update to ensure that the prohibition applies to retail establishments that predominately sell alcoholic beverages that are not produced on-site.</p>	<p>Text has been updated in response to this comment</p>
		<p>These revisions would apply to Policy 5.3.2.2 e) iii. (Mixed Use Designation I Permitted Uses), Policy 5.3.3.2 e) ii. (Mixed Use Designation II Permitted Uses), and Policy 5.3.4.2 e) iii. (Regional Commercial District Permitted Uses). Draft wording is proposed as follows:</p> <p>Financial institutions and any retail outlets that predominately sell alcoholic beverages that are not produced on site - not including restaurants or facilities where alcoholic beverages are made, or partially made, sold, and consumed within one building. The Town may consider relief from this policy through an Amendment to this Plan that is supported by a Retail Commercial Study that demonstrated no negative impact on the Downtown Core, and addresses any other relevant economic development or land use planning considerations to the satisfaction of the Town. The Town may also conduct such a study on a Town-wide basis.</p>	<p>Text has been updated in response to this comment</p>
		<p>2. Prohibition of Financial Institutions and Retail Establishments for the Sale of Alcoholic Beverages in the Mixed Use I, Mixed Use II, and Regional Commercial District Designations</p> <p>As previously mentioned, it is noted that Financial Institutions and Retail Establishments for the Sale of Alcoholic Beverages are only permitted in the Downtown Core designation under the Town’s current OP policy framework. It is further noted that these uses specific to the Downtown Core designation are proposed to be carried forward in Draft 2 of the OP Update. We agree and support that this policy framework is proposed to be carried forward, as this has led to a clear distinction between the important Regional Commercial District and Downtown Commercial areas within the Town, and we believe both have been successful as a result of the existing policy framework. A lot of work was completed previously to establish the existing commercial structure within the Town, including the Downtown Area and West End Regional Commercial Area, and the Downtown Collingwood BIA would request that no substantial changes be made to this existing commercial policy framework. This may be re-evaluated during the completion of a Town-wide commercial study.</p>	<p>Text adjusted in response to this comment</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

	<p>3. Downtown Core Designation Permitted Uses It is noted that under Policy 4.4.4.1 of the current Town of Collingwood OP, Food Supermarkets are listed as a permitted use. From our review of Draft 2 of the Collingwood OP, it appears that Policy 5.3.1.2 does not list Food Supermarkets as a permitted use. Food Supermarkets are an important use and there is an existing Loblaws Supermarket that is an important anchor of the downtown area. As such, we request that Food Supermarkets be carried forward as a permitted use in the Downtown Core designation.</p> <p>4. Downtown Core Designation Minimum Height It is noted that under Policy 5.3.1.3 e) ii., the Draft 2 Collingwood OP proposes a minimum height of 2 storeys or 8 metres, whichever is greater, for new development in the Downtown Core designation. It is requested that this policy be revised to “the minimum height for a new development shall generally be 2 storeys or 8 metres, whichever is greater” in order to provide flexibility, as there may be existing buildings that proceed with ‘development’ as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan that should not necessitate the existing buildings being made taller. Additionally, exiting historic buildings may be under 2 storeys and should not be required to go taller if proceeding with a ‘development’ application.</p> <p>5. Downtown Core Designation Maximum Height It is noted that under Policy 5.3.1.3 e) iii., the Draft 2 Collingwood OP proposed a maximum height of 6 storeys or 20 metres, whichever is less for the Downtown Core designation. From the BIA’s perspective this is a significant change that requires careful consideration and balance in consideration of the existing small Town character and Downtown Heritage Conservation District Plan. It is requested that any increased maximum height provisions to be included in the new OP be deferred until the Downtown Visioning consultation, leading to the development of the Downtown Master Plan has been completed by the Town in order to ensure that appropriate maximum height provisions are reviewed and determined in the context of compatibility within the existing Downtown character and Downtown Heritage Conservation District Plan. The BIA feels that through this exercise increased height permissions can be reviewed in greater detail and potentially targeted within the Downtown area to areas where it is more appropriate while lesser heights may be appropriate to be maintained in other areas of the Downtown.</p>	<p>Food supermarkets are a permitted retail use. They are only identified when they are to be specifically prohibited. Expanding locations for food supermarkets is critical to avoid food deserts, ensure equitable access to healthy food, and support complete communities/AT/transit.</p> <p>Text is included to deal with this issue.</p> <p>Text has been adjusted to reflect concerns about height in the Downtown Core Designation and Heritage Conservation District. Will be reviewed through a Downtown Master Plan process.</p>
	<p>6. Downtown Core Designation Minimum Parking It is noted that Policy 2.3.1.3 k) and Policy 5.3.1.3 l) of Draft 2 of the Collingwood OP outline provisions related to Parking and Transportation Management for new developments in the Downtown Core designation. We request that there should be no minimum parking requirements for all permitted non-residential uses within the Downtown Core designation as this will promote more efficient development and reduce required parking where supported.</p>	<p>This type of request requires support through parking study, or more comprehensively, potentially through the Downtown Master Plan, policies have been clarified.</p>
	<p>7. Surface Parking It is noted that Policy 5.3.1.4 i) contains policies related to Parking and Access. Specifically, Policy 5.3.1.4 i) i. contains prescriptive wording that surface parking lots shall not have direct frontage on Hurontario Street. We recognize and understand the intent of the policy; however, there may be circumstances where it is more appropriate or only feasible to provide surface parking having frontage on Hurontario Street. As such, it is requested that the wording of Policy 5.3.1.5 i) i. be revised to the following in order to provide flexibility:</p> <p>Driveways and surface parking lots shall not have direct frontage on Hurontario Street, wherever possible, and access to parking facilities shall be from Local or Collector Roads and laneways, avoiding Hurontario Street, wherever possible. Access to parking areas shall be defined through clearly designated entrances and exits;</p>	<p>No change. This type of request requires support through a parking study.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>8. Community Improvement Plan Incentives The Downtown BIA strongly supports maximizing the efficiency and usage of the existing building stock within the Downtown. It is understood that a vacancy rate currently exists within the Town's Downtown area specifically on second/upper floors due to some of the existing building stock needing to be renovated to meet current Ontario Building Code requirements, accessibility standards and/or market standards. The costs associated with the required renovations have become a deterrent for new businesses looking to locate within the Downtown area. As such, it is requested that the Town implement incentives through a Community Improvement Plan (CIP) to promote new businesses and assist with required renovations to the existing building stock in order to minimize vacancies within existing underutilized building stock within the Downtown area.</p> <p>9. Ground-Oriented Retail Uses It is suggested that policies be included under Section 5.3.1 (The Downtown Core Designation) to generally encourage new professional offices to be located to the second or upper floors of a building in order to promote active retail uses on the ground floor where feasible.</p> <p>10. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Policies It is noted that Draft 2 of the Town of Collingwood OP contains policies related to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) under Section 3.5 h). We support the Town's inclusion and promotion of these CPTED-related policies.</p> <p>11. Urban Forest Policies It is noted that Draft 2 of the Town OP contains policies related to the Town's Urban Forest under Section 3.7 j). We support the Town's inclusion and promotion of these policies.</p>	<p>The Official Plan does not preclude the Town from doing this. In fact, it suggests that it be considered.</p> <p>Wording has been adjusted in consideration of this concern.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p>
6	Brett Plummer	<p>I have some specific criticism about this draft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2.d) and 3.2.j)xi.: I believe that parkland is essential for everyone, so should not be reduced, even for attainable housing. • 3.4.d): I believe that all non-rural dwelling units should at least have a transit stop and public park / community garden within a 5-minute walk. I know you mention this in 3.5.m)i. and 3.7.g.ii) respectively, but stop short of setting these as a requirement for some reason. • 5.1.8.8.a)iii.: What if I want to provide Short-Term Accommodations in which people can only arrive by walking, cycling, transit, etc.? Why should I have to provide a parking spot? If the guest parks somewhere they are not allowed, they would just be towed / fined. • 5.2.5.2.a)vii. and 5.2.5.3.c): I believe privately-owned uses such as golf courses should not be considered parks / open space since they are not public goods that are freely accessible for all. • 5.3.1.3.l)ii. Parking is a waste of valuable space that promotes driving and deteriorates the urban setting, instead of promoting better forms of transportation. Ideally there would be only Accessible and delivery parking spots downtown. I know this sounds extreme, but anyone who has experienced a nearly-car-free downtown would agree that this should be our goal. • 6.1.3.e)iii.: We should put the source of danger and destruction – cars – underground instead of making it less appealing to walk or cycle. Leave the surface for the living. • 7.1.8.7. I believe parkland dedication is a vital use of land in an urban setting, so we should set only minimums and not maximums. 	<p>The Town has been carefully considering all of the issues related to Short-Term Accommodations, and this Official Plan implements that work.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>This Official Plan permit structured parking</p> <p>The Planning Act prescribes the maximum parkland achievable through the development approval process.</p>
7	Ulli Rath	<p>Please take a look at the Letters-to-the-Editor in today's Collingwood Today. There continues to be a strong public/voter sentiment that is opposed to 6 storey or even higher buildings that is still included in the now second draft of our Official Plan. I am one of those that has been opposed to 6-8-even 12 storey buildings as part of our official plan and expressed these sentiments to you and Council at your Oct 17th public meeting.</p>	<p>The issue has been considered. Changes to Section 5.3.1.3 (e). have been implemented to recognize lower height limits in the Downtown Core until such time as a Downtown Master Plan is completed, though the policies do set the stage for potential height increases recognizing the benefits of moderate density increases downtown to support economic vitality, transit, active transportation, mixed use, and the ability for households to live in the same neighbourhood in which they work.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

8	Linda Haldenby	<p>(summarized) Linda Haldenby expresses several concerns regarding the town's Community Values and the proposed amendments to the Official Plan:</p> <p>15-Minute Community: The writer supports the idea of a "15-minute community" where essential services are within easy walking distance. However, they express concern that higher density development in their area may push more residents outside of the 15-minute radius. They also emphasize the need for a more convenient and comprehensive public transportation network and a safer connected trail network to address this issue.</p> <p>Land Use Designations: The writer strongly opposes a proposed amendment to the Official Plan related to land use designations, particularly the addition of a sentence allowing golf course conversion in "extenuating circumstances." They believe this could be detrimental to environmental sustainability, urban forests, and the local community's health. They express concerns about the impact of such conversions on habitat, flood plains, and groundwater recharge areas.</p> <p>Cranberry Golf Course Development: The writer is concerned about proposed changes to the Cranberry Golf Course layout, which could involve cutting down many trees and negatively affect threatened species, flood plains, and local residents. They suspect that the desire for profit through future development may be prioritized over environmental quality.</p> <p>Protection of Natural Heritage Features: The writer stresses the importance of protecting natural heritage features, including trees, to help the community adapt to climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. They support the Urban Forest Management Plan and oppose "cash-in-lieu" of tree preservation.</p> <p>Active Transportation Network: The writer strongly supports the planning and expansion of an active transportation network to promote the health of citizens and reduce reliance on automobiles. They call for better cycling infrastructure, including safer routes and signalized crossings. They express concerns about the use of the term "scooters" and the safety of pedestrians on multi-use trails shared with snowmobiles.</p>	<p>Acknowledged, no change required.</p> <p>Importantly, an Official Plan cannot limit a landowner's ability to make application for an Official Plan Amendment. However, an Official Plan Amendment requires a "complete" application that includes a host of technical studies in support of the Amendment, including Environmental Impact Study, as well as other hydrological and/or hydrogeological studies. Following the submission, there is a full statutory public process and a decision of Council. Following the decision of Council, if the Amendment is adopted by Council, it would then be sent to the County for approval. Any approval is also appealable to the Ontario Land Tribunal. The application is also appealable to the Ontario Land Tribunal by the applicant, should it be refused by Council.</p> <p>Further, an Official Plan Amendment is only one step in the development approval process. Subsequent approvals for rezoning (also a public process) would be required, as well as Draft Plan of Subdivision/Condominium, and potentially Site Plan Approval.</p> <p>In response to the comments the policies have been adjusted</p> <p>Acknowledged and agree.</p> <p>Acknowledged and agree. More details to be reviewed through the Master Transportation Plan.</p>
9	Mark Palmer August 16, 2023	<p>Final Response: Per our discussion, you answered my question. I now understand.</p> <p>3. In Section 5.3.1.3 (The Downtown Core Designation – General Development Policies), street and/or intersection named references related to the "key entry points" should be included to avoid confusion and interpretation. This includes naming the Market Lane - Hume Street intersection as one of the "key entry points" to the Downtown Core Designation (as there is now wayward signage at this location), as well as other gateway (street corridor or intersection) locations entering the Downtown Core Designation too.</p> <p>Final Response: Per our discussion, I feel we both agreed that the Market Lane – Hume Street intersection location can be considered a "key entry point" to the Downtown Core Designation area. Therefore, I request this location be identified as such in Section 5.3.1. Also, to be consistent, other "key entry point" locations to the Downtown Core Designation area should also be identified in Section 5.3.1 as well.</p>	<p>No change made, policy is general on purpose to permit site-specific review and justification.</p>
		<p>Finally, my last comment refers to the Pretty River Flood Fringe shown on Schedule '3' and all associated policies within the Draft OP Report. Besides impacting development potential in terms of new residential and commercial ADU opportunities, this out-dated "flood spill area" could significantly impact economic growth within the Downtown Core Designation; Mixed-Use Corridor I Designation; and, Mixed-Use Corridor II Designation areas.</p>	<p>NVCA has confirmed that the work done to date does not substantiate a change to Schedule 3. Please continue to liaise with the NVCA directly as the authority with jurisdiction. Future amendments can be made based on NVCA's approval of technical supporting materials.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

10	<p>Mark Palmer</p> <p>October 17, 2023</p>	<p>For your consideration and response, I have one question regarding the OP's next steps and final comment.</p> <p>1. Ron Palmer and you mentioned a staff report forthcoming to address all +40 written submissions received about Draft #2 and other insightful Qs raised tonight. Will my earlier email comments below be addressed in that staff report?</p> <p>2. Finally, in terms of my earlier comment about the Pretty River Flood Fringe designation (shown on Schedule 'C'), I respectfully provide this follow-up. Please refer to https://www.collingwoodtoday.ca/local-news/stay-clear-of-pretty-river-dike-while-maintenance-resumes-today-7657692 and related figure at the end of this follow-up email . In light of the Pretty River maintenance work underway, Greenland's background knowledge + having access to the latest science-based Pretty River model to support my earlier professional opinion, it must be a Town priority now to bring this NVCA consultation issue to a head. The article web link will help conclude the discussion much sooner with the final OP preparation.</p> <p>Perhaps I am still missing something per your August 16th reply below to delay action further and which will require more staff time and expense? If so, please advise.</p> <p>FYI (and related if it helps to make my point). Over the past few weeks, I have spoken to other Hume Street property owners who are also supportive (like me) of the new OP corridor land use designations. I provided advise to them about mixed – use infill building possibilities and used my latest 121 Hume Hub concept (shared this year with your staff) as an example. These other redevelopment opportunities will also help make a dent to provide much needed mid-rise housing or ADUs along Hume Street and 100% compliant with the new OP. However, all of these other sites are now constrained by the improper Pretty River Flood Fringe designation in Draft#2 of the OP. Therefore, it calls into question - if we all agree housing is a crisis + priority, why are we impeding property owners (within the significant Pretty River Flood Fringe area) who want to contribute with new housing infills? They all face from the outset now unnecessary NVCA red tape and with no defensible basis to support an NVCA encroachment permit requirement. The NVCA should not have any jurisdiction about this matter anymore. I also agree with CAO Skinner, that the Town controls its destiny about these related matters and not the NVCA. Please consider further with your team and address in your pending staff report.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See above response.</p> <p>Town to participate with NVCA as needed.</p> <p>Acknowledged however jurisdiction of the NVCA is Provincially legislated.</p>
11	<p>Mark Palmer</p> <p>October 18, 2023</p>	<p>My final feedback below and related to the Town's exemplary OP public consultation process:</p> <p>1. If needed, I will advise those affected Hume Street property owners about the PR flood fringe matter. I did encourage all earlier to contact Nathan (maybe some have by now?) to discuss how the new OP would affect their properties. Some have adjoining lots that could be consolidated later on as a single mixed-use site plan. I also encouraged each to send comments in support of the new Hume Street corridor designation since all were supportive after speaking with me.</p> <p>2. As shared earlier with you, I have attached again the 2021 NVCA – Town letter that was included with my August 16th email to you. Again, I respectfully submit for consideration "There is no rationale in the letter why the latest floodplain update results cannot be accepted by the NVCA. I strongly encourage Town staff and Council to contact the NVCA to seek further clarification and discuss this matter with a hopeful outcome that the NVCA will approve ASAP the latest Pretty River floodplain update (using best available science, data, tools and expertise)" and because the Town / NVCA will now "...provide proper vegetation control maintenance of the Pretty River main channel (dyke) sections."</p> <p>Finally, until there is consensus, the NVCA would of course have to engaged regarding any proposed development application within the PR flood fringe area - now referenced in the new OP.</p> <p>My final point being, there should be no need any more since this would allow the Town to better / sooner encourage ADU, etc. intensification "possibilities" within the entire (now out dated) PR flood fringe area.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>See above response and note that the NVCA letter specifically indicates changes should not be made to the OP.</p> <p>Correct.</p> <p>Acknowledged, but see previous responses.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

Area Specific Requests			
#	Name	New Comment on Draft 2 (Received Prior to November 7, 2023)	Response (November 2023)
1	Denis Martinek 247 Osler Bluff Rd.	(summarized) Comments are extensive and are summarized by the landowner with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No portion of the subject lands should be placed in the proposed Greenlands System; No portion of the subject lands should form part of the proposed Natural Heritage System; No portion of the subject lands should be placed in the proposed Environmental Protection Designation; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subject lands in their entirety should be placed in a designation other than the proposed Rural Designation; and, The subject lands in their entirety should be placed in the Rural Residential Designation (with adjustments to the text of the Plan as they relate to the proposed Future Community Area). 	An Environmental Impact Study should be completed by the proponent and peer reviewed by the Town (and applicable Conservation Authority, as appropriate) to demonstrate lands are not Natural Heritage System in order to adjust Environmental Protection land use designation boundaries in this Official Plan. Landowner opted not to have an EIS (2017) peer reviewed by the Town to confirm Natural Heritage System and features on the site. Landowner is undertaking an updated Environmental Impact Study (EIS) which will be provided when completed. Lands are located within the Mountain Road West Corridor Secondary Plan Area, and should remain in the Rural designation, as they are in the current Official Plan, urban development would require the completion of a secondary plan.
2	Colin Travis Travis and Associates PO Box 323 Thornbury, Ontario N0H 2P0 on behalf of Bridgewater/Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc. "East Lands" North side of Highway 26 west of Princeton Shores Boulevard	East Lands 1. The proposed designations in Schedules 1 and 2 on the East lands have boundaries that appear to respect boundaries in the in-force Official Plan with regards to the proposed Future Neighbourhood designation. At this stage of our review, the boundaries and the range and type of uses proposed in Draft OP 2 Future Neighbourhood do not appear to be problematic as they would support implementation of the approved Draft Plan and Zoning By-law. 2. Notwithstanding comment 1, above, we are concerned over the imposition of the "Adjacent Lands Overlay" on the East lands on Schedule 3. The approved zoning and Draft Plan are based on approved Environmental Impact Studies and the application of the overlay fails to recognize this status. The "Existing Approvals" provision in section 5.6.2.3 d) does little to ameliorate our concern of application of the Adjacent Lands Overlay as it states that in cases where an EIS is completed and a planning approval now exists, the Town "may" waive EIS study requirements. Furthermore, we understand there will be additional industry wide comments via the Georgian Triangle Development Institute (GTDI) that question the carte-blanche application of "approximate" 90m Adjacent Lands Overlay. We specifically request that the Adjacent Lands Overlay be removed as it applies to the East lands. In the meantime, we will monitor the GTDI position on the Adjacent Lands Overlay.	Acknowledged. The Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications. Appropriate transition policies have been included and apply to all existing approvals. New applications will be reviewed under the relevant policy framework that applies at the time of application.
3	Colin Travis Travis and Associates PO Box 323 thornbury ontario N0H 2P0 on behalf of Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc. "West Lands" Part Lots 48, 49, 50, Concession 11	West Lands 3. We were not provided with the requested opportunity (October, 2021) to review the West lands land use matters with Planning Staff or the Official Plan review consultant prior to issuance of Draft OP 1 or Draft OP 2. Area specific comments to Draft OP 1 are summarized in a comments matrix companion document to Draft OP 2. Regarding our requests, the Staff response in the matrix is: "The request is subject to an ongoing OLT process. No further response is appropriate at this time." We are confused with this response as the only "appropriate" response recommended is to redesignate the West lands from Rural to "Environmental Protection". At best this confounds and ignores the current status of the lands. We maintain the request for the designations on the West lands referenced in our October 2021 submission letter, including to permit "Medium Density Residential" as well as to recognize the "Environmental Protection" lands as appropriate. An alternative would be to add the West lands as an Area Specific Policy on Schedule '7' assigning the same OLT note as provided for in the existing Official Plan to allow those designations to be determined as part of the outstanding appeals. This would be more in keeping with the comment made by Staff in the matrix referred to above.	Same response. Ongoing appeal to OLT. This is a Site Specific Land Use Redesignation request from Rural to Residential (Medium Density) and Environmental Protection. This as a MAJOR Site Specific redesignation request in accordance with the established criteria, which would require an Official Plan Amendment to facilitate.
		4. The proposed designations in Schedules 1 and 2 on the West lands are not consistent with the in-force Official Plan as they ignore the designated "Rural" land use areas and replace these entirely with "Environmental Protection" designations. We request that this be corrected. We note that similar "Rural" areas found in the in-force Official Plan in other parts of the Town are followed through in the Draft OP 2. We are not aware of the rationale extending this approach to the West lands. It our opinion that these lands remain appropriate for development as part of the "Rural" land use area.	Rationale for the proposed Environmental Protection designation is contained within the Greenlands Discussion Paper which supports the Official Plan, and the mapping of which is contained in Appendix III.

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>5. With regards to Draft OP 2 Natural Heritage Systems (“NHS”) policy and mapping our ecologists (Azimuth Environmental) offer the following comments:</p> <p>A preliminary update to the Natural Heritage System (NHS) has been prepared as part of the Collingwood Official Plan Updates and is presented in Schedule 3 – Natural Heritage System. Draft OP 2 natural heritage policies have as their basis the Natural Heritage (“NH”) Discussion Paper. This paper summarizes how the Town’s NHS was refined through review of existing available resources and background documents in conjunction with updates based on aerial photography for the area (Plan B et al., 2020). This Discussion Paper utilizes the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (“NHRM”; MNR, 2010) as a guidance document to help identify components of the NHS.</p> <p>Understandably, the NH Discussion Paper emphasises how and what natural heritage features/functions have been identified on the updated preliminary NHS mapping. However, it does not appear that existing/historical land use designations were considered nor does it appear that input was obtained from relevant stakeholders throughout the development of the preliminary NHS. As per item #7 under the “Things to Think About” within the NH Discussion Paper, ‘there is a need to consider how the NHS will be applied to existing lots of record, approved, but undeveloped plans of subdivision, properties with existing designations and existing zoning for development’ (Plan B et al., 2020). This consideration recommendation is consistent with the NHRM (MNR, 2010), that states ‘for settlement areas, there can be some unique considerations in planning for natural heritage systems’ which include ‘consideration for existing built up areas and for other parts of settlement areas designated to be built up in the future’.</p>	<p>An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) should be completed by the proponent and peer reviewed by the Town (and applicable Conservation Authority, as appropriate) to demonstrate lands are not Natural Heritage System in order to adjust Environmental Protection land use designation boundaries in the proposed Official Plan.</p>
		<p>The NHRM further indicates that once a preliminary NHS is available, the boundaries of the feature should be refined to promote ecological integrity but also identify components to be excluded from the NHS (i.e. land devoted to residential use). Refinement of the NHS should occur in consultation with relevant stakeholders that may hold a variety of land use objectives. We are of the opinion that the update to the NHS should be considered preliminary and will require additional consideration and refinement in order to address the existing land use designations and zoning within the Town of Collingwood. Apart from provincially designated Natural Heritage features (i.e. habitat of Endangered and Threatened species, Provincially Significant Wetlands, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest), the onus is on the planning authority to establish significance of other Natural Heritage Features. The refinement of the preliminary NHS should occur as part of the Official Plan update and should not be downloaded to the landowners through the completion of an EIS subsequent to approval of a new Official Plan.</p>	<p>Acknowledged, see above response.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Colin Travis Travis and Associates PO Box 323 Thornbury, Ontario N0H 2P0</p> <p>On behalf of Owner: Georgian Communities</p>	<p>Georgian Communities March 22, 2021 request provided specific land use and engineering points supporting inclusion of the subject lands into the Secondary Plan area. Our client did not receive any response to the points that challenged the information base, the observations, or the conclusions. My client provided a sound presentation based on engineering and land use planning principles.</p> <p>The August 17, 2022 submission built upon the March 22, 2021 submission and maintained that the inclusion of the subject lands into the Secondary Plan area was logical and noted that the subject lands would be the only lands not within a Secondary Plan area.</p> <p>In item 5 to the Draft OP 1 comments matrix (Area Specific Requests) the Town response was that Council considered the request as “major” and requiring an Official Plan Amendment. Staff advise that such an amendment would require studies and justification and the need for additional urban lands.</p> <p>The Town response fails to account for two major land use considerations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject lands are proposed to be designated “Future Urban”, the same designation for lands within the Secondary Plan Area. Draft OP 2 clearly establishes that the intent is that the subject lands are to be for future urban development. 2. A Secondary Plan area designation requires a Secondary Planning exercise that will include the same range of studies and justifications that the Town suggest is required to place the lands in a Secondary Plan area to begin with. A Secondary Plan planning exercise will account for land uses, servicing and phasing. The subject lands would then be analyzed in such a context. 	<p>This is a Site Specific redesignation request, and the Town has previously responded that this would be considered as a "MAJOR" redesignation request through Staff Report P2021-27, and require a site specific Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Town response was "Lands Not for Urban Uses. Needs to be considered through the County Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). Official Plan Amendment required."</p> <p>There has been no demonstrated need for additional greenfield lands to meet future minimum growth targets.</p> <p>Although a future Secondary Plan would be required to redesignate this significant portion of the community to urban land uses, the Town has not prioritized the undertaking of such an amendment given the results of the MCR.</p> <p>It is not clear that Georgian Communities owns, has an interest in, or represents all of the lands that are identified as the subject of the land use redesignation request.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		To undertake a Secondary Plan exercise on lands to the north-west without consideration of the subject lands is illogical as the Draft OP 2 intent has the lands as "Future Urban". The subject lands exhibit the same underlying characteristics as other lands within the Secondary Plan Area. Placing the subject lands in the Secondary Plan Area is not a major land use change, but an identification of what is required in order to determine land use in the future (that is, a Secondary Plan).	Could be considered through a site specific amendment.
5	Colin Travis Travis and Associates PO Box 323 Thornbury, Ontario N0H 2P0 On behalf of Owner: L. Law Cranberry Golf Course	<p>The subject of converting golf course lands to urban uses was before Council in 2021. Our written submission was a follow up to meeting with Planning Staff. Planning Staff had recommended that the proposal to use surplus golf course lands for urban uses would need an Official Plan policy amendment and as such should be forwarded to the Official Plan review team via Council.</p> <p>Our letter was misconstrued as an attempt by Mr. Law to use the Official Plan review process as some sort of short circuit of public process to get golf course lands redesignated. However, at no point in the Official Plan review process has any land use change been proposed. All that was sought were additional Official Plan policies to guide the process of considering the conversion of golf course lands to urban uses. Also misconstrued was that Mr. Law sought the redesignation of the entirety of the golf course lands for urban uses. It was made quite clear that only a portion of the golf course would be identified as being surplus.</p> <p>These misconceptions remain as evident in oral and written submissions made to Council by the public.</p> <p>To be clear, the purpose of participating in in the Official Plan review process is to advise that the existing Official Plan land use conversion policies do not specifically address private golf course lands and, in light of the principles of land use conversions, this is an oversight which should be corrected in the new Official Plan.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>The initial policy recommendation by the applicant suggested a policy framework for conversions of a portion of golf course lands from Open Space to Future Neighbourhood without an Official Plan Amendment. It was staff's position that this would be inappropriate, and recommended that an Official Plan Amendment application be pursued. At the time the Town was aligning draft policies with Simcoe County OPA No. 7 to allow the consideration of conversion requests that exceed growth targets under specific circumstances.</p> <p>In the initial assessment of the applicant's comment submissions and proposed policy framework, the Town had previously responded that this would be considered as a "MAJOR" redesignation request through Staff Report P2021-27, and require a site specific Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Town response was "Unclear which lands are proposed for redesignation. Potential natural heritage and natural hazard impacts to be comprehensively addressed. Considerable potential for impacts to surrounding lands. Needs to be considered through the County Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). Official Plan Amendment required."</p> <p>The applicant has initiated the preconsultation process to determine study requirements and next steps to proceed with an Official Plan Amendment application.</p>
		<p>1. Under Section 4.2 a private golf course is now considered as part of a public open space system. This is entirely inappropriate. The golf course lands should have a separate recognition respecting the fact that it is a private golf course facility and not part of a public authority open space or parks system.</p> <p>2. The proposed conversion policy is irrational by linking potential development of surplus lands on public services to "outside" of the planning horizon (that is, beyond 2051). It is unreasonable to demand a proponent to justify that proposed growth is unable to be accommodated in existing areas when the Town is unable to quantify the amount of potential development within those areas.</p> <p>3. We are requesting a reasonable Official Plan policy anticipating that surplus, vacant lands within the existing "Built-up Area Boundary" will be available in the near future. We need to know how such lands can be reasonably assessed.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Parks and Open Space System is not wholly publicly-owned and accessible.</p> <p>Applicable policy 5.2.5.3f) has been adjusted to provide more clarity for a land use redesignation request from Parks and Open Space to another designation, requiring a comprehensive planning process, without presumption of future land uses.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>4. The proposed golf course conversion policy in Section 5.2.5.3 e) ignores the land use advisories we have been providing over the past three years. In summary these advisories are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It is not the intent of the Owner to convert the entire golf course to urban land uses. The intent of the Owner is to rationalize the operation and design of the existing golf course in order address such matters as: customer preferences for shorter and quicker play; reduced reliance on fertilizer; reduced requirements for irrigation; reduced maintenance costs and; improving the economic viability of a private golf course facility. b. The redesign of the golf course will achieve the Owner objectives and will result in surplus lands. c. The redesign of the golf course is a short-term project. The lands will be surplus in the short term. d. The surplus land will be situated for the most part on or adjacent to existing public facilities. e. The surplus lands will be situated within the existing Built-Up Area Boundary. f. Contemporary land use planning principles acknowledge that it is preferable to use underutilized, vacant, inefficient serviceable lands within urban areas. g. From a community land use perspective, the golf course is within an existing neighbourhood. h. The use of surplus lands in the context of the existing Cranberry area community has the potential to provide a variety of public benefits that includes but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. More efficient transit services ii. Contributions to active transportation facilities iii. Provision of more localized neighbourhood commercial and service uses iv. Efficient, compact urban form suitable to support the town in achieving attainable housing objectives as Mr. Law has publicly supported the Province and Town initiatives in promoting attainable housing v. Overall contribution to complete community initiatives vi. Provision of public parkland opportunities that have been ignored during the development of this sector of the Town over the past few decades i. It simply does not make sense not to encourage development “within town” and within existing neighbourhoods. <p>5. The Adjacent Lands Overlay approach is excessive and unnecessary and must be removed as some “natural” features have been picked up unnecessarily.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>The Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications, consistent with the PPS and NHRM.</p>
		<p>It is unfortunate that we were not able to pursue this matter in more detail as we had requested. Although we remain willing to discuss this matter further, we are left with the alternative of suggesting additional policy wording to recognize an opportunity to utilize surplus lands within a serviced urban environment. We ask that the following be added to Section 5.2.4.3 e):</p> <p>“That conversion of surplus lands to an existing golf course for urban uses will be considered by the Town if the surplus lands resulting from the golf course re-design are a portion of the existing golf course and the surplus lands front onto municipal services. The conversion of such lands shall require an amendment to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and must comply with development policies provided under the “Future Neighbourhood” policy section to this Plan.”</p> <p>We understand the broader development community will be commenting on such matters as: extensions to Draft Approval (section 5.1.7 (j)); Natural Heritage Systems (section 5.6) and the incorporation of SCAP (section 4.3 i)) as an Official Plan land use control policy. Our client will be reviewing additional industry responses to such non-site-specific policies.</p>	<p>See above re: policy adjustment for clarity.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

6	<p>Colin Travis Travis and Associates PO Box 323 Thornbury, Ontario N0H 2P0</p> <p>on behalf of Mason Homes 320 – 380 High Street</p>	<p>Mr. Mason completed a due diligence process prior to purchasing the property. That due diligence included consultations with Planning Staff. Throughout the due diligence process it was confirmed that the east portion of the subject lands is designated for medium density residential uses. It was also confirmed that an EIS would be required as part of any development application process.</p> <p>In our August 17, 2022 submission in response to Draft OP 1 we requested that Schedules 1, 2 and 3 be corrected to reflect the land use designations and intents of the existing Official Plan. In keeping with that approach Draft OP 2 Schedule designations are requested as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schedule 1 would show the east lands designated “Greenfield Residential Community Areas” with a “Greenlands System” designation along the existing Black Ash Creek corridor. The west lands would be designated as “Future Urban” and “Greenlands System”. 2. Schedule 2 would show the east lands as “Future Neighborhood” and, “Environmental Protection” along the existing Black Ash Creek corridor. The west lands would be designated “Rural” and “Environmental Protection”. 3. Schedule 3 would remove the “Natural Heritage System” from the majority of the east lands, with such designation restricted to the Black Ash Creek Corridor. The west lands would be designated “Natural Heritage System” and the “Adjacent Lands Overlay” removed entirely. 	<p>The responsibility of the Town to define the Natural Heritage System in accordance with the Provincial Natural Heritage Reference Manual, and to preclude development and site alteration in those defined areas, with particular emphasis on Provincially significant features and functions. The Provincial Policy Statement is clear - all significant natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions shall be protected.</p> <p>The establishment of the Natural Heritage System is based on the information and data sources identified in Discussion Paper 5 Greenlands, dated July 2020, which was carried out by a fully qualified environmental scientist.</p> <p>Same response. An Environmental Impact Study should be completed by the proponent and peer reviewed by the Town to demonstrate lands are not Natural Heritage System in order to adjust Environmental Protection land use designation boundaries in this Official Plan.</p> <p>An EIS can be submitted and reviewed at a later date through a development application.</p>
		<p>4. The “Environmental Protection” boundaries appear to be generally consistent with the existing Official Plan “Environmental Protection” boundaries on Schedule ‘A’. Draft OP 2 policy states that the Environmental Protection designation includes an “associated 30 metre buffer”. The Adjacent Lands Overlay is an “approximately” 90 meter setback from the Environmental Protection Designation (section 5.6 b)). The Environmental Protection designated lands already have a 30metre buffer built into the designation boundaries.</p> <p>Given the identification of natural heritage features on the subject lands, an EIS is required regardless of the Adjacent Lands Overlay. The Adjacent Lands Overlay is a redundant designation because a 30m buffer is already accounted for and an EIS would be required. Other than simply expanding “natural features” type policies beyond that which can technically and scientifically defined as “natural features”, the Adjacent Lands Overlay areas appear punitive and superfluous. The Adjacent Lands Overlay should be removed.</p> <p>5. In additional discussions with Mr. Masons environmental consultants, Azimuth Environmental, we offer further comments on the proposed “Environmental Protection” designation on the east lands. A preliminary update to the Natural Heritage System (NHS) had been prepared as part of the Collingwood Official Plan Updates and is proposed in Schedule 3 as “Natural Heritage System”. Draft OP 2 natural heritage polices have as their basis the Natural Heritage Discussion Paper. This paper summarizes how the Town’s NHS was refined through review of existing available resources and background documents in conjunction with updates based on aerial photography for the area (Plan B et al., 2020). This Discussion Paper utilizes the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (NHRM; MNR, 2010) as a guidance document to help identify components of the NHS.</p>	<p>See ‘Natural Heritage System’ response from Draft 1 Comment Matrix for description of EP designation and Adjacent Lands Overlay.</p> <p>Same response. The Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>Understandably, the Discussion Paper emphasises how and what natural heritage features/functions have been identified on the updated preliminary NHS mapping. However, it does not appear that existing/historical land use designations were considered nor does it appear that input was obtained from relevant stakeholders throughout the development of the preliminary NHS. As per item #7 under the "Things to Think About" within the Discussion Paper, 'there is a need to consider how the NHS will be applied to existing lots of record, approved, but undeveloped plans of subdivision, properties with existing designations and existing zoning for development' (Plan B et al., 2020). This consideration recommendation is consistent with the NHRM (MNR, 2010), that states 'for settlement areas, there can be some unique considerations in planning for natural heritage systems' which include 'consideration for existing built up areas and for other parts of settlement areas designated to be built up in the future'. The proposed designation on the east lands has failed to demonstrate this consideration as it applies to the subject lands.</p> <p>The NHRM further indicates that once a preliminary NHS is available, the boundaries of the feature should be refined to promote ecological integrity but also identify components to be excluded from the NHS (i.e. land devoted to residential use). Refinement of the NHS should occur in consultation with relevant stakeholders that may hold a variety of land use objectives.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that the update to the NHS should be considered preliminary and will require additional consideration and refinement in order to address the existing land use designations and zoning within the Town of Collingwood. Apart from provincially designated Natural Heritage features (i.e. habitat of Endangered and Threatened species, Provincially Significant Wetlands, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest), the onus is on the planning authority to establish significance of other Natural Heritage Features. The refinement of the preliminary NHS should occur as part of the Official Plan update and should not be downloaded to the landowners through the completion of an EIS subsequent to approval of a new Official Plan.</p>	Acknowledged.
		<p>In light of the above, it is apparent that the local planning authority has not undertaken a balanced exercise in first establishing the significance of the Natural Heritage Features and, with such an exercise, has not considered any refinement of boundaries to account for existing residentially designated lands. The proposed designations have been insufficiently considered, especially in light of no direct consultation with key landowners and, the dramatic shift in proposed land use direction. For example, the subject lands have extensive frontage along a major arterial road, the lands can be easily serviced, and the lands are a significant component of Collingwood's Urban Structure intended in the existing Official Plan. We find no analysis that accounts for such characteristics and land use roles the subject lands play within the overall community.</p> <p>6. We understand the broader development community will be commenting on such matters as: extensions to Draft Approval (section 5.1.7 (j)); Natural Heritage Systems (section 5.6) and the incorporation of SCAP (section 4.3 i) as an Official Plan land use control policy. Our client will be reviewing additional industry responses to such non-site-specific policies.</p>	Acknowledged.
7	<p>Shelley Wells MES, MCIP, RPP Plan Wells Associates</p> <p>On behalf of Lorablue Holdings Inc. Harbour Centre, 20 Balsam Street</p>	<p>Draft 2 of the proposed new Official Plan has implemented a 30 m buffer from lands designated Environmental Protection, plus a 90 m Adjacent Lands Overlay, for a total of a 120 m setback. Any new development within the 120 m will require an Environmental Impact Study.</p> <p>We find the Town is proposing to implement a 'carte blanche' policy that treats every natural heritage feature as if it were a Provincially Significant Wetland.</p> <p>This is a menu approach not a one policy fits all approach. We have researched and summarized Natural Heritage policies in the following Official Plans (see attached Policy Summary Chart). We find the Draft # 2 Official Plan Natural Heritage policies to be out of step with the generally accepted menu approach to defining Natural Heritage features and setting out the limits of adjacent lands. These policies should be eliminated and the more traditional menu approach substituted.</p> <p>We request clarity in Section 5.3.2.3 General Development Polices, that Harbour Centre will develop as an individual site and will not be required to prepare a Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>The Town's proposed Natural Heritage System is appropriate and consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and the proposed Provincial Planning Statement.</p> <p>The EP land use designation and Adjacent Lands Overlay are designed to require an EIS to be prepared to assess natural heritage features.</p> <p>The Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications. It is not designed to prohibit development, unless the features warrant it.</p> <p>Flexibility has been provided in this policy. This project is in the preconsultation stage - specific comments would be provided through that process.</p>
		<p>Section 5.7.4.2 Area 12 Specific Policy</p> <p>Under separate cover we have submitted detailed analysis to justify the following request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The designation for the wetland limit in the new Official Plan reflect the agreed 2022 staked boundary between Mr. Speller and NVCA. • Policy 5.7.4.2 (Area 12 on Schedule 7) be amended to add the following wording in a new item b) "The minimum required yard to the wetland previously labeled Environmental Protection, now re labeled Natural Heritage in Schedule 3, and Environmental Protection in Schedule 2 is three (3) metres as confirmed by the Ontario Municipal Board in the March 2014 Board order. (PL100526)" 	<p>An updated EIS has been provided to adjust the EP land use designation limits by clarifying a wetland boundary. A Town peer review has not commenced. The NVCA is reviewing the EIS update and previous correspondence to determine if updated wetland boundaries for the site are acceptable.</p> <p>It would be inappropriate to add a site specific Official Plan policy to identify a 'development setback' to a wetland from a historic appeal to the Town's Zoning By-law.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

8	<p>KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC. Mark Yarranton, MCIP, RPP Tim Schilling, MCIP, RPP</p> <p>On behalf of Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd. 5 Silver Creek Drive.</p>	<p>I am in receipt of your letter to our client dated September 20, 2023 seeking feedback on the draft OP policies and mapping and in particular the Area Specific Policies for our client's site. The direction the draft OP appears to be moving in the right direction by including the Area Specific Policy but I will need some additional time to also review the other related policies in concert and hope to be in touch shortly with comments or questions of clarification.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
9	<p>Katherine Holmes, Founder and Chair, Friends of Silver Creek</p> <p>RE: Specific Development application for Huntingwood Trails (5 Silver Creek Drive) and Bridgewater (North side of Highway 26 west of Princeton Shores Boulevard)</p>	<p>Page. 164 Schedule 3 - Natural Heritage System Map</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Huntingwood Trails development lands are marked as being within the “sub watershed.” A “sub watershed,” defined as “an area of land that water flows over or through to drain into a larger body of water,” and the Town of Collingwood’s own sponsored Blue Mountains Sub Watershed Health Check 2023 report includes maps that clearly indicate that the floodplain boundaries (see report, page 52, Feature 7.1 map) are within the proposed Huntingwood Trails housing development area. •The Ontario Government’s Bill 23 prohibits any development on floodplains. • To prevent major flooding to the proposed development and the Forest area homes, Friends of Silver Creek request the Town review the following and address this in the Official Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed Huntingwood Trails development will be built on an identified subwatershed or floodplain which will exacerbate an already flood-prone area and the surrounding Forest Drive neighbourhood. Major flooding is more of a reality than ever due to climate change. Approval of this development must be reconsidered as disastrous flooding will occur. 	<p>Huntingwood Trails West development applications have been approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal. Natural heritage, natural hazards, and traffic matters have or will be addressed through submission of further studies and fulfillment of conditions of draft approval.</p> <p>Huntingwood Trails East development applications are in process at this time, and a public meeting will be scheduled once a technical review has been completed.</p>
		<p>Page 165 Schedule 4 - Waste management/Source water protection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •This shows most of the Forest neighborhood and the Huntingwood Trails potential development is in an IPZ-2 intake protection zone •Most of the Forest neighborhood is in a “significant groundwater re-charge area” •To prevent further disturbance of the highly vulnerable aquifer present in the Huntingwood Trails potential development area and the Forest area, Friends of Silver Creek request: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Huntingwood Trails development be reconsidered as it will disturb this highly vulnerable aquifer with potential for depleting this very important water source <p>Page 167, Schedule 6 - Transportation Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The proposed “future arterial and collector road alignments to be determined through the preparation of a Secondary Plan” would be on an Environmentally Protected Area and be adjacent to an Active County Waste Management Site as per map on page 165. • Friends of Silver Creek object so please: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oReject the development of a road from Tenth Line along Georgian Trail to the western border of Silver Glen Preserve to Hwy 26, and north of Hwy 26 to Georgian Bay adjacent to Princeton Shores Boulevard also on Environmentally Protected areas. 	<p>See above.</p> <p>There is no proposed road along the Georgian Trail - this is a Secondary Plan Area boundary (Mountain Road West Corridor).</p>
		<p>Page 169, Schedule 7.1- Area Specific Policies Map</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Development Area #1 and Development Area #2 have been renamed as per OLT22-002301 decision on September 19 2022. oFriends of Silver Creek request the following correction on the map Official Plan of the Town of Collingwood Schedule '7.1' Area Specific Policies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oIn addition, include in the Official Plan and denote the area on this map per Sonja Skinner: “The Environmental Protection Area including the wetlands will be ceded to the Town for protection in perpetuity.” Has this land title transfer taken place? <p>Page 193, Figure 8 – Wetlands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The proposed development, Bridgewater, will be built in the middle of the Provincially Significant Silver Creek Wetland. •The NVCA has indicated to the Friends of Silver Creek that the Bridgewater “island” of land was created by the clearing of the land and truckloads of fill dropped into the area designated for development •To maintain the water quality of Silver Creek, Friends of Silver Creek request the following addition be addressed in the Official Plan as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oAny development that proceeds in proximity to the Silver Creek must have a minimum of a 30 METRE BERM PLUS A SIX FOOT FENCE that will run adjacent to Silver Creek and surrounding floodplain to prevent runoff of various toxins and protect rare and endangered species from human access from the proposed developments. 	<p>The Area Specific policies require dedication of specific lands as a condition of development approval.</p> <p>This comment is site specific to the Bridgewater/Consulate development applications. Bridgewater development applications have been approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal. Natural heritage, natural hazards, and traffic matters have or will be addressed through submission of further studies and fulfillment of conditions of draft approval.</p> <p>Consultate West lands have been under appeal since 2004, and the future land use designations will be resolved either through the existing appeal or future development applications.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

	<p>Page 193, Figure 11 – Fish Habitat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Silver Creek supports cool-water and cold-water habitat from the Escarpment headwaters to Georgian Bay. •Given suitable flow and absence of other barriers, rainbow trout and Chinook salmon are able to move upstream as far as Lake of the Clouds to spawn. •To maintain the quality of the fish habitat, Friends of Silver Creek request the following addition be inserted into the Official Plan as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oAny development that proceeds in proximity to the Silver Creek Wetland boundary and floodplain must have a minimum of a 30 METRE BERM PLUS A SIX FOOT FENCE that will surround the perimeter of the developments to prevent runoff of various toxins to the Wetland and surrounding floodplain from the proposed developments. 	<p>This comment is site specific to the aforementioned development applications where setbacks to natural heritage features and natural hazards have or will be addressed through the appropriate studies to the satisfaction of applicable authorities. The Official Plan is not the appropriate tool to address this comment.</p>
	<p>Page 197, Figure 12 – Species at Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Silver Creek Wetland support a variety of wildlife including rare reptiles and amphibians. Shorebirds and waterfowl utilize this area on their migration in the spring and again in late summer/fall. •It is important to note that approximately 200,000 birds die or are seriously injured from the light and reflections off tall buildings (particularly glass) in Toronto alone during migratory seasons •To support species at risk, Friends of Silver Creek request the following addition be inserted into the Official Plan as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oAny development that proceeds in proximity to the Silver Creek Wetland boundary and floodplain must have a minimum of a 30 METRE BERM PLUS A SIX FOOT FENCE to discourage human access to the Wetland in order to protect species at risk oAny building higher than 2 stories must have minimum reflective glass. In addition, the developer must create a preventative plan for bird spring and fall migration to protect bird populations. 	<p>This comment is site specific to the aforementioned development applications where setbacks to natural heritage features and natural hazards have or will be addressed through the appropriate studies to the satisfaction of applicable authorities. The Official Plan is not the appropriate tool to address this comment.</p>
	<p>Page 198, Figure 13 – Hazard Lands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Flooding has become a primary issue in Canada and around the world. Prior to the release of Ontario’s Bill 23, the Insurance Bureau of Canada urged the Ontario Government to ensure any changes to the Conservation Authorities’ powers should be aimed at strengthening their ability to prevent development within floodplains. •Thus Bill 23 states clearly that there can be no housing development on floodplains. •Collingwood sponsored the Blue Mountains Sub watershed Health Check 2023, a report that includes maps that clearly indicate that the Silver Creek floodplain boundaries (see report, page 52, and Feature 7.1 map) are within the proposed Huntingwood Trails housing development area. •To prevent serious future flooding to new neighbourhoods and existing homes, Friends of Silver Creek object and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oReject the development of the Silver Creek floodplain on the grounds that new homeowners would be at major risk of being uninsurable due to the areas designation as floodplain and the very real possibility of extreme flooding. 	<p>This comment is site specific to the aforementioned development applications where setbacks to natural hazards have or will be addressed through the appropriate studies to the satisfaction of applicable authorities (i.e the appropriate Conservation Authority). The Official Plan is not the appropriate tool to address this comment.</p>
	<p>Page 38, Section 4.1.3.10.2 Riverine Floodplain Management</p> <p>3. Floodplain Boundaries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Floodplain boundaries must be determined by carrying out a new hydrological studies at the expense of the developer and approved by the Town, prior to approval of any development. •Friends of Silver Creek request the following: Given the changing environment due to global warming, these hydrology studies must be undertaken not more than 1 year prior to the time of application and if significant delays between approval and the commencement of development occur (i.e. 2 years) an additional study will need to be undertaken by the developer to the satisfaction of the NVCA, Town of Collingwood and the County of Simcoe. All hydrological studies must be carried out by an independent third party selected by the Town of Collingwood and paid for by the developer. <p>Page, 148, Section 8.6.5 Parkland Dedications</p> <p>Friends of Silver Creek request the following: Define in the plan the circumstances under which a cash payment would be taken in lieu of land.</p>	<p>This comment is site specific to the aforementioned development applications where setbacks to natural hazards have or will be addressed through the appropriate studies to the satisfaction of applicable authorities (i.e the appropriate Conservation Authority). The Official Plan is not the appropriate tool to address this comment.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>Page, 167, Section 11.2.1 Environment Impact Statement (EIS) • Friends of Silver Creek request the following: The EIS must be undertaken not more than 1 year prior to the time of application and if significant delays between approval and the commencement of development occur (i.e. 2 years) an additional study will need to be undertaken by the developer to the satisfaction of the NVCA, Town of Collingwood & County of Simcoe. . All environmental studies must be carried out by an independent third party selected by the Town of Collingwood and paid for by the developer.</p> <p>Page 171, Section 11.6 Traffic Impact Study Friends of Silver Creek request the following: The Traffic Impact Study must be undertaken not more than 1 year prior to the time of application and if significant delays between approval and the commencement of development occur (i.e. 2 years) an additional study will need to be undertaken by the developer to the satisfaction of the NVCA, Town of Collingwood & County of Simcoe.</p>	<p>This comment is site specific to the aforementioned development applications where these matters have or will be addressed through the appropriate studies to the satisfaction of applicable authorities. The Official Plan is not the appropriate tool to address this comment.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Christopher S. Assaff, B.COMM Vice-President</p> <p>Charis Developments Ltd. 49 Huron Street</p>	<p>The 2nd Draft proposes to place the subject lands in the Downtown Core Designation. Prior to commenting on this proposed Designation, Charis stresses that it must be recognized that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject lands are not contiguous to and are an outlier to the remainder of the proposed Downtown Core Designation. 2. The subject lands are not located in the Town's Heritage District. 3. The subject lands have similar characteristics to the lands along the north side of First Street which are proposed to be located in the Mixed-Use Corridor I Designation. These similar characteristics include being distant from established residential neighbourhoods, located outside of the Heritage Conservation District, proximity to lands proposed to be designated Environmental Protection and frontage and street orientation (north side of an arterial road). <p>With the foregoing being said, and notwithstanding Charis' submission on the 1st Draft wherein Charis expressed a desire to have the subject lands placed in the Mixed-Use Corridor I Designation, the 2nd Draft continues to propose to place the subject lands in the Downtown Core Designation with this Designation containing statements and required policies focussed on the Heritage District and Hurontario Street.</p>	<p>No change to previous response deom Draft 1.</p> <p>This is a Site Specific redesignation request, and the Town has previously responded that this would be considered as a "MAJOR" redesignation request through Staff Report P2023-24, and require a site specific Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Response was "Designated in current Official Plan as Downtown Commercial Core. Designation carried over to Draft 1 as Downtown, which already supports intensification and a mix of uses. Mixed use Corridor One would permit significantly higher density (potentially including 12-storey built form) and a wider variety of uses. Potential for impacts to surrounding properties, including proximity to the downtown heritage conservation district, and should be rationalized and evaluated through an Official Plan Amendment."</p>
		<p>Further, the 2nd Draft proposes to continue the inconsistent policies found in the 1st Draft as they relate to Mid-Rise and High-Rise permissions in the proposed Downtown Core Designation.</p> <p>Given the foregoing, it is Charis' submission that if the subject lands are not removed from the Downtown Core Designation and placed in the Mixed-Use I Designation then separate polices must be provided in the Downtown Core Designation for those lands that are in the Heritage Conservation District, those that front on Hurontario Street and those lands that are not (such as the subject lands).</p> <p>Summary That the lands known municipally as 49 Huron Street be removed from the Downtown Core Designation and placed in the Mixed-Use I Designation similar to those lands on the north side of First Street located outside of the Heritage Conservation District or, that separate polices be incorporated in the Downtown Core Designation for these lands that align with those proposed for the Mixed-Use Corridor I Designation and that those policies that reference the Heritage Conservation District and/or for lands that front on Hurontario Street be changed/revised such that it is clear that they do not apply to these lands.</p>	<p>See responses on Heritage and Height in Downtown.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

11	<p>Christopher S. Assaff, B.COMM Vice-President</p> <p>Charis Developments Ltd.</p> <p>Portion of 839 Hurontario Street, 869 Hurontario Street and 7564 Poplar Sideroad – “The Gateway Centre”</p> <p>Further consolidated 853 Hurontario Street.</p>	<p>Charis generally supports the direction of the 2nd Draft which proposes to place these lands in the Strategic Growth Area (Schedule 1) and in the Mixed-Use Corridor I (Hurontario Street Lands) and the Mixed-Use Corridor II Designations (7564 Poplar Sideroad).</p> <p>The proposed designation of 7564 Poplar Sideroad represents a change from the 1st Draft wherein it was proposed to place these lands in the Mixed-Use Corridor I Designation. Notwithstanding that this represents a significant decrease in the height and density policies for these lands from the 1st Draft, Charis generally supports the proposed land use designation for 7564 Poplar Sideroad.</p> <p>Regarding the continued proposed prohibition of “retail outlets for the sale of alcoholic beverages”, Charis requests that a site specific permissive policy for the subject lands be included in the New Official Plan.</p> <p>Much has changed since the restrictive policies and regulations related to the location of retail outlets for the sale of alcoholic beverages in the Town were developed in the 1990’s and the Town adopted Official Plan Amendment No. 37 in 1996 (being the Amendment which introduced these restrictive policies and regulations, and the Ontario Municipal Board’s subsequent approval of the Amendment after a lengthy hearing). These changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town’s population has grown from 15,5962 in 1996 to an estimated 26,5633 today (and is slated to grow to a minimum of 42,690 in 2051); • The regional population has grown significantly; • The Western Commercial Node was seen to be substantially built-out in 20055 and is in fact built-out today; • The number of residents in the southerly portion of the Town (in the Indigo, Grandeur, Liberty, Mountaincroft, Summit View, etc., plans of subdivision) has grown significantly, and will continue to grow (Poplar Trails, Eden Oak, Poplar Regional Health & Wellness Village); and, • Poplar Sideroad has developed as the de facto Town bypass. <p>Further, the restrictive policies and regulations for retail outlets for the sale of alcoholic beverages were established at a time when the creation and locations of these outlets was highly restricted by the Province of Ontario. Since then, the Province has authorized the sale of alcoholic beverages, in particular wine and beer, in approximately 450 grocery stores and authorized the establishment of LCBO Convenience Outlets in approximately 400 locations, including locations in Nottawa and Craigeleith.</p> <p>Regarding justification for a site specific permissive policy for a retail outlet for the sale of alcoholic beverages on the subject lands, Charis submits that it would align with the Town’s 15-Minute Community and active transportation objectives (pedestrian and bicycle); it would address the needs/desires of the local population; support other retail enterprises in the area and on the site; address the needs of the travelling public; and, alleviate vehicular issues/challenges in the Downtown.</p> <p>Lastly, Charis submits that the LCBO is a government enterprise and is the sole retailer of spirits in Ontario and it our opinion that it is best positioned to determine the number of stores, store thresholds, evaluate market demands, the needs of the local and travelling public, etc.</p> <p>Summary - Charis respectfully requests a site specific permissive policy to permit a retail outlet for the sale of alcoholic beverages for the lands known municipally as 833 Hurontario Street (PIN 58262-0078), 853 and 869 Hurontario Street and 7564 Poplar Sideroad.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>This is a Site Specific redesignation request, and the Town has previously responded that this would be considered as a "MINOR" redesignation request through Staff Report P2023-24.</p> <p>Response was "Request aligns with the Project Team’s mixed-use corridor approach. Draft 1 identified these lands in the Mixed-Use Corridor One designation. Schedule 1 was amended to show the parcels as Strategic Growth Area and include 7564 Poplar Sideroad as Mixed-Use Corridor Two to recognize transition adjacent to an existing lower density residential neighbourhood."</p> <p>Restrictive policies were retained at the request of the BIA and include the ability for individual landowners or the Town to undertake a Retail Commercial Study in support of future amendments.</p> <p>Request for site specific permission to permit a retail outlet for the sale of alcoholic beverages is an addition to the above site specific request. Staff cannot support this request at this time, due to the continued prohibition of retail sales of alcohol outside of the Downtown being maintained in the Official Plan. New policies allow for relief from this prohibition through an Official Plan Amendment supported by further Retail Commercial Study by a landowner or the Town.</p>
12	<p>Andrew Pascuzzo, MCIP, RPP Pascuzzo Planning Inc.</p> <p>11555 Highway 26</p>	<p>1. The proposed designation of the property in Schedule 1 – Growth Management Plan is a small portion of Strategic Growth Area (pink) and the remainder of the lands in Greenlands System (green). On behalf of my clients, I would request that staff and the consultants consider designating a large portion of the property in the Strategic Growth Area designation, similar to the properties to the west.</p> <p>2. The proposed designation of the property in Schedule 2 – Land Use Plan is Mixed Use Corridor II (dark orange) and Parks and Open Space (light green). On behalf of my clients, I would request that staff and the consultants consider designating a larger portion of the property in the Mixed Use Corridor II designation, similar to the properties to the west.</p> <p>3. The existing site specific exception is being proposed as section 5.7.5.1. On behalf of my clients, I would request that staff and the consultants consider permitting all the uses of the proposed Mixed Use Corridor II designation, rather than limiting them.</p>	<p>Same response as Draft 1.</p> <p>This site is subject to an ongoing official plan amendment application that proposes to update the existing site specific land use designations on the site, therefore it is inappropriate to make this additional change at this time. The Site Specific policies are proposed to continue in the new Official Plan with the Mixed Use Corridor II designation applying to those lands subject to the site specific exception.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

<p>13</p>	<p>David Finbow Land Development & Building Code Consulting on behalf of Richard Thomson Tennis School 255 Osler Bluff Road</p>	<p>As noted in my previous correspondence, the subject lands were previously used as a tennis school with 6 tennis courts and a clubhouse facility, which included sleeping accommodation for 20 persons. Unfortunately, tennis operations had to cease as the clubhouse was destroyed by fire, a fire caused by individuals later charged with mischief. The current Official Plan and Zoning By-law provides for these uses and the owners want to maintain these permissions.</p> <p>The 2nd Draft proposes to place the subject lands in the Greenlands System (Schedule '1') and in the Environmental Protection Designation and Parks and Open Space Designation. While the Parks and Open Space Designation permits "Private recreational facilities including golf courses, sports clubs/activities" the Environmental Protection Designation does not.</p> <p>Regarding the portion of the subject lands proposed within the Environmental Protection Designation, it would appear that this is proposed to apply to an approximate 20.0 metre wide strip of land that contains the existing improved laneway giving access to the remainder of the lands, which are proposed to be designated Parks and Open Space.</p>	<p>See response below.</p>
		<p>This is of concern as private recreational facilities are not permitted in the Environmental Protection Designation and the permission found at Policy 5.6.1.2 a) v. which permits "other existing lawful uses...as of the date of the adoption of this Plan" may be determined not to be applicable given the pause in operations that have occurred. It is therefore requested that the portion of the subject lands containing the existing improved laneway, which does not have environmental/natural heritage attributes, be placed in the Parks and Open Space Designation or alternatively Policy 4.5.1.2 a) v. be broadened to include existing improved facilities.</p> <p>With regard to the Parks and Open Space Designation, as noted previously, it permits private recreational facilities, which we understand would include open or enclosed tennis courts. Further, this Designation also permits "Accessory buildings and structures, and limited commercial uses which serve the main permitted use may be permitted subject to the relevant policies of this Plan, and the requirements of the Zoning By-law." We understand that accessory buildings an structures would include a clubhouse and caretaker or accommodation units for the facility's staff.</p>	<p>In order to change the EP land use designation mapping, an EIS is required. An EIS may be prepared as part of a future development application.</p> <p>EP policies allow for minor modifications to mapping boundaries with a supportive EIS through development application review.</p>
		<p>The Parks and Open Space Designation also provides policy direction in terms of the height/built form of these accessory buildings and limits them to Low-Rise Buildings (Policy 5.2.5.3. d)). Policy 5.1.8.1 a) indicates "Where Low-Rise Buildings are specifically identified as a permitted built form within any Designation in this Plan, the maximum building height shall be 3 storeys, or 11 metres in height, whichever is less." This restriction is extremely problematic, not only for my clients but may also be for the Town and other entities that desire to erect buildings or structures, be it permanent or temporary, to enclose sports fields/facilities on lands in the Parks and Open Space Designation. Examples of these issues include the enclosure of 3 of the 6 existing tennis courts within a "bubble" which would require a permissible height of approximately 15.5 metres and, to enclose a full size (11 v 11) football pitch within a "bubble" would require a permissible height in the magnitude of 21.0 metres.</p> <p>Given the foregoing, it is recommended that to preclude Official Plan Amendments for buildings/structures in the Parks and Open Space Designation that exceed the maximum 11 metres that more permissive language be used in terms of the maximum height of buildings/structures in the Parks and Open Space Designation and/or an exemption be developed for temporary buildings such as a "bubble". This would support the Town's vision in terms of being an active community.</p> <p>In summary, it is respectfully submitted that the portion of the subject lands proposed to be designated Environmental Protection be changed to the Parks and Open Space Designation and the current prohibitive restriction regarding height/built form be revised to facilitate temporary buildings (a "bubble").</p>	<p>The policies provide sufficient flexibility to permit additional height, if appropriate, in the Zoning By-law.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

<p>14</p>	<p>Innovative Planning Solutions Greg Barker, B.A.A. Partner 2204604 Ontario Inc Regional Commercial District lands 20 High Street</p>	<p>(Summarized) This correspondence is submitted following comments provided on the 1st Draft Official Plan, submitted in August 2023. Comments previously provided have gone unaddressed in this second draft to the satisfaction of the Owners. IPS does not believe that the OP goes far enough to address the current issues around Housing and Climate Crisis. Allowing for a wider range of housing types and residential uses through the OP policies on the RCD lands would also have the potential to reduce development pressures in existing/established neighbourhoods... however the OP maintains onerous and restrictive policies on the RCD lands which is expected to have the unintended consequence of the lands remaining undeveloped. It would be reasonable and appropriate for the OP to include policies which continue to support the area as a commercial destination AND allow for a range of housing types to take advantage of and support the nearby amenities (including commercial and employment uses).</p> <p>The combination of prohibiting stand alone residential uses, mandating minimum ground floor non residential uses in mixed use buildings and overarching policies to protect the downtown core brings into question the viability of development on the subject lands in the current and future market for big box commercial and residential/housing demand.</p> <p>Regional Commercial district policies conflict with the Community Values articulated in the OP.</p> <p>The RCD lands have not seen recent development occur for a number of reasons, including, in part some of the restrictions imposed under the current Official Plan, and in consideration of existing available commercial amenities and uses in the area.</p> <p>The residential intensification opportunities available to the RCD lands which is located within a strategic growth area are limited and severely challenged by requiring mixed use buildings along with the limited commercial type uses being permitted... In our opinion has the effect of preventing residential uses from occurring, thus increasing development pressures throughout the Town elsewhere in locations not intended for higher density developments... the RCD lands would be more appropriately developed in a horizontal mixed use manner (ie across the lands, including stand alone residential and stand alone commercial uses) than a vertical (ie mixed use buildings) manner and would better facilitate intensification as outlined in the Plan.</p>	<p>This is a Site Specific redesignation request, and the Town has previously responded that this would be considered as a "MAJOR" redesignation request through Staff Report P2023-24, and require a site specific Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Town response was "Property is within Regional Commercial District which contains specific restrictive policies for commercial uses developed to protect the viability of the Downtown.</p> <p>The Town nor the landowner has not undertaken a comprehensive commercial study that would support changing these policies through this OP update.</p> <p>Request seeks substantial site-specific changes and a revised policy framework, which would require a commercial market study and site specific Official Plan Amendment."</p> <p>Comments remain generally the same as those provided for Draft 1.</p>
		<p>Clarification is requested relating to permitted minimum building height as mid rise buildings require a minimum height of 3 storeys (5.1.8.2 (a)).</p> <p>Further discussion with the Town is requested relating to these draft policies with the intention of developing policies which will realistically allow for residential uses while maintaining an appropriate level of commercial uses within the RCD designation. The Subject lands generally comprise Area 20 and Area 21 - Area specific policies are overly restrictive policies which in our opinion would be more appropriate as zoning provisions. overly restrictive policies which in our opinion would be more appropriate as zoning provisions. In general, it does not appear much attention has been given to the policies relating to the Regional Commercial District lands. The majority of policies are maintained from the current Official Plan.</p>	<p>Policy changes have been made in RCD policies to adjust minimum building heights for some flexibility and acknowledge modest existing building expansions.</p> <p>RCD policies have been retained from current Official Plan. Town response has not changed from Draft 1. New OP policies provide opportunity for a landowner or the Town to undertake a Retail Commercial Study to adjust permitted uses and other specific Regional Commercial District policies.</p>
<p>15</p>	<p>Kristine A. Loft BES BAA MCIP RPP Principal Loft Planning On behalf of Primont (Collingwood 100) Inc. 207 Osler Bluff Road</p>	<p>The Subdivision of Land - Section 7.1.5 The policies of Sections 7.1.5.1(i) and (j), are subjective and restrictive when compared to other County and Municipal draft plan extension policies. There are many circumstances that can delay the registration of a subdivision or condominium that are completely outside the owner/developer's control, and they should not be penalized for these challenges. Such phasing may be as a result of, for example, broader infrastructure constraints, allocation limits, etc. Multi-phase projects typically benefit from phased registrations with subsequent registrations following in succession over several years. It is inappropriate to mandate such a short timeline for satisfaction of all conditions of draft plan approval and it is equally inappropriate to limit such extensions to 1 year – particularly where it may be well-known that the extension will need to be longer.</p> <p>Within the "response matrix" to Draft 1 comments the Town did provide the following comment: "It is agreed that up-front in the next version of the DRAFT Official Plan there will be a clear statement of transition that indicates that all existing development approvals will be carried forward and recognized, where appropriate and supportable as good planning. Further, there will be a policy statement that indicates that all development applications submitted prior to the approval of the Official Plan shall be subject to the policy and regulatory frameworks in effect at the time of the application."</p> <p>However, the currently drafted policy is insufficient, lacks transparency or reliability and requires revision. We recommend the Official plan include clear policy on extensions – particularly for phased plans and those caught in transition. Such policy language should also provide clear direction on how any discretion will be exercised by Council and/or staff, when extensions will be granted by default and when extensions will be subject to greater discretion. This is particularly relevant as the Town addresses current water and sewer capacity constraints.</p>	<p>Appropriate transition policies have been included and apply to all existing approvals. New applications will be reviewed under the relevant policy framework that applies at the time of application.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>Section 5.6 Natural Heritage System Draft 2 of the proposed Official Plan contemplates a 30 metre buffer from lands designated Environmental Protection, plus a 90 metre Adjacent Lands Overlay, for a total of a 120 metre setback. Any new development within the 120 m will require an Environmental Impact Study.</p> <p>Based on the currently drafted text, the Official Plan requirements for adjacent lands and triggers for Environmental Impact Studies are substantially greater than the requirements of the Provinces Natural Heritage Reference Manual being,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 120 metres from provincially significant wetlands, o 50 metres from significant woodlands, valley lands, wildlife habitat, significant portions of habitat for threatened or endangered species and significant ANSI, and o 30 metres from fish habitat. <p>We request that Council defer adopting an Environmental Protection designation (Schedule 2) and Natural Heritage System and Adjacent Lands (Schedule 3) on the subject lands until an Environmental Impact Study is completed or include language that provides that the results of such study will determine any designations without the need for an amendment to the plan. We further request that the Official Plan – Draft 2 be amended to reflect standardized adjacent lands which will require the completion of a peer-reviewed Environmental Impact Study prior to development in order to establish the required setback.</p>	<p>The Town's proposed Natural Heritage System is appropriate and consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and the proposed Provincial Planning Statement.</p> <p>The EP land use designation and Adjacent Lands Overlay are designed to require an EIS to be prepared to assess natural heritage features.</p> <p>The Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications. It is not designed to prohibit development, unless the features warrant it.</p>
<p>16</p>	<p>MHBC Oz Kemal, BES, MCIP, RPP Partner on behalf of Crestpoint Real Estate (Blue Mountain) Inc. 2 and 6 Old Mountain Road, and 5, 7 and 15 Balsam Street commonly identified as the Blue Mountains Centre</p>	<p>In reviewing the Draft #2 amendments in context of our Submission Letter, we appreciate that minor amendments were made, but note that the policy intent from the current Draft #2 Official Plan and from Draft #1 remain. For example, while a zoning by-law amendment application may be made to alter the minimum retail unit sizes under policy 5.3.4.3.d, an amendment to the Official Plan is required to alter the retail unit sizes of 5.7.6.1.b (Area 18). In effect, the recommendation to remove the lands from Area 18 and the range of retail unit size limitations for the Subject Lands, was not considered.</p> <p>Recommend: As previously requested, remove the Subject Lands from Area 18, Schedule 7, and from the Area Specific policies of 5.7.6.1.</p> <p>Under section 5.3.4 The Regional Commercial District Designation, policy 5.3.4.3.d. defers to the Zoning By-law regulations to determine 'minimum' retail unit sizes through Zoning By-law regulations, whereas policies 5.3.4.2.d and 5.7.6.1.b defer to Official Plan policies for maximum floor area sizes. We continue to recommend that these inter-related retail unit size zoning regulations be removed from the Official Plan.</p> <p>Similarly, while we appreciate the addition of policy text in s.5.3.4.3.e.ii that recognizes existing built forms of one storey and the potential expansion needs, we are concerned with the inclusion of another regulatory standard, namely that an expansion must be less than 1,000 m2 of GFA. It is unclear how this GFA was determined, as no studies regarding the Retail Market have been undertaken by the Town in the preparation of the Draft Official Plan. As a regulation, this standard should be removed from the Draft Official Plan and/or included in the Zoning By-law regulations for the applicable Zone.</p>	<p>This as a MAJOR Site Specific redesignation request in accordance with the established criteria, which would require an Official Plan Amendment to facilitate with the same response as provided for 20 High Street, which states "Property is within Regional Commercial District which contains specific restrictive policies for commercial uses developed to protect the viability of the Downtown.</p> <p>The Town nor the landowner has not undertaken a comprehensive commercial study that would support changing these policies through this OP update.</p> <p>Request seeks substantial site-specific changes and a revised policy framework, which would require a commercial market study and site specific Official Plan Amendment."</p> <p>Policies provide opportunity for a landowner or the Town to undertake a Retail Commercial Study to adjust permitted uses and other specific Regional Commercial District policies.</p> <p>Policies provide flexibility for modest expansions to existing and new small-scale one storey retail buildings.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>NEW DRAFT #2 POLICIES: Comments and Recommendations</p> <p>In reviewing we note the following matters and policies that have been added to the draft Official Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 3: Natural Heritage System <p>The addition of a Subwatershed Boundary line that incorporate the majority of Town lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 5: Active Transportation Plan <p>It is noted that the sidewalk along the Balsam Street frontage of the Subject Lands, has been renamed from 'Multi-Use Sidewalk' to 'Multi-Use Pathway.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 7: Area Specific Policies <p>As noted previously, the Areas have been renumbered. In the case of the Subject Lands, the Area number is now "18".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4.3.j <p>The policy notes, in part, that the Allocation Policy is, "to clarify for the development community and the public, how a finite resource will be managed to ensure servicing capacity is "allocated to those projects that provide the greatest benefit to the community."</p> <p>Has the Town ascertained that potable water will soon disappear, as it is a 'finite' resource for the Town, and that the Town is now managing the quantity of that natural resource (e.g. Georgian Bay)? Perhaps the policy should be rephrased to indicate that the Town's financial resources are 'finite' on an annual basis and not capable of servicing growth.</p>	<p>Available servicing capacity is a finite resource. No change required.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.2.4 Health Service Overlay <p>It is unclear if the Town is limiting medical service uses to a restricted geographic area through this overlay. Given that the terms pertaining to medical uses are only referenced in this Overlay, it is unclear if medical offices will not be permitted in other neighbourhoods in context of 15-minute communities as noted in policy 3.4.d.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.1.6 Entrances onto Public Roads <p>Noted that several policies have been added, but also note that such policies should merely defer to government transportation standards, as such standards resolve the policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 7.2.6 Policy Conflicts <p>Policy 7.2.6.b defers to Area Specific Policies where a conflict exists between the general policies and the specific policies.</p>	<p>Health care offices are broadly permitted.</p>
<p>17</p>	<p>Gordon H. Russell, MCIP, RPP Land Use Planner G. H. Russell Planning and Development Services</p> <p>on behalf of Messrs. M. Vercillo and B. Maiolo</p> <p>2681199 Ontario Inc., 2667588 Ontario Inc. & 2773098 Ontario Inc.</p>	<p>Existing Official Plan - Schedule 'A' designates the majority subject lands "Residential" and a smaller portion "Environmental Protection". The "Environmental Protection" designation is along the western boundary of the subject lands inclusive of part of the Black Ash Creek feature. Schedule 'C' designates the residential component of these lands as "Medium Density Residential". Regarding Natural Heritage Resources, Schedule 'B' designates the west area "Category 1 Valley Lands" and "Category 2 Woodlands".</p> <p>Proposed Official Plan Draft 2 - Schedule '1', Growth Management Plan, proposes to re-designate most of the subject lands "Greenlands System". A small portion of their land fronting onto High Street is proposed to be designated "Residential Community Areas". Schedule '2', Land Use Plan, proposes to re-designate the majority of the subject lands as "Environmental Protection" with a small portion fronting High Street as "Existing Neighbourhood". Schedule '3', Natural Heritage System, proposes to re-designate the subject lands "Natural Heritage System" for the most part and a smaller portion of the lands along High Street with the "Adjacent Lands Overlay".</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
		<p>Summary of Requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the status of the subject lands as acknowledged in existing Official Plan designations (Residential & Medium Density) be carried forward in the proposed new Official Plan. 2. Proposed Schedule '1' to be revised to designate the subject lands as "Greenfield Residential Community Area" with the westerly boundary area along Black Ash Creek designated "Greenfield System". 3. Proposed Schedule '2' be revised to designate the subject lands "Future Neighborhood" and "Environmental Protection" in accordance with our developable land limit boundary depicted on the attached draft Block Plan of Subdivision. 4. That discussions on the development of the subject lands continue in order to address development form, density, process and agreement(s) (Subdivision and/or Development). 	<p>An Environmental Impact Study should be completed by the proponent and peer reviewed by the Town (and applicable Conservation Authority, as appropriate) to demonstrate lands are not Natural Heritage System in order to adjust Environmental Protection land use designation boundaries in this Official Plan.</p> <p>Portion of lands not identified as Greenlands System on Schedule 1 in proposed plan will be shown as Greenfield Residential Community Areas. Mapping has been corrected.</p> <p>Portion of lands not identified as EP on Schedule 2 in proposed plan will be shown as Future Neighbourhood. Mapping has been corrected.</p> <p>Acknowledged. The landowner intends to continue preconsultation and submission of development applications supported by an EIS.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>Moving ahead, 2681199 Ontario Inc., 2667588 Ontario Inc. & 2773098 Ontario Inc. look forward to continued discussions with Town Staff with a view to establish a new Residential Plan of Subdivision with Permitted Built Form/Uses as listed in Section 5.2.2.2 Permitted Built Form/Uses, of OP Draft 2, inclusive of:</p> <p>a) Development within the Future Neighbourhoods Designation may be within Low-Rise, Mid- Rise, and High-Rise Residential Buildings.</p> <p>b) The following uses may be permitted on lands within the Future Neighbourhoods Designation, as shown on Schedule 2, subject to the relevant policies of this Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residential units in Low-Rise, Mid-Rise, and High-Rise Residential Buildings; 2. Additional Residential Units; 3. Additional Needs Housing; 4. Live-work Units; 5. Home-Based Businesses; 6. Short-term Accommodations; 7. Day Care Facilities; 8. Small-Scale Places of Worship; 9. Neighbourhood Centres; 10. Neighbourhood Supporting Uses; and 11. xii. Public Service Facilities. <p>In regard to density, it is our intent to design this development and its associated residential blocks to a maximum of 55 units per gross hectare and to the range outlined in the low, mid and high rise residential building policies, whichever density calculation is greater.</p>	<p>Formal development application approvals will be required to achieve these goals, supported by an appropriate and acceptable EIS and other studies as deemed appropriate by the Town.</p>
<p>18</p>	<p>Tim Smith, Principal Urban Strategies</p> <p>On behalf of Smycorp Investments Inc.,</p> <p>25.6-acre property in the northwest quadrant of Poplar Sideroad and Raglan Street intersection</p>	<p>In our comments on Draft 1 of the new Official Plan, dated August 17, 2022, we stated our opinion that the Town should not finalize the new OP until the Province has made a decision regarding the MZO requested for the proposed Poplar Regional Health and Wellness Village on lands immediately east of the subject property. The Province has since approved the MZO, and the Town has responded in the draft OP by acknowledging the approval and permitting a mixed of uses across the lands while maintaining an underlying General Employment Area designation in the event the village proposal does not move forward and the MZO is revoked.</p> <p>We appreciate the policy context for the Smycorp lands remains uncertain and that the Town does not wish to delay updating its Official Plan while it waits for greater certainty regarding the Poplar Village proposal. Nevertheless, as stated in our previous comments, we continue to feel that if the village plans, including a new hospital, move forward, they should prompt the Town to comprehensively review the Official Plan, at least with respect to the supply and structure of employment lands. Such a review should consider the village's impacts on adjacent lands, including the subject property, to ensure their intended uses fit with and complement the village uses and character.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
		<p>In the meantime, our more immediate concern with the Draft 2 OP is the elimination of standalone office buildings and commercial establishments as permitted uses on the Smycorp property under the proposed General Employment Area designation. "Corporate administration offices" and "business offices", along with restaurants, recreation facilities, convenience stores and gas stations, are permitted under the Industrial Park designation in the current OP, and the site's M4 zoning permits office uses and a range of other commercial uses. It is our understanding the Town is proposing more restrictive land use permissions in response to the Proposed Provincial Planning Statement, which if adopted without amendments would prohibit office and retail not associated with a primary employment use in employment areas (except where such uses already exist). The Proposed PPS, however, has not yet been adopted, and we believe the Province will be reconsidering the employment area policies given the significant impact they will have on both municipalities and private landowners. Therefore, it is premature for the Town to be aligning its new Official Plan with the Proposed PPS.</p> <p>In conclusion, we respectfully request that the Town carry forward the current land use permissions on the subject property in the new Official Plan under the general provisions of the General Employment Area designation or through a site-specific exception. If the Town is aligning the OP to the Proposed PPS to try to avoid further updates to the plan following adoption of the PPS, we would like assurance in writing that the Town will initiate a future Official Plan Amendment reversing the prohibition against standalone office and other commercial uses should the Province not proceed with that policy direction. Smycorp Investments is moving forward with an application that would pave the way for "flex office" buildings on the site, which would support Collingwood's growing and evolving economy.</p>	<p>Employment land use designation policies and permitted uses are consistent with the proposed Provincial Planning Statement and Planning Act provisions (not yet proclaimed and in effect). Retaining the current land use permissions would not be consistent with these provincial planning instruments, and would require a site specific Official Plan Amendment would be required to facilitate this request.</p> <p>Should the Province change the direction in the proposed Provincial Planning Statement, the Town will take the necessary steps to address the policy changes.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

19	<p>Kyle Galvin MCIP RPP Innovative Planning Solutions</p> <p>on behalf of EDEV Inc.</p> <p>11338 and 11344 and 11352 Highway 26, and 12 Gun Club Road</p>	<p>We respectfully request the following changes to the Draft Official Plan:</p> <p>Redesignate the subject site on Schedule '1' in the Draft Official Plan from: 'Residential Community Areas' to 'Strategic Growth Areas' (retain the 'Greenland System' designation)</p> <p>Redesignate the subject site on Schedule '2' in the Draft Official Plan from: 'Existing Neighbourhood' to 'Mixed Use Corridor 1' (retain the 'Environmental Protection' designation).</p>	<p>This is a Site Specific Land Use Redesignation request. This as a MAJOR Site Specific redesignation request in accordance with the established criteria, which would require an Official Plan Amendment to facilitate.</p> <p>Property is not located within a Strategic Growth Area and is not an appropriate location for mixed use commercial/residential land uses.</p>
20	<p>Colin Travis MCIP RPP Travis & Associates</p> <p>on behalf of Lotco II Limited, AI Allendorf</p> <p>Lotco II Limited 50 Saunders Street</p>	<p>1. Draft OP 2 has slightly modified the proposed land use designations. However, overall, the proposed land use designations continue to support development of the subject lands for low density residential development. In this regard, the July 2023 approved Draft Plan and Zoning By-law would conform to the land use intent expressed in Draft OP 2.</p> <p>2. In a non-site-specific context, Draft OP 2 offers significant departures from existing Official Plan policy. We understand the broader development community will be commenting on such matters as: extensions to Draft Approval (section 5.1.7 (j)); Natural Heritage Systems (section 5.6) and the incorporation of SCAP (section 4.3 i)) as an Official Plan land use control policy. Our client will be reviewing additional industry responses to such non-site-specific policies and may have additional commentary.</p> <p>We request acknowledgement of receipt of this letter and confirmation that our interpretations of these broader policies as they affect the subject lands are correct.</p>	<p>Unclear on the interpretations being made of the broader policies.</p>
21	<p>Colin Travis MCIP RPP Travis & Associates</p> <p>on behalf of Trails of Collingwood, David Ferracuti Town File Nos: D1203117 and D14617</p> <p>391 High Street</p>	<p>1. Our understanding that the proposed Draft OP 2 land use designations permit development of the subject lands as allowed for under existing Draft Plan and Zoning permissions. We would appreciate confirmation of this overall assessment.</p> <p>2. Our August 17, 2022 submission expressed concern over the "Adjacent Lands Overlay" (Schedule '3').</p> <p>3. We understand that the broader development industry will be submitting a response on Draft OP 2 and such a submission may bring to light additional comments that we may want to refer to.</p>	<p>Appropriate transition policies have been included and apply to all existing approvals. New applications will be reviewed under the relevant policy framework that applies at the time of application.</p> <p>The Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications. It is not designed to prohibit development, unless the features warrant it. Transition policies apply to existing approvals.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p>
22	<p>Shelley Wells MES, MCIP, RPP Plan Wells Associates</p> <p>on behalf of Ted North (295 Mountain Road) Ltd. Todco Investments Inc.</p>	<p>Draft 2 of the proposed new Official Plan has implemented a 30 m buffer from lands designated Environmental Protection, plus a 90 m Adjacent Lands Overlay, for a total of a 120 m setback. Any new development within the 120 m will require an Environmental Impact Study.</p> <p>We find the Town is proposing to implement a 'carte blanche' policy that treats every natural heritage feature as if it were a Provincially Significant Wetland. We note the Ontario Natural Heritage Reference Manual for Policy Section 2.1 - Provincial Policy Statement 2020 defines "adjacent lands" as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 120 metres from provincially significant wetlands • 50 metres from significant woodlands, valley lands, wildlife habitat, significant portions of habitat for threatened or endangered species and significant ANSIs and • 30 metres from fish habitat. <p>This is a menu approach not a one policy fits all approach. We have researched and summarized Natural Heritage policies in the following Official Plans (see attached Policy Summary Chart):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Township of Clearview, Office Consolidation January 2019 • Municipality of Meaford, Office Consolidation November 2014 • Town of the Blue Mountains July 2022 Draft • County of Grey, June 7, 2019 <p>We find the Draft # 2 Official Plan Natural Heritage policies to be out of step with the generally accepted menu approach to defining Natural Heritage features and setting out the limits of adjacent lands. These policies should be eliminated and the more traditional menu approach substituted.</p>	<p>The Town's proposed Natural Heritage System is appropriate and consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, the proposed Provincial Planning Statement, and NHRM.</p> <p>The EP land use designation and Adjacent Lands Overlay are designed to require an EIS to be prepared to assess natural heritage features.</p> <p>The Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications, consistent with the PPS and NHRM. It is not designed to prohibit development, unless the features warrant it.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>We remain of the opinion that the above noted policies require specific reference to Panorama and Panorama North. We need to be assured that extensions will be granted to bridge from the current lapse dates to the date on which the work is completed to bring water service infrastructure and adequate supply to the property boundary of both these draft plan approved subdivisions.</p> <p>We note that Mair Mills Village Inc. and Ted North (295 Mountain Road) Ltd. have worked collaboratively with the Town of Collingwood and neighboring owners of 2577336 Ontario Limited (formerly known as "Linksvie" and now owned by the Wyview Group) and 2721733 Ontario Limited (formerly known as "Red Maple" and now owned by Lunor), to re-draft and finalize a cost sharing arrangement for the design and construction of the Stewart Road pumping station, reservoir, and the 10 th Line trunk watermain.</p> <p>Negotiations to finalize the Advanced Timing Agreement have stalled. Mr. Craig Robson, (Robson Carpenter), on behalf of the owners of the above noted draft approved subdivisions, has said owners require certainty in order to make an investment well in excess of Ten Million Dollars (\$10,000,000) to fund this infrastructure.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that the Town's Servicing Capacity Allocation Policy (SCAP) includes wording which alludes to flexibility for extenuating circumstances to extend draft plan approvals, we require specific wording in the proposed Official Plan which guarantees the Panorama and Panorama North draft plan of subdivision approvals remain in place for a reasonable length of time after this infrastructure is commissioned.</p>	This is subject a separate legal process and is not a matter for the Official Plan Review.
		<p>We remain of the opinion that the foregoing required certainty is not achieved by having any element of the advanced Timing Agreement commitments being conditional on a SCAP score, or ambiguous wording on extenuating circumstances to grant an extension to a draft plan as set out in Section 7.1.5.1 (i) and (j) of the draft Official Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, we remain of the opinion that Section 7.1.5.1(i) and (j) are out of step with policies set out in Official Plan policies of surrounding Municipalities and the County of Grey.</p> <p>We have researched and summarized draft plan extension policies in the following Official Plans (see attached Policy Summary Chart):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Township of Clearview, Office Consolidation January 2019 • Municipality of Meaford, Office Consolidation November 2014 • Town of the Blue Mountains July 2022 Draft • County of Grey, June 7, 2019 <p>In our opinion a 'clear statement of transition' in the second draft of the proposed new Official Plan does not align with the Town's response above. We find this response to be contradictory.</p> <p>The Town stated, "that all existing development approvals will be carried forward and recognized, where appropriate and supportable as good planning." If development approvals have already been obtained, then appropriate and good planning has already been established.</p> <p>We request that the Town include a 'clear policy for transition' for Panorama and Panorama North. We offer the following wording for your consideration: "All existing development approvals for Panorama and Panorama North will be carried forward and recognized as appropriate and good planning. Extensions will be granted to bridge from the current lapse dates to the date on which the work is completed to bring water service infrastructure and adequate supply to the property boundary of both these draft plan approved subdivisions."</p> <p>Any policy contained in the second draft that is contradictory to the above noted policy should be removed.</p>	<p>This is subject to a separate legal process and is not a matter for the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Appropriate transition policies have been included and apply to all existing approvals. New applications will be reviewed under the relevant policy framework that applies at the time of application. Staff/consultant do not recommend site specific transition policies for individual development applications.</p>
23	<p>Shelley Wells MES, MCIP, RPP Plan Wells Associates</p> <p>On behalf of Mair Mills Village Inc. Panorama Subdivision 260 Mountain Road.</p>	See above letter for Panorama North	Same comments provided for Panorama North Subdivision - See response above.

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

24	<p>MHBC Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP Partner</p> <p>on behalf of Wyview Group & FLATO Developments Inc</p> <p>Draft Plan Approved Linksvie Subdivision (780 Tenth Line)</p>	<p>MHBC understands that Plan Wells Associates submitted a letter dated October 11, 2023 to the Town providing comments on the Town's Draft Official Plan on behalf of their Clients, Ted North and Mair Mills Village who are the owners of the Panorama and Panorama North Subdivisions. Wyview Group and FLATO Developments Inc. support the comment and concern raised by Panorama and Panorama North regarding Section 7.1.5 The Subdivision of Land policies for extensions to draft plan approvals.</p> <p>As noted in the Plan Wells Associates letter, our Clients are part of the landowner group that is preparing the cost sharing agreement for the design and construction of the required upgrades to the municipal water/waste water infrastructure to service the proposed developments. The landowner group would be investing in excess of ten million dollars to fund the required infrastructure and as a result our Clients require certainty that extensions to the Linksvie Subdivision draft plan approval will be granted, particularly when any requests for an extension are predominately due to factors outside of our Clients control. Our Clients would also like to express their concern with this prescriptive approach the Town is taking in light of specific reasons outlined in the letter.</p>	<p>This is subject to legal discussion and is not a matter for the Official Plan Review.</p>
25	<p>MHBC Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP Partner</p> <p>on behalf of Wyview Group & FLATO Developments Inc</p> <p>Adjacent landholding to the west Draft Plan Approved Linksvie Subdivision comprised of contiguous parcels comprising over 130 hectares (320 acres) of land in the Mountain Road West Corridor Secondary Plan</p>	<p>Wyview Group and FLATO Developments Inc are also requesting the Town's consideration their above noted landholdings adjacent to the Linksvie Subdivision be included as part of the Greenfield Areas in the Town of Collingwood Official Plan and be designated to be available for residential development. As part of this request, the following Official Plan Schedules would need to be revised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 1 Growth Management Plan identifies the landholdings as 'Future Urban' and 'Greenlands System'. Wyview Group and FLATO Developments Inc are requesting this schedule be updated so that the landholdings are within the 'Greenfield Residential Community Areas' and 'Greenlands System'. • Schedule 2 Land Use Plan designates the landholding as 'Rural' and 'Environmental Protection'. Wyview Group and FLATO Developments Inc are requesting this landholding be re-designated as 'Future Neighbourhood' and 'Environmental Protection'. 	<p>This is a Site Specific redesignation request, and the Town has previously responded that this would be considered as a "MAJOR" redesignation request through Staff Report P2021-27, and require a site specific Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Response was "Lands Not for Urban Uses. Needs to be considered through the County Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). Official Plan Amendment required."</p>
		<p>The request is being made at this time for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will facilitate more housing supply in the Town of Collingwood to assist with the current housing shortage; • The Town has adjusted the growth horizon from 2041 to 2051 in the 2nd Draft of the Town's OP and will need to accommodate additional growth; • More resources will become available by bringing required servicing improvements to this area of Collingwood. It is understood the developers will be expected to provide the upfront costs to bring services to the site; • Assist the Town in meeting its Official Plan policy of ensuring a minimum 15 year supply of Greenfield Area lands that are designated and available for residential development; • This will provide an opportunity to master plan a large portion of the Greenfield Area that is currently under single ownership by two reputable companies that are actively developing other properties within the Town and nearby municipalities; and • Our Clients have completed considerable work including environmental fieldwork to inform and prepare a concept master plan for these landholdings. Please see the constraints mapping and the concept master plan attached as Figures 2 and 3 for reference. 	<p>See response above.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

26	<p>Colin Travis MCIP RPP Travis & Associates</p> <p>on behalf of Red Maple, Town File No. D1202218 725 Tenth Line</p>	<p>1. Our concerns over the "Adjacent Lands Overlay" as expressed in our August 18, 2022 response to Draft OP 1 remain. The extent and type of development is established in the approved Draft Plan and Zoning By-law. Environmental constraint areas are clearly identified and accounted for.</p> <p>2. We concur with the intent of the comments provided by PlanWells Associates (October 11, 2023): area landowners have met with the Town as part of an exercise to draft and finalize cost sharing for the Stewart Road Pumping Station. The cost sharing amounts to front-ending. Such an approach requires extensions to Draft Approval in order to bridge the time gap between available services and utilization of such services. No such consideration is given in Section 5.1.7 to Draft OP 2.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that that proposed "SCAP" policies in Draft OP 2 are insufficient and inappropriate to address the realities of infrastructure funding with private-sector partners. Utilizing SCAP remains a highly subjective experience.</p> <p>PlanWells identified approaches used in nearby planning jurisdictions that merit consideration when infrastructure financing agreements with private land owners are necessary.</p> <p>3. We are aware that the local development industry will be responding to Draft OP 2 and we may have additional comments.</p>	<p>Sames response. Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications consistent with the PPS and NHRM. This application has already received conditional draft approval and clearance from the NVCA for the plan of subdivision. Transition policies apply to existing approvals.</p> <p>This is subject to a separate legal process and is not a matter for the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The SCAP provides a framework to allocate servicing capacity in a fair, sustainable, transparent and logical manner.</p> <p>This is subject to a separate legal process and is not a matter for the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p>
27	<p>Celeste Phillips, MCIP, RPP Celeste Phillips Planning Inc.</p> <p>On behalf of 70 High Street Inc. 70 High Street</p>	<p>The current draft of the Official Plan proposes to 'down-designate' my client's property to a 'Prestige Employment' designation that would specifically prohibit retail and service commercial uses and restaurants, hotels, convention centres and banquet facilities, indoor and outdoor event spaces, recreation facilities, automobile service centres and repair shops, mini-storage facilities. Additionally, it would also appear that the draft Official Plan proposes to set a maximum size for office uses.</p> <p>My client opposes the land use designation change from Business Park to Prestige Industrial for 70 High Street and the proposed prohibition of certain already-permitted uses.</p> <p>I note that at the October 4, 2023 Open House, reference was made to 'transition policies' of the new Official Plan and it is my position that the development for 70 High Street has been in the planning process since September 2022 and should be 'transitioned' to allow for the continuation of now permitted uses at this location.</p>	<p>Employment land use designation policies and permitted uses are consistent with the proposed Provincial Planning Statement and Planning Act provisions (not yet proclaimed and in effect). Retaining the current land use permissions would not be consistent with these provincial planning instruments.</p> <p>Acknowledged</p> <p>The Plan contains transition policies that state "All development applications deemed complete by the Town prior to the approval of this Plan shall be subject to the Official Plan policies in place at the time the development application was deemed complete by the Town."</p>
28	<p>Skelton Brumwell Michael Wynia, MCIP, RPP, Partner, Senior Ecologist and Planner</p> <p>on behalf of 12123045 Canada Inc., and Adventurous Holdings Ltd. Re: "Braeside Lots" Part N ½ Lot 37 Concession 5, Nottawasaga, Parts 57 to 71 inclusive, and Parts 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, and 56 on Plan 1R729, in the Town of Collingwood</p>	<p>We are in the process of reviewing information and have completed initial site investigations.</p> <p>We have already expressed the opinion that applying the more restrictive designation on the entirety of the properties in question is not warranted. Again, in our experience, it is also unusual for a landowner to have to challenge a proposed municipal designation with a completed EIS, particularly where the municipality is proposing to down-designate the lands.</p> <p>In this case, our client is however prepared to complete a full EIS. Unfortunately, in order to complete a full EIS we will need to extend field work into at least the spring of 2024 in order to properly document site conditions and provide a full opinion on the extent of any environmentally sensitive lands and the implications to the appropriate land uses and designations.</p> <p>We recognize that it is not likely that the Town will be delaying further work on the new Official plan until the spring or summer of next year.</p> <p>In this context, we are respectfully suggesting an approach that may equitably deal with this matter.</p>	<p>An Environmental Impact Study should be completed by the proponent and peer reviewed by the Town (and applicable Conservation Authority, as appropriate) to demonstrate lands are not Natural Heritage System in order to adjust Environmental Protection land use designation boundaries in this Official Plan.</p> <p>Environmental Protection mapping boundaries may only be adjusted where an EIS has demonstrated that the lands do not contain natural heritage features. An EIS is being completed by the applicant, which will be peer reviewed by the Town, upon receipt.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>The subject lands are already potentially to be included in a special policy area. We respectfully suggest that it is premature to down-designate the lands and that an alternative approach would be to designate the lands with special policy that will establish development opportunities based on further detailed site work. While the exact wording could be discussed, we would suggest something similar to the following:</p> <p>"59 and 60-72 Braeside Street Collingwood</p> <p>Notwithstanding the designation applying to the lands and the policies of this Plan, subject to the conclusions and requirements of an Environmental Impact Study, the lands may be developed in accordance with the permitted uses and development policies of the Rural Residential land use designation. This may allow development of existing lots as well as limited development of additional residential lots where former lots have been consolidated. Furthermore, within these lands development may occur on individual private on-site services provided the adequacy of the proposed method of water supply and sanitary sewage disposal and sufficient reserve capacity for effluent treatment of hauled sewage is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Town and/or other authority with jurisdiction. Where individual private on-site services are utilized they should be installed to facilitate future connections to municipal services."</p>	<p>This as a MAJOR Site Specific redesignation request in accordance with the established criteria, which would require an Official Plan Amendment to facilitate.</p>
		<p>The exact wording could be further reviewed, but the essence is that the existing lots and recreation of previously consolidated lots could be developed on private services subject to an EIS and appropriate servicing study. While the actual density of lots would be dependent on the outcome of the environmental and servicing studies, it is anticipated that this would be low density, similar to, and compatible with, that which already exists in the area.</p> <p>This approach addresses the potential servicing and natural environment issues of the lands with appropriate safeguards and avoids a down-designation of the lands in the absence of a full assessment of those matters.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
<p>29</p>	<p>ZELINKA PRIAMO LTD. Jonathan Rodger, MScPI, MCIP, RPP Senior Associate</p> <p>on Behalf of on Behalf of Canadian Tire Properties Inc. 89 Balsam Street (55 Mountain Road)</p>	<p>At this time, our preliminary comments for the June 2023 Draft Official Plan area as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 5.1.2(a)i. states that “the design of any development adjacent to the Environmental Protection Designation shall include opportunities to enhance the ecological integrity of the natural heritage feature and its associated ecological functions.” Our previous comment on this policy sought clarification on the intent of “opportunities to enhance”, suggesting that “where appropriate” be added to the policy. This policy remains unchanged in this second draft. The Town provided response that these “opportunities to enhance” are to be identified through Environmental Impact Studies. We maintain our initial comment that a “where appropriate” clause be added, such as with minor additions to existing properties where the lot is adjacent to an environmental feature, but would not pose any direct interface or interaction with the feature. In these cases, it would not be appropriate to perform an Environmental Impact Study. • Policy 5.3.4.3(e)i. provides a minimum ground floor height of 4.25 m (floor to ceiling) in the Regional Commercial designation. Our previous comment was to add a “where appropriate” clause to recognize that this requirement may not always be appropriate, such as in cases of minor expansions to existing buildings that do not meet this height requirement. While noting Staff’s response that for most non-residential land uses, this may be appropriate, we maintain our comment that it may not always be appropriate. Alternatively, we suggest that this policy could be applicable to only “new development”, to recognize the substantial development in the area that does not presently meet this minimum requirement. 	<p>Same response. Other policies provide opportunity to waive an EIS for minor development.</p> <p>Same response. No change necessary.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 5.1.8.2(a) sets out that Mid-Rise buildings shall be a minimum height of 3 storeys and maximum of 8 storeys. In the Regional Commercial District Designation section, policy 5.3.4.3(e)ii. states that “in addition to the policies for Mid-Rise [...] buildings”, the minimum building height shall be 2 storeys. It is still unclear that the minimum height of 2 storeys would supersede the requirement of 3 storeys with this wording. We suggest rewording this policy to “notwithstanding the policies for Mid-Rise [...] buildings” for added clarity to support what we believe to be the intention. We support the addition to policy 5.3.4.3(e)ii. of provision for minor developments and expansions to be one storey. • Policy 5.3.4.4(b) states that “theme concepts in façade treatment, signage, lighting, and landscaping” are to be incorporated into all development and redevelopment within the Regional Commercial District designation.” We previously requested clarification regarding the intent of the term “theme concepts” and how they may be evaluated in a proposal. The Town provided that a policy was added to recognize that there is an existing Plan in place, however we request further clarification as to where this policy is located. 	<p>Policy adjustment made.</p> <p>Same response. This is an existing policy carry-over from the current Official Plan, which references applicable Urban Design Standards established by the Town. The new Official Plan has extensive policies that refer to the operative Urban Design Manual for guidance.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>• Policy 5.3.4.3(f) states that stand-alone non-residential uses are permitted in the Regional Commercial District designation, however Policy 5.3.4.2(a) states that “all permitted uses shall be developed within Mid-Rise and High-Rise Buildings, with some flexibility for the Town to consider lower built forms for expansions to existing buildings or smaller scale buildings.”</p> <p>In addition, Policy 5.3.4.3(e)(ii) provides a minimum building height of 2 storeys or 8.0 metres with exceptions for expansions or small new builds. We request that these policies be harmonized to more clearly establish the intent of this designation. As much of this area is currently developed as single-storey commercial buildings, in our submission such uses and appropriately associated development forms should continue to be permitted. For example, although stand-alone non-residential uses are permitted, uses such as the existing Canadian Tire store are most feasible in a one-storey built form, as opposed to mid-rise or high-rise built forms.</p>	Clarified with 'notwithstanding' language and some flexibility for existing uses/buildings.
		<p>The same Policy 5.3.4.3(f) prohibits “stand-alone residential development”. We suggest an alteration to this policy to add “generally prohibited”, and defer to the zoning by-law to provide greater detail on these permissions. This would improve the long-term flexibility of the area with this designation and allow for contextually appropriate portions of the Regional Commercial District designation to develop as residential, where ground floor non-residential may not be feasible or desirable. Alternatively, we seek the Town’s confirmation that “stand-alone residential development” does not necessarily mean stand-alone residential buildings. In our opinion, the latter can be implemented to form part of an overall mixed-use development and therefore should not be prohibited.</p>	Stand-alone residential development should require an Official Plan Amendment in the Regional Commercial District.
		<p>• Policy 5.3.4.4(f) states that “loading and garbage facilities shall not be located between the building(s) and/or a public road right-of-way.” We previously requested that this policy include a “where feasible” clause to recognize existing site configuration, context, and operational needs. The Town responded in agreement but no change to the policies is apparent in this draft. We reiterate our previous comment and seek confirmation the revised policy will be implemented.</p>	Change made.
30	ZELINKA PRIAMO LTD. Rob MacFarlane, MPL, MCIP, RPP Senior Planner on Behalf of Choice Properties REIT	<p>Policies 3.5(d-g) provide guidance with respect to development that would be considered “compatible”, and there continues to be no reference to matters of compatibility with respect to noise, vibration, odour, etc., and there is limited reference in the Official Plan with respect to these concerns. Staff’s response to our previous comment is that these specific causes of adverse impact are inherent within the definition of “compatible development” and no further specificity is required. We continue to suggest that specific sensory impacts should be more clearly identified, consistent with the PPS;</p> <p>Policies 5.1.8.2(c) and 5.1.8.3(c) continue to propose to cap Floor Space Index (FSI) for Mid- and High-Rise buildings. In our previous comments, we suggested removing prescriptive metrics from the Official Plan related to FSI to account for site-specific contexts, rather reserving these performance standards for implementing Zoning. We acknowledge Staff’s response that the proposed FSI regulations are generous in many contexts. However, we maintain that the Town should consider language such as “should”, rather than “shall” with respect to specific performance standards such as density, to maintain the intent of the policy direction but not unduly limit developments in various contexts, and introduce some flexibility;</p>	Disagree Disagree
		<p>Policy 5.3.1.3 (e)(iii) permits heights for mid-rise and high-rise buildings in the Downtown Core to be up to 6 storeys or 20 metres, which conflicts with other policies in the Draft Official Plan, such as the mid-rise policies of 5.1.8.2 (a), which permits up to 8 storeys, and the high-rise policies of 5.1.8.3 (a), which permits up to 12 storeys (and specifies that tall buildings are greater than 8 storeys). In addition, Policy 5.3.1.3(e)(iii) states that buildings taller than 6 storeys “may be considered for approval by the Town” in strategic locations. We suggest clarity be provided within the policy to allow for instances where taller buildings may be considered in the Downtown Core, including the following suggested modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Modifying Policy 5.3.1.2(a) to identify high-rise buildings as a permitted built form: “Development within the Downtown Core Designation should be primarily in Mid-Rise Buildings, with opportunity for High-Rise Buildings.”; and o Modifying Policy 5.3.1.3(e)(iii) to clarify that taller building heights may be permitted without amendment to the Official Plan: “Taller buildings may be considered for approval by the Town at strategic locations, without amendment to this Plan, including...”; <p>Policy 5.6.3.5(b) continues to make reference to a Two-Zone Concept for the Petty River Floodplain: the floodway and the flood-fringe area. We reiterate our suggestion that both conceptual overlays be added to Schedule 3 – Natural Heritage System for consistency between the schedule and policy text.</p>	<p>Proposed policies are not conflicting - the Downtown Core policies permit Mid-Rise built form in principle, but further restrict building heights in the Downtown. Policies have been modified to restrict building height to 12 metres until a Downtown Master Plan is completed.</p> <p>Schedule 3 and new Schedule 3.1 indicate the Petty River Floodplain and Flood Fringe.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

31	<p>MHBC Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP Partner</p> <p>on behalf of Eden Oak - Raglan Draft Plan of Subdivision</p> <p>452 Raglan Street</p>	<p>As the Town is aware, our Client's lands are subject to recent Draft Plan of Subdivision and site-specific Zoning By-law Amendment approvals. The Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment were approved through an OLT settlement on July 24, 2023. The Draft Plan of Subdivision will provide 20 single detached dwellings and 108 townhouse dwelling units, for a total of 128 dwelling units.</p> <p>Transition Policy - We thank the Town for including a transition policy in Draft 2, however do have a concern with some of the language included. In consideration of the above, it is requested that Policy 1.2 j) be modified to allow for the transition of any subsequent implementing development applications such as Draft Plan Extensions. Example wording is provided below:</p> <p>This Plan recognizes that there are existing development approvals that have not yet been built. It is important to state that where there is a conflict between this Plan and any existing development approval, the existing development approval shall prevail. Further, there are development applications in process at the Town. All development applications deemed complete by the Town prior to the approval of this Plan shall be subject to the Official Plan policies in place at the time the development application was deemed complete by the Town. For further clarity, subsequent implementing development applications shall be subject to the land use policy framework in place prior to the approval of this Plan by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and shall not require an amendment to this Plan.</p>	<p>Appropriate transition policies have been included and apply to all existing approvals. New applications will be reviewed under the relevant policy framework that applies at the time of application.</p>
		<p>It is noted that the requested modification has been implemented in other municipal Official Plans such as the City of Barrie Official Plan, which was modified by the Province through their review and approval of the document. The attached Memo (see Attachment 1) provides an overview of the transition policies outlined in the City of Barrie Official Plan, as well as an overview of how the transition policies were modified by the Province to the Council-approved version. We believe it is important that Policy 1.2 j) be revised as per the requested language above, as it is understood that the existing Draft Plan Approval for the Subject Lands will lapse on July 24, 2026; however, the Town has ongoing servicing limitations and as of the time of writing this letter, the full water treatment expansion is not anticipated to be completed until 2029 and that assumes a significant amount of funding is secured in the near future. As such, it is likely that many approved developments may need to seek extensions simply because there is limited servicing capacity available between now and the full water treatment expansion being completed. These developments should not then be penalized by having to demonstrate conformity with a different Official Plan than when they were originally approved and potentially need to pursue further design changes or an amendment to the Updated Official Plan.</p>	<p>See above response.</p>
32	<p>Colin Travis, MCIP, RPP Travis and Associates</p> <p>on behalf of Nefsky - The Beer Store 415 First Street</p>	<p>Draft OP 2 Schedule '7' identifies "Area Specific Policies" Area number 13 applies to the subject lands and under Section 5.7.4.3 states that "a retail outlet for the sale of alcoholic beverages shall be an additional permitted use". This policy inclusion addresses our November 30, 2022, comment...</p> <p>The principle of intensifying land use along designated "corridors" merits support. In the implementation of such policies, we note that assessing compatibility with adjacent land uses would ideally incorporate tools that are objective, not subjective in nature. In addition, we note that several properties within the corridor designations have a relatively shallow depth, a characteristic that will require acknowledgment when undertaking a test for compatibility. As a chief characteristic purpose of the corridor designations is to support public transit, the implementing Zoning could consider reduced parking standards.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

33	<p>Colin Travis, MCIP, RPP Travis and Associates</p> <p>on behalf of Mountainside Sport 774 & 766 Mountain Road</p>	<p>In a letter dated February 23, 2021 we requested that the Official Plan review account for the existing uses on the subject lands. In addition, to continuing to acknowledge existing land uses, we requested that a limited range of local convenience uses be added. A copy of our February 23, 2021 letter is attached.</p> <p>We find no specific response to our letter, no further review of the land use planning merits we provided in support of our request provided to us and, no reference to our request in the latest, Draft OP 2.</p> <p>The existing Official Plan designates the west portion of the subject lands as "Restrictive Commercial" (below excerpt from Schedule A, Land Use Plan). The easterly portion is designated RR, Rural Residential. The existing commercial designation is not reflected in Draft OP 2.</p> <p>The subject lands lie within the west end "Secondary Plan" area to the existing Official Plan.</p>	<p>This is a Site Specific redesignation request, and the Town has previously responded that this would be considered as a "MINOR" redesignation request through Staff Report P2021-27, and could be considered through the update to the Official Plan, with the response being "Town to consider the Restrictive Commercial land use designation in context of broader Commercial and Residential structure in draft OP, as well as the Mountain Road West Corridor Secondary Plan Area policies."</p> <p>The Town has further considered the request in the context of the proposed OP policies and land use designations and are of the opinion that 774 Mountain Road should remain in a Restrictive Commercial land use designation, while 766 Mountain Road can be added to the Restrictive Commercial land use designation, both noted as Area Specific Policy 29 on Schedule 7.</p> <p>However, an Official Plan Amendment would be required to expand the uses to other neighbourhood serving commercial uses on these properties at this time in advance of the completion of the Mountain Road West Corridor Secondary Plan.</p>
		<p>Draft OP 2 proposes to designate the subject lands "Residential Community Areas" under Schedule '1' and, "Rural Residential" under Schedule '2'.</p> <p>There is limited reference to "Residential Community Areas" in Draft OP 2. It is explained under section 4.2 a) i, that such areas comprise "... those locations where significant development for urban uses has occurred" and are areas that are located within the "Built-up Area Boundary".</p> <p>The subsequent Schedule '2' designation of "Rural Residential" is confusing. This is because section 5.5 provides policies for "Future Community Area" and states that such an area is outside of the "Built-up Area Boundary" and includes the "Rural Residential Designation". However, Schedule 1 clearly shows the subject lands located in the "Residential Community Areas" designation and within the "Built-up Area Boundary".</p> <p>Part of the purpose of the Draft OP 2 "Future Community Area" is ensure that such lands are to continue to be used for agricultural purposes including existing "Rural Residential uses" (section 5.5 a)) until required for future community development.</p> <p>As a side note, the sub-heading of section 5.5 does not match the land use designation on Schedule 1.</p>	<p>Wording corrected from Future Urban to Future Community Area on Schedule 1.</p> <p>Mapping adjusted.</p>
		<p>As the westerly residential areas are residential neighbourhoods, the range of permitted uses should be revisited with a view to allowing services and facilities ordinarily desirable at a neighbourhood level. A similar range as identified in section 5.2.1.2. Within that context, permitting a limited range of neighbourhood scale convenience commercial a service uses on the subject lands is warranted. The existing commercial land use designation should also be carried forward in the next version of the Draft Official Plan. This is consistent with the intent of our February 23, 2021 submission.</p>	<p>See above response.</p>
34	<p>Emma West, MCIP, RPP Bousfields Inc.</p> <p>On behalf of Di Poce Management Limited (MZO Lands) 7120 & 7200 Poplar Sideroad</p>	<p>In our preliminary review of the Draft Official Plan, we note that the document includes policies which do not align with the MZO. Below we have provided a comparison table of some of the Official Plan policies that are inconsistent with the provisions of the MZO. In summary, our concerns include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The Draft Official Plan confirms the inclusion of a new relocated hospital on the subject lands, whereas the MZO only includes the permission for a hospital, as this will be a matter to be ultimately determined by the hospital, Province and other applicable authorities; > The Draft Official Plan states that a "new hospital facility" not on the existing hospital site is only permitted within the Major Institutional designation, however, the MZO permits a hospital on the subject lands; > The Draft Official Plan proposes a maximum number of units on the subject lands, whereas the MZO does not; 	<p>Staff provided a written response, with minor and positive adjustments to the overlay policy approach, and these changes were agreed upon by the Project Team and the proponent's land use planner, with the caveat that she needed to confirm with her client. The adjusted policies, as agreed to amongst the professional planners, outline the proponent's vision that was presented to Council and the public in support of the MZO, do not conflict with the MZO, provide ample flexibility for evolution of the vision without amendment to the Plan and protects Employment Lands should the MZO ultimately be revoked.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

	<p>> The Draft Official Plan limits housing to certain dwelling types, excluding dwelling types expressly permitted by the MZO; > The Draft Official Plan requires over 3 times the amount of non-residential gross floor area than is required by the MZO; > The Draft Official Plan requires a minimum amount of non-residential gross floor area by use, whereas the MZO does not; > The Draft Official Plan provides a maximum building height in metres and storeys, whereas the MZO only provides a maximum building height in storeys; > The Draft Official Plan limits residential uses in all buildings to 25% of the gross site area, whereas the MZO only limits residential uses in stand-alone residential buildings.</p>	<p>See above response.</p>
	<p>Further Comments dated October 23, 2023 As you are aware, we have been monitoring and participating in the process for the creation of new Official Plan and as a follow-up to our comments provided in a September 2023 letter and a subsequent discussion with you, we request that the modifications to the new Official Plan with respect to the subject site be limited to the following addition to section 5.7 as a new subsection 5.7.10:</p> <p>The lands located at 7120 and 7200 Poplar Sideroad are planned to accommodate the Poplar Regional Health and Wellness Village and are subject to Ontario Regulation 525/22 under the Planning Act (the Ministerial Zoning Order "MZO"). The lands are envisioned to include a fully integrated mixed-use health and wellness community with significant health care related facilities, a range of mid to high rise residential dwelling units, parks and open space facilities as well as, but not limited to, associated retail and service commercial facilities, generally in accordance with the Vision for the Poplar Regional Health and Wellness Village presented to Council on March 7, 2022 (the "Vision").</p> <p>The Vision features interconnected mixed-use districts interwoven with thoughtfully planned and programmed open spaces and trails that collectively serve to generate economic impact, knowledge-based employment, improve access to medical services and regional connectivity, offer a diversity of mid to high density housing options, and create a thriving health and wellness community.</p> <p>Notwithstanding any policies in this Plan to the contrary, the lands subject to the MZO shall be developed in accordance with the MZO and associated development agreement negotiated between the Town and landowners (the "Development Agreement"). Development of the lands shall be subject to a comprehensive block planning exercise in accordance with the terms of the Development Agreement.</p>	<p>Project Team and staff do not support this proposed approach, as it provides very little direction available publicly in policy to achieve the vision, relying on the development agreement with the Town and the processes outlined therein.</p> <p>-To recognize that the lands are subject to a MZO, and that the MZO that was presented to the public and ultimately supported by Council on the basis of an exciting health and wellness village "vision". Certainly, the MZO itself is broad in terms of the regulatory regime. A regime that may, or may not, actually deliver the "vision" that provided the rationale for Council's support. A publicly available policy set that reflects the vision and allows ample flexibility for changes over time through the block planning process does not provide any barriers to achieving the desired outcomes on the site.</p> <p>-The overlay approach was selected to ensure that should, for any reason, the proposed MZO be rescinded, that the Town has the opportunity to revert the subject lands back to the original employment land designation rather than simply achieving a traditional residential neighbourhood without the key supportable components of the "vision", which was focused on the provision of a broad mixed-use community, focused on health and wellness, including significant employment generating uses.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

<p>35</p>	<p>Kari Payne, 18 Mariner's Haven</p>	<p>RE: Area specific policy 5.7.1.2l - Town of Collingwood Official Plan Draft 2 The one to do with Mariners Haven is directly below and it is an age-old battle Mariners Haven has been fighting with the Town for many years, and through various councils.</p> <p>Please review all the attachments below: 1. I have attached a letter from October 2016 from the Board of Mariners Haven at the time 2. Attached is also the letter to the Town from Barriston Law, the legal firm Mariners hired to advise the Town stating the walkway/path should not be allowed on the Easement Mariners Haven (MH) has over the Kaufman/Krug lands - Part 3 (which is essentially the property line between MH and the factory lands. 3. The next attachment is an affidavit from Tom Kaufman supporting the above 4. The last item is the Trail Agreement between Krug and the Town</p> <p>In summary this information should be enough for the Town of Collingwood to realize the errors (safety and financial) of placing a public walkway/trail on the property line between Mariners Haven and the Kaufman/Krug factory lands.</p> <p>(Summary) Request to remove future trail improvements on property abutting Mariner's Haven.</p>	<p>Approach to future improvements is to include those which are supported by existing Town plans/studies. Waterfront Master Plan provides conceptual trail linkage with flexibility on location, while Cycling Plan does not include trail. Schedule 5 has been amended.</p>
<p>NEW Comments Provided in Draft 2</p>			
<p>36</p>	<p>Krystin Rennie, MAES MCIP RPP Georgian Planning Solutions</p> <p>70 & 72 First Street</p>	<p>The subject lands are located at 70, and 72 First Street and are designated Strategic Growth Area on Schedule 1 and Downtown Core on Schedule 2.</p> <p>We are looking to expand the following policy.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.1.1 iii) speaks to building height within the Downtown Core Designation and reads - the maximum building height shall be 6 storeys, or 20 metres, whichever is less, and shall be subject to the applicable policies of this Plan and the Urban Design Manual. Taller buildings may be considered for approval by the Town at strategic locations, including intersection sites along Hurontario Street and key entry points to the Downtown Core Designation.</p> <p>We suggest that the Official Plan policy contain additional language to broaden what is considered a strategic location, and key entry points to the Downtown Core Designation. With consideration to include intersections along First Street in addition to Hurontario Street.</p>	<p>It is understood that this policy reference is to 5.3.1.3 (e) iii).</p> <p>These properties are located in the Downtown Collingwood Heritage Conservation District, which has height restrictions. Policies have been clarified, and height considerations in the Downtown will be further considered in a Downtown Master Plan.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

37	<p>Gordon H. Russell, MCIP, RPP Land Use Planner G. H. Russell Planning and Development Services</p> <p>Telfer Homes Inc. 80 & 90 Mountain Road</p>	<p>Telfer Homes Inc. wishes to maintain its existing mini-storage facility and warehouse storage use of this property and in the future will wish to expand their existing operation to include a mixed use (commercial office/hotel and stacked (vertical) urban warehouse storage facility) together with rear yard secondary linear storage units (garages and/or seaway containers).</p> <p>In the future it is the intent of Telfer Homes Inc. to move forward with a Site Plan Control application accommodating a mixed-use campus consisting of up to four (4) main buildings having up to six (6) storeys, each with a maximum height of fifteen (15) m and facing Mountain Road, together with rear yard accessory linear ground floor storage structures.</p> <p>Requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject lands be recognized with a site-specific Prestige Employment Exception designation within the new Official Plan which continues to permit both the existing and future uses including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Commercial Uses (Offices), • Hotel, and • Storage/Mini-storage facility, and 2. Telfer lands be formally recognized by way of a Town Letter/Zoning Certificate that its existing Storage/Mini-storage facility Use is; 1) permitted, and 2) may be enlarged in conformity to the new Official Plan and in compliance to the Town Zoning By-law (Section 5.4.1.2 Permitted Uses d)). 	<p>Policies have been included that recognize the continuance of existing uses that may not be permitted in a new Official Plan.</p> <p>Application requirements will be determined through preconsultation, and be based on the applicable Official Plan policies at the time of application submission.</p> <p>Employment land use designation policies and permitted uses are consistent with the proposed Provincial Planning Statement and Planning Act provisions (not yet proclaimed and in effect). Retaining the current land use permissions would not be consistent with these provincial planning instruments.</p> <p>Should the Province change the direction in the proposed Provincial Planning Statement, the Town or the County through modifications, will take the necessary steps to address the policy changes.</p>
38	<p>Ray Duhamel, M.C.P., MCIP, RPP, Partner, Jones Consulting</p> <p>2322254 Ontario Inc. 101 Mountain Road</p>	<p>2322254 Ontario Inc. intends on developing the subject lands for industrial uses in accordance with the Industrial Park (M5 Zoning) list of permitted uses on the site.</p> <p>The new draft Official Plan proposes to designate the majority of the site as 'Greenlands System' with the balance proposed to be designated as 'Employment Areas'. My client requests that the limits of the 'Greenlands System' designation be revised to reflect the boundaries of the proposed subdivision as supported by the Environmental Impact Study prepared for their property.</p> <p>A pre-consultation application has been submitted to the Town which included the submission of a detailed Environmental Impact Study. In addition site inspections with the Town's Environmental Consultant and Planning Staff have occurred. The EIS defined the limits of the significant natural heritage features in support of the proposed industrial plan of subdivision.</p>	<p>An EIS has been prepared for the site, which is being peer reviewed by the Town and reviewed by the NVCA. Whether the Environmental Protection land use designation mapping can be refined based on the proponent's EIS is to be determined.</p>
39	<p>KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC. Mark Yarranton, MCIP, RPP</p> <p>On behalf of 15234891 Canada Inc. and 15248345 Canada Inc. 38 & 40 Silver Creek Drive</p>	<p>The purpose of this letter is to formally request either the re-designation or policies to allow a broader range of residential use involving a full range of townhouses including street, back-to-back, and stacked townhouses on the Subject Lands as part of Town's ongoing Official Plan update process...</p> <p>In support of the proposed intensification described above, we have attached a copy of a letter dated September 18th 2023 prepared by Crozier Engineering that confirms that the re-designation of the Subject Lands could be supported and achieved from a Transportation, Servicing and Stormwater Management Perspective. In consideration that the proposed development represents infilling, and the lands can be serviced on full municipal services with independent access, these lands should also be exempt from requiring a future Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Having reviewed the proposed Growth Management Plan or structure contained within Draft OP, we have made several observations and comments as to why the Subject Lands adjacent to Highway 26 are more suitable to a designation and/or policies that would allow for more intense forms of grade related housing including a full range of townhouses which would involve redesignating these lands "Mixed Use Corridor II" or alternatively, adding broader use permission to the Rural Residential designation or site specific policies to allow a full range of townhouses.</p>	<p>Site Specific Land Use Redesignation request. Staff view this as a MAJOR request, which would require an Official Plan Amendment to facilitate.</p> <p>Property is located within the Mountain Road West Corridor Secondary Plan Area, which would require a comprehensive process prior to any redesignation.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

40	<p>KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC. Keith MacKinnon, MCIP, RPP</p> <p>On behalf of 2374515 Ontario Corporation 180 Ontario Street</p>	<p>We have reviewed the draft policies and schedules, and it is our opinion that the proposed Existing Neighbourhoods designation is suitable for the subject lands. We acknowledge that the Town will support intensification within the Existing Neighbourhoods designation by permitting mid-rise buildings up to 8-storeys in height in the form of apartment and mixed-use buildings, subject to specific criteria as proposed in the draft Official Plan. The proposed designation affords the opportunity for redevelopment and intensification that is of an appropriate form and scale, which will assist the Town and County in meeting their Provincial Growth Plan targets and accommodating projected population growth well into the future. The subject lands are within walking distance to Downtown Collingwood and are of an appropriate size to accommodate moderate intensification that is in line with the future policy direction of the Town, while continuing to respect the existing neighbourhood character and context. It is for these reasons that we believe the proposed policies and permitted uses within the Existing Neighbourhoods designation are appropriate for the subject lands.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
41	<p>Kristine A. Loft MCIP RPP Principal Loft Planning</p> <p>On behalf of 1000133004 ONTARIO INC. 9489 Beachwood Road and 61 Summer View Avenue</p>	<p>...We submitted for pre-consultation in June 2022 and a pre-consultation meeting was held August 17, 2022...</p> <p>...The current Schedule "A" Land Use Plan designates the subject property as Restrictive Commercial Exception One (ResC-1) and are subject to policy 4.4.11.1. The property is also within the Highway 26 East Corridor Secondary Plan Area and is subject to policy 8.10.1. The proposed development would require an Official Plan Amendment which was proposed to be to a Business Park designation....</p> <p>Based on our review of the Draft 2 – Official Plan, we would ask that the Town identify the lands within a Strategic Growth Area (Schedule '1') and Mixed Use Corridor I (Schedule '2') rather than the current Draft 2 – Official Plan mapping which identifies the lands as Residential Community Area on Schedule '1' and Existing Residential on Schedule '2' – Land Use. The lands are also identified within the Area 3 – Schedule '7' – Area Specific Policies which we recognize bring forward the existing Site-Specific policies within the current Official Plan.</p> <p>The lands from a current land use perspective are not existing residential, the lands have been a longstanding commercial business (9849) and vacant lands (61) located on a narrow triangular parcel of land that is flanked between Highway 26 E and Beachwood, at the entry to the Town from the east. The parcels are under single ownership.</p> <p>The landowners would be open to discussions regarding the lands being designated as noted above, (Mixed Use Corridor I designation) and deletion of the existing site-specific exception related to a gas station use on the subject lands.</p>	<p>Property is located within the Highway 26 East Corridor Secondary Plan Area which would require a comprehensive process prior to any redesignation.</p> <p>This as a MAJOR Site Specific redesignation request in accordance with the established criteria, which would require an Official Plan Amendment to facilitate.</p> <p>Existing site specific land use permissions are proposed to continue for these properties in the new OP through the Area Specific Policy 3.</p>
42	<p>MHBC Planning Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP Partner</p> <p>on behalf of Poplar Developments I Inc. - Summitview Phase 3 Draft Plan of Subdivision</p>	<p>Transition policy - We would like to thank the Town for including a transition policy within the 2nd Draft. For further clarity it is requested that Policy 1.2 j) be modified to allow for the transition of any subsequent implementing development applications such as Draft Plan Extensions.</p> <p>Timing for Draft Plan Subdivision Approvals/Extensions - impractical and will discourage existing and new development.</p> <p>It is our opinion that these prescribed timelines are impractical and will discourage existing and new development within the Town; whereas, efforts should be made to promote investment, specifically, residential development.</p> <p>These timelines are also especially more challenging within the context of the current servicing climate within the Town. As previously discussed, if the full treatment plant is not completed by 2029, then any current approved draft plan would not be able to be extended by more than 3 years (beyond 2026/2027).</p> <p>We request that the Town not set prescribed timelines around maximum timeframes for Draft Plan Approval or Draft Plan Extensions and maintain a flexible approach which allows the Town to adjust to changing development realities such as challenging economic conditions and servicing constraints while maintaining and attracting needed investment in order to bring new communities to the Town of Collingwood.</p>	<p>Appropriate transition policies have been included and apply to all existing approvals. New applications will be reviewed under the relevant policy framework that applies at the time of application.</p> <p>This is subject to legal discussion and is not a matter for the Official Plan Review.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

43	Sachin Patkar 9429 Beachwood Road	Correspondence requests a redesignation from existing Restrictive Commercial land use designation to Mixed Use Corridor 2.	This as a MAJOR Site Specific redesignation request in accordance with the established criteria, which would require an Official Plan Amendment to facilitate. Property is located within the Highway 26 East Corridor Secondary Plan Area, and proposed for Area Specific Policy 1, which continues to permit the uses that are existing (or similar to) on the property.
44	Michael Figol, Barrister & Solicitor & Notary Public On behalf of Ihor Wons & Peter Wons 55 Braeside Street	Comments and Objections: 1. Process to provide notice - unfair to use municipal addresses of non-principal residences (seasonal dwellings). Finding out about OP well into the process. 2. Portion of property in Environmental Designation will affect ability to sever the lot. 3. Mapping of EP designation appears arbitrary. 4. The arbitrary nature of the map is further exacerbated by our review of vacant lots on both sides of the street which are not included as lands to be designated as an Environmental Protection zone. 5. There are no heritage features, some trees could be preserved but most are brush and weed trees. 6. The passing of the OP will negatively impact the sale price.	Proper Notice under the Planning Act was provided. In order to change the EP land use designation mapping, an EIS is required. An EIS may be prepared as part of a future development application. Proposed EP policies allow for existing lots of record to be developed for a single-detached dwelling, subject to meeting certain criteria.
45	Elena Cistrone 72 Broadview Street	We are landowners with a lot in the area (72 Broadview Street) that is currently designated as rural residential, and under the new plan will change to environmentally protected land. We are concerned as this change may have an impact on the ability to build on this lot. It is our understanding that the process for changing the official plan has been ongoing for the last three years, however, we were not notified by the town during the process. We only became aware of this process by a third party communication in mid October 2023. As we have only recently learned of the proposed changes, we have not had the time to consult with advisors and understand the impact that the changes will have on the lot. For the reasons stated above we oppose the plan unless there is a formal communication and acknowledgement from the town that the plan does not restrict the lot owner to build or sell the lot for the purpose of building a dwelling on our property.	In order to change the EP land use designation mapping, an EIS is required. An EIS may be prepared as part of a future development application. Proposed EP policies allow for existing lots of record to be developed for a single-detached dwelling, subject to meeting certain criteria.
46	Nigel Hilliard, President, Blue Mountain Golf and Country Club 706 Tenth Line	Regarding the 2nd Draft, it proposes to place the Club's lands in the Greenlands System (Schedule 1 - Growth Management) and to designate the lands as Parks and Open Space and Environmental Protection (Schedule 2 - Land Use Plan). Policy 5.1.1 a) indicates that 'The detailed land use designations throughout the Town are organized in the following categories: v. Greenlands System Designation/Overlay > Environmental Protection; and > Adjacent Lands Overlay The Club submits that Policy 5.1.1 a) should be corrected to ensure that the Greenlands System Designation/Overlay includes the Parks and Open Space Designation.	The Parks and Open Space designation has been appropriately located under the umbrella of 'Residential Community Areas' in the Town's urban structure.

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>With regard to the Parks and Open Space Designation, it is noted that a golf course and "Accessory buildings and structures, and limited commercial uses which serve the main permitted use may be permitted subject to the relevant policies of this Plan, and the requirements of the Zoning By-law."We understand that accessory buildings and structures would include a clubhouse, maintenance building, on-course amenity buildings/facilities, course infrastructure buildings/structures and a teaching facility building and therefore be permitted under this Designation.</p> <p>The Parks and Open Space Designation also provides policy direction in terms of the height/built form of these accessory buildings and limits them to Low-Rise (3 storeys or 11 metres, whichever is less). The Club generally supports this proposed policy direction provided the implementing Zoning By-law provides for the height of a building to be measured to the top of a flat roof or the mid-point of a sloping roof.</p> <p>As to the Environmental Protection Designation, we note that Section 5.6.1.2 a) v. indicates that "Existing golf courses and other existing lawful uses restricted to their geographic location as of the date of the adoption of this Plan" are permitted. The Club supports this proposed policy.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. This comment is more relevant to the upcoming Comprehensive Zoning By-law Update, scheduled for 2024.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p>
		<p>Schedule 5 addresses Active transportation and identifies the Tenth Line for "Future Improvements". The Club has been engaged in terms of the Mountain Road West and Tenth Line EA and Addendum and has received confirmation from Town staff that the multi-use trail proposed for the Tenth Line will be located on the east side of the road allowance. The Club supports this direction in terms of the location of the multi-use trail proposed for the Tenth Line.</p> <p>In summary, the Club generally supports the direction of the 2nd Draft and requests that Policy 5.1.1 a) v. be reviewed in terms of the Designations found under the heading of Environmental Protection and Adjacent Lands Overlay</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>47</p>	<p>Amanda Stellings, Manager, Land Development, MacPherson Builders Limited</p> <p>Blue Fairway at Cranberry Trail</p>	<p>We appreciate and support the 'Residential Community Area' designation that has been applied to the Blue Fairway lands on Schedule '1' Growth Management Plan. However, we have some comments/concerns with the schedules/mapping included in the DRAFT 2 document, which have been detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schedule '1' Growth Management Plan - The road alignment of 'Cranberry Tr. W.' and 'Cranberry Tr. E.' is not shown on the mapping. As part of the approval for Phases 5 and 6 of the Blue Fairway development, the final portion of Cranberry Trail has been approved by the Town. As such, it would be appropriate to illustrate the alignment of Cranberry trail on the schedule. 2. Schedule '2' Land Use Plan - This schedule incorporates portions of the Blue Fairway development within the 'Parks and Open Space' and 'Environmental Protection' designations. As previously noted, the Blue Fairway Draft Plan of Subdivision has been approved based on various reports/studies, including environmental studies, submitted as part of the initial approval. As such, the mapping on this schedule should be updated to remove these designations in place of the 'Existing Neighbourhood' designation. 	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Mapping will be corrected to show the portions of existing Cranberry Trail East and West that have been constructed.</p> <p>Mapping will be corrected in Final draft OP.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>3. Schedule '3' Natural Heritage System - Similar to bullet point no. 2 above, there are portions of the Blue Fairway development designated as part of the 'Natural Heritage System' and 'Adjacent Lands Overlay'. The mapping on this schedule should be updated to remove the Blue Fairway development from these designations.</p> <p>4. Schedule '6' Transportation Plan - We are supportive of the 'Future Collector' designation of Cranberry Trail, which reflects the full build out of Cranberry Trail in accordance with the Site Plan Approval for Phases 5 and 6 of the Blue Fairway development.</p> <p>5. Appendix III: Natural Heritage System - There are several features identified on the Blue Fairway development lands within the Appendix III drawings that should be removed to reflect the draft approved Plan of Subdivision as detailed below: Figure No. 8 - Removal of the 'Wetland' and 'Provincially Significant Wetland (Silver Creek Wetland Complex CL7)' overlay; Figure No. 9 – Removal of the 'Mixed Forest', 'Deciduous Forest', and 'Deciduous Swamp' overlay; Figure No. 10 – Removal of the 'Woodlands' overlay; and, Figure Nos. 15/15a/16 – Removal of the 'Natural Heritage System (wetlands, woodlands, valleylands, watercourse, floodplain)' overlay.</p>	<p>Mapping will be corrected to remove EP land use designation but Adjacent Lands Overlay will remain as it is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Appendix III is taken from the Greenlands Discussion Paper, and forms the basis for the Town's Natural Heritage System, and is not to be altered.</p>
48	<p>Travis Sandberg, Manager - Land Development and Planning, Dunn Capital Corporation</p>	<p>Regarding Designated Employment Greenfield Area: Recognize the surplus of 19.5ha of vacant developable employment lands. Consider factors such as intensification and absorption rates when assessing surplus.</p> <p>Regarding Commercially Designated Land Supply: Address the anticipated shortage of vacant commercially designated land by 2038 through the Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p> <p>Regarding Redesignation of Industrial Fringe Special Policy Area: Reject the proposed re-designation of the Industrial Fringe Special Policy Area to Prestige Employment. Create a distinct land use designation for the area reflecting its unique character. Consider a designation similar to the non-residential components of the Mixed-Use Corridor One designation.</p>	<p>Industrial Fringe policies are not proposed to continue, as they do not conform to the proposed Provincial Planning Statement or Planning Act provisions (not yet proclaimed and in effect). Should the Province change the direction in the proposed Provincial Planning Statement, the Town will take the necessary steps to address the policy changes.</p>
		<p>Regarding Flexibility of Land Use Designation: Acknowledge and maintain the recognition of legally existing "non-employment" uses. Advocate for a distinct land use designation for the Industrial Fringe Policy Area to allow a broader range of compatible uses. Emphasize the benefits of maximizing flexibility for (re)development and reducing impacts on existing buildings.</p> <p>Regarding Test Requirements for Redesignation: Demonstrate that the Industrial Fringe Policy Area meets the required tests for redesignation, as outlined in the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, and the Draft Provincial Planning Statement. Support the redesignation of the area into a more appropriate mixed-use designation.</p>	<p>Policies have been included that recognize the continuance of existing employment uses that may not be permitted in the new Official Plan.</p>
		<p>Regarding Transition Policies: If redesignation does not occur, incorporate clear transition policies into the Official Plan. Ensure the continuation of current uses within the Industrial Fringe Policy Area to maintain its viability.</p> <p>Regarding Split Designation: A number of properties appear to be proposed to be split-designated as Prestige Employment and General Employment, including those located in the Mountain Road Employment Area. As a general question, how will the proposed split designations impact large multi-occupancy buildings in terms of existing/future use of individual units where the designation intersects the building footprint?</p>	<p>Policies have been included that recognize the continuance of existing employment uses that may not be permitted in the new Official Plan.</p> <p>Permitted uses are reflective of the land use designation which may be further refined by the Zoning By-law. Also subject to review through development applications. Applications will be reviewed on a case by case basis.</p>

P2023-32 Appendix B - Collingwood Official Plan - Draft 2 Comment Response Matrix - December 2023

		<p>Section 5.7.3.7 Area 9 – Shipyards Comment: Area 9C and Area 9D, per Schedule 7.1, appear to be mislabelled when compared to associated policy text of Section 5.7.3.1 Part C and Part D.</p> <p>Section 5.7.6.4 Area 21 – Third Street Extension: S.5.7.6.4(a) states: “Notwithstanding the permitted uses identified within the Regional Commercial District Designation, permitted uses include...”.</p> <p>S.5.7.6.4(e) states: “All other permitted land uses and associated policies included within this Section of this Plan shall be applicable to lands within the Regional Commercial District Designation that are delineated as Area 21: Third Street Extension”.</p> <p>Comment: The policies under Section 5.7.6.4 could benefit from added clarity with respect to permitted uses. More specifically, to clarify if the uses listed under S.5.7.6.4(a) are permitted in addition to those uses otherwise permitted in the Regional Commercial District designation.</p>	<p>Policy reference corrected.</p> <p>This is the clear intention of the policy, which is a carry-over from the current Official Plan. No change necessary.</p>
		<p>Regarding 180 Mountain Road - Mountain Road Employment Area – Schedule “2” Land Use Plan Construction of a 120,000 sq. ft. building on the lands has been started, for which lease agreements are in the process of being negotiated and secured based on the provisions and permitted uses under the current Official Plan and Zoning By-law. It is noted that a site plan amendment application for the lands will be submitted to the Town at such a time that tenants are secured in order to adjust the site layout, including parking, for the associated uses, as required.</p> <p>It is requested that the Draft Official Plan include provisions to carry forward the uses currently permitted under Zoning By-law 2010-040, including site-specific zone permissions, to ensure that pending lease agreements are not impacted by the Official Plan update in the event that the submission of a complete site plan amendment applications occurs after the adoption and approval of the Draft Official Plan.</p>	<p>Employment land use designation policies and permitted uses are consistent with the proposed Provincial Planning Statement and Planning Act provisions (not yet proclaimed and in effect). Retaining the current land use permissions would not be consistent with these provincial planning instruments.</p> <p>Appropriate transition policies have been included and apply to all existing approvals. Staff do not recommend site specific transition policies for individual development applications.</p> <p>Application requirements will be determined through preconsultation, and be based on the applicable Official Plan policies at the time of application submission.</p>
		<p>Regarding 510 Hume Street It is requested that the existing site-specific provisions be carried forward for 510 Hume Street. These uses are reflective of the existing site plan approval for the lands, which may be permitted to proceed per Section 1.2(j) of the Draft Official Plan, however, may be impacted should any technical revisions be required to the site plan to ensure compliance with any updated regulations related to the uses prior to, or following, construction. Carrying forward the existing land use permissions on a site-specific basis will provide clarity and assurance related to the implementation of the approved plan, including any technical revisions that may be necessary in the future.</p>	<p>Employment land use designation policies and permitted uses are consistent with the proposed Provincial Planning Statement and Planning Act provisions (not yet proclaimed and in effect). Retaining the current land use permissions would not be consistent with these provincial planning instruments.</p> <p>Appropriate transition policies have been included and apply to all existing approvals. Staff do not recommend site specific transition policies for individual development applications.</p> <p>Application requirements will be determined through preconsultation, and be based on the applicable Official Plan policies at the time of application submission.</p>

Town of Collingwood Official Plan Review – Summary of Supplemental Comments received after December 11, 2023 Official Plan Adoption

	Date Received	Respondent/Consultant	Address	Comments/Key Issues/Concerns	Response
1	County: Feb. 28, 2024 Town: Dec. 7, 2023	Colin Travis, Travis & Associates	Georgian Bay Hotel Lands, now subject to Wyldeewood Creek Site Plan. Vacation Inn Drive Trafalgar Road	Regarding OPA 24 A mapping error was carried forward regarding the southern portion of the Georgian Bay Hotel Lands, now subject to the Wyldeewood Creek site plan application. It appears that Schedules 1, 2 and 3 require a minor adjustment to reflect OPA 46 as the development lands are clearly squared off at the south-west corner and, the EP lands were increased in area along the east boundary.	Appropriate change to mapping was made post adoption.
2	County: Feb. 28, 2024 Town: Oct. 30, 2023, Aug. 17, 2022	Colin Travis, Travis & Associates	Mason Homes 320 – 380 High Street	The adopted Official Plan fails to address comments raised in our Oct 30, 2023 submission (Refer to #6 in Comment Response Matrix). We must stress that the proposed designation has very serious consequences and deserves a thorough reconsideration.	Refer to Area Specific Request #6 in Comment Response Matrix. An Environmental Impact Study should be completed by the proponent and peer reviewed by the Town to demonstrate lands are not Natural Heritage System in order to adjust Environmental Protection land use designation boundaries in this Official Plan. An EIS can be submitted and reviewed at a later date through a development application.
3	County: Feb. 28, 2024 Town: Oct. 30, 2023, Aug. 17, 2022 Mar. 22, 2021	Colin Travis, Travis & Associates	Georgian Communities South of Sixth Street, West of Black Ash Creek	The adopted Official Plan fails to address comments raised in their previous submission. Subject lands to be included in the west area Secondary Plan Area.	Refer to Area Specific Request #4 in Comment Response Matrix. Considered a Major Redesignation by the Town. 'Lands Not for Urban Uses' needs to be considered through the County OP Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). OPA required. There has been no demonstrated need for additional greenfield lands to meet future minimum growth targets.
4	County: Feb. 28, 2024 Town: Oct. 30, 2023, Aug. 18, 2022	Colin Travis, Travis & Associates	Red Maple 725 Tenth Line	Concern with the 'Adjacent Lands Overlay'. We echo the concerns of others in the development industry over utilizing and recognizing SCAP as a planning tool enconced in the OP for infrastructure funding.	Refer to Area Specific Request #26 in Comment Response Matrix. Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an EIS through development applications consistent with the PPS and NHRM. This application has already received conditional draft approval and clearance from the NVCA for the plan of subdivision. Transition policies apply to existing approvals. Subject to a separate legal process and is not a matter for the Official Plan Review. The SCAP provides a framework to allocate servicing capacity in a fair, sustainable, transparent and

Town of Collingwood Official Plan Review – Summary of Supplemental Comments received after December 11, 2023 Official Plan Adoption

	Date Received	Respondent/ Consultant	Address	Comments/Key Issues/Concerns	Response
					logical manner.
5	County: Feb. 28, 2024 Town: Oct. 30, 2023, Feb. 23, 2021	Colin Travis, Travis & Associates	774 Mountain Road 766 Mountain Road	Subject lands current commercial land use permissions should also include neighbourhood scale commercial uses and service commercial uses. These additional uses were not included in the adopted OP.	Refer to Area Specific Request #33 in Comment Response Matrix. The Town has further considered the request in the context of the proposed OP policies and LUD and are of the opinion that 774 Mountain Road should remain in a Restrictive Commercial LUD, while 766 Mountain Road can be added to the Restrictive Commercial LUD, both noted as Area Specific Policy 29 on Schedule 7 of the OP. An OPA would be required to expand the uses to other neighbourhood serving commercial uses on these properties in advance of the completion of the Mountain Road West Corridor Secondary Plan.
6	County: Feb. 28, 2024 Town: Oct. 30, 2023, Aug. 17, 2002	Colin Travis, Travis & Associates	Mr. Law Munro Golf Ltd. Cranberry Golf Course	The subject of converting golf course lands to urban uses was before Council in 2021. Requesting that a portion of the golf course lands would be identified as surplus. The purpose of participating in the OP review process is to advise that the existing OP land use conversion policies do not specifically address private golf course lands and, in light of the principles of land use conversions, this is an oversight which should be corrected in the new Official Plan.	Refer to Area Specific Request #5 in Comment Response Matrix. The initial policy recommendation by the applicant suggested a policy framework for conversions of a portion of golf course lands from Open Space to Future Neighbourhood without an OPA. It was staff's position that this would be inappropriate and recommended that an OPA application be pursued. Considered by the Town as a "MAJOR" redesignation request. Potential natural heritage and natural hazard impacts to be comprehensively addressed. Considerable potential for impacts to surrounding lands. Needs to be considered through the County OP and MCR.
7	County: Feb. 28, 2024 Town Oct. 31, 2023, Oct. 1, 2021	Colin Travis, Travis & Associates	Bridgewater – Consulate Part Lots 48, 49, 50 Concession 11 Hwy 26 West (West Lands)	Proposing a redesignation on the subject lands as noted in Area Specific Requests #3 n the Comment Response Matrix.	Refer to Area Specific Request #3 in Comment Response Matrix. This is a Site-Specific Land Use Redesignation request from Rural to Residential (Medium Density) and Environmental Protection. This is a MAJOR Site-Specific redesignation request in accordance with the established criteria, which would require an Official Plan Amendment to facilitate. Also ongoing OLT appeal.
8	County: Dec. 5, 2023	Bob Lehman, Lehman & Associates	Archdiocese of Toronto Lands, 490 Raglan Street	It is my opinion that the designation as Parks and Open Space is no longer applicable and would not represent an appropriate use of the land.	No change necessary at this time.
9	Town: Dec. 4, 2023	Shelley Wells, Plan Wells Associates	Mr. Jaswinder Grewal 11322 Hwy #26	Requesting limit of EP Designation not be confirmed until the IES has been submitted and confirmed.	No change necessary at this time.

Town of Collingwood Official Plan Review – Summary of Supplemental Comments received after December 11, 2023 Official Plan Adoption

	Date Received	Respondent/ Consultant	Address	Comments/Key Issues/Concerns	Response
10	Town: Dec. 10, 2024	Margaret Mooy, President ACO Collingwood Branch	The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario (ACO)	Concern with OP generally setting the stage for taller buildings within the Collingwood Heritage Conservation District. (also see previous comment with Comment Response Matrix. (Increased Height comment #20).	Town provided a response email to ACO on Dec. 11, 2023 noting the following. The new OP does set the stage for higher buildings in the Downtown, up to 6 storeys within the Conservation District and up to 8 storeys outside of the District in response to the community priority to recognize the downtown as the heart of the community, an economic driver, and a gathering space (Priority 2). The permission for high rise buildings (up to 12 storeys) was REMOVED in response to the comments received.
11	Town: Dec. 8, 2023	Ray Duhamel, Jones Consulting	2322254 Ontario Inc. 101 Mountain Road	The new draft OP proposes to designate the majority of the site as 'Greenlands System' with the balance proposed to be designated as 'Employment Areas'. Request that the limits of the 'Greenlands System' designation be revised to reflect the boundaries of the proposed subdivision as supported by the EIS prepared for their property.	Refer to Area Specific Request #38 in Comment Response Matrix. An EIS has been prepared for the site, which is being peer reviewed by the Town and reviewed by the NVCA. More work is required to address species at risk, wetland-related groundwater data and geotechnical info.
12	Town: Dec. 8, 2023 Nov. 21, 2023	Carly Emmett, Barriston Law & Kristine Loft	DNRN Holdings Inc. Commercial Development 10045 Hwy 26	Seeking an industrial complex addition of pickleball courts as a complimentary use within an employment area. Looking for continued permission of recreational facilities coexisting with lands that are designated as employment areas, while additionally requesting a simple mapping exercise be performed to include the Property in the "General Employment" designation in the proposed OP.	Employment land use designation policies and permitted uses are consistent with the proposed Provincial Planning Statement and Planning Act provisions (not yet proclaimed and in effect (Oct. 20, 2024)).
13	Town: Nov. 15, 2023	Benjamin Y	450 Mountain Road	Policy Section 3.3 Promoting a Strong and Healthy Economy iv. will make our economy stronger. To do more, requesting more efficient rezoning processes. Suggesting C7 Restrictive commercial properties along Mountain Road due to the traffic and noise not suitable for housing. This would encourage 'Promoting a Strong and Healthy local Economy, Providing Employment, Create more Revenues, helping, serving, and attracting tourists.'	No change suggested.
14	Town: Dec. 11, 2023	Deborah Doherty Councillor, Town of Collingwood	All	Concerned with the number of negative comments regarding the proposed maximum building height of 6 storeys in the Downtown	No change suggested.

Town of Collingwood Official Plan Review – Summary of Supplemental Comments received after December 11, 2023 Official Plan Adoption

	Date Received	Respondent/ Consultant	Address	Comments/Key Issues/Concerns	Response
				Heritage District and 12 storeys in other areas. The population projections for the next 10 years do not demonstrate the need for this height increase.	
15	Town: Dec. 11, 2023	Alberto De Luca 444939 Ontario Ltd.	Beechwood Estates Poplar Sideroad and Highway 26	Concerned that entire land holdings are shown as Environmental Protection (82 acres). Suggesting the lands be shown as Future Urban through a Special Policy Area.	No changes proposed as no supporting technical material has been provided to the Town / NVCA to peer review.
16	Town: Nov. 22, 2023. Aug. 17, 2022	KLM Planning Mark Yarranton and Tim Schilling	Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd. Part of Lots 47, 48 and 49 Concession 12 5 Silver Creek Drive	We respectfully request that paragraph a) of the Area 5 Area Specific Policy be revised as noted in our letter. We request that the Area 6 Area Specific Policy be revised to permit vehicular access “and servicing” through lands designated Environmental Protection consistent with the Area 5 Area Specific Policy. Various other technical requests.	Refer to Area Specific Request #8 in Comment Response Matrix. Comments Acknowledged. OLT appeal
17	Town: Dec. 8, 2023, Oct. 31, 2023	MacPherson Amanda Stellings, Manager, Land Dev’t	MacPherson Builders (Cranberry) Ltd. Blue Fairway at Cranberry Trail	None of our previous concerns have been addressed. Please refer to Area Specific Request #47 in Comment Response Matrix.	Acknowledged. Mapping will be corrected in final OP to show the portions of existing Cranberry Trail East and West that have been constructed.
18	Town: Dec. 8, 2023	Cassels – Signe Leisk Counsel for Di Poce Management Ltd. (DPML)	Poplar Regional Health and Wellness Village - MZO Lands	Working with Town towards a mutually agreeable resolution regarding the Poplar Regional Health and Wellness Village and its relationship to the Ministerial Zoning Order and the Development Agreement executed between the Town and DPML.	Acknowledged.
19	Town: Dec. 11, 2023	Urban Strategies Inc. Tim Smith C/O Smycorp Investments Inc.	Northwest Quadrant Poplar Sideroad and Raglan Street	Objections to policies in the OP that will remove land use permissions on Smycorp’s land such as General Employment Areas will not permit stand alone buildings and commercial establishments.	Refer to Area Specific Request #18 in Comment Response Matrix. Acknowledged.
20	Town: Jan. 31, 2024	Gord Russell	Janette and Graham Parsons 27 & 29 Forest Drive	Concern with subject lands being designated Greenlands and EP in Adopted OP.	
21	Town and County Various dates	Denis Martinek	247 Osler Bluff Road	Concern with the subject lands LUD and seeking change from EP to Rural.	EIS has not yet been Peer Reviewed. No change at this time.

Town of Collingwood Official Plan Review – Summary of Supplemental Comments received after December 11, 2023 Official Plan Adoption

	Date Received	Respondent/ Consultant	Address	Comments/Key Issues/Concerns	Response
22	County: Aug. 7 2024 and Various dates	Celeste Phillips	70 High Street	Request that subject lands maintain the currently permitted uses, most notably indoor recreational uses.	Refer to Area Specific Request #27 in Comment Response Matrix. We proposed no changes to the Plan based on the 70 High Street comments. There were a number of comments that objected to implementation of the Provincial restrictions on commercial and other uses in employment areas. Here is our response form the comment matrix:
23	Town: June 27, 2024 and various	Mr. Maffei	85 Toner Street	Request small-scale and detailed mapping revisions to subject lands, related to natural heritage, hazards lands and EP designations.	Specific details noted in your emails regarding floodplain areas and other environmental constraints are matters that will be reviewed when you have submitted development applications for specific uses proposed for the property. Further environmental and natural hazard submissions will be required to support your future development applications. The OP is not the appropriate planning instrument to effect the small-scale and detailed mapping approach that you are suggesting would be appropriate at this time.
24	County: Feb. 7, 2024	Shelley Wells, Plan Wells Associates	Mair Mills Village Part of North Half Lot 44, Concession 11	The Draft # 2 Official Plan Natural Heritage policies are out of step with the generally accepted menu approach to defining Natural Heritage features and setting out the limits of adjacent lands. These policies should be eliminated and the more traditional menu approach substituted.	Refer to Area Specific Request #22 & 23 in Comment Response Matrix. The Town's proposed Natural Heritage System is appropriate and consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, the proposed Provincial Planning Statement, and NHRM. The EP land use designation and Adjacent Lands Overlay are designed to require an EIS to be prepared to assess natural heritage features. The Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications, consistent with the PPS and NHRM. It is not designed to prohibit development, unless the features warrant it.
25	County: April 2, 2024	Michael Wynia, SBA	59 & 60-72 Braeside St.	Believe it is premature to down-designate the subject lands and that an alternative approach would be to designate the lands with special policy that will establish development opportunities based on further detailed site work.	Refer to Area Specific Request #28 in Comment Response Matrix. Waiting on the EIS Report and Peer Review in order to address this site specific concern.

Town of Collingwood Official Plan Review – Summary of Supplemental Comments received after December 11, 2023 Official Plan Adoption

	Date Received	Respondent/ Consultant	Address	Comments/Key Issues/Concerns	Response
26	County: Dec. 20, 2023	Kristine Loft, Loft Planning	1000133004 Ontario Inc. 9849 Highway No 26 East and 61 Summer View Avenue	Objecting to the OP for various reasons identified in the Comment Response Matrix #41.	Refer to Area Specific Request #41 in Comment Response Matrix. Property is located within the Highway 26 East Corridor Secondary Plan Area which would require a comprehensive process prior to any redesignation. This as a MAJOR Site Specific redesignation request in accordance with the established criteria, which would require an OPA to facilitate. Existing site-specific land use permissions are proposed to continue for these properties in the new OP through the Area Specific Policy 3.
	AGENCY				
1	Dec. 18, 2023	Enbridge Gas	All	No comments – Email	n/a
2	Aug. 12, 2022	Bell Canada	All	Transportation Network, telecommunications and broadband comments	n/a
3	Feb. 8, 2024 & Various	MTO	All	Technical direction and recommended roadway improvements and new corridor	Changes made to OP as per comments.
4	Nov. 2, 2020 & Various	NVCA	All	Technical regarding EP, NHS, Hazards Lands, etc.	Changes made to OP as per comments.
5	Mar. 19, 2024	MMAH	All	Concerned with Black Ash Creek Special Policy Area – policies carried forward from 1980's and 2005 OP	In discussions
6	Aug. 17, 2022 & Various	SCDSB	All	Clarification of Public Service Facilities policies and permissions, major institutional, childcare, etc.	Changes made to OP as per comments.
7	Nov. 26, 2020 & Various	SMDHU	All	General comments to support healthy communities	Changes made to OP as per comments.
8	Sept. 20, 2023 & Various	County of Simcoe	All	Policy and mapping conformity and consistency, structure, formatting, terminology, etc.	Changes made to OP as per comments.
9		Collingwood Hospital	All	Understanding permissions on the existing Hospital site and expansion and redevelopment opportunities on those lands	n/a
	INTERNAL				
		Internal County Departments	Various Topics	Various	Changes made to OP as per comments.

Town of Collingwood Official Plan Review –**Summary of Persons who made Oral Submissions at the October 17, 2023 Public Meeting**

	Respondents		Address			
	First Name	Last Name				
1	Joann	Bowden	36 Brock Crescent	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 2L5
2	Norman	Sandberg	328 Pine Street	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 2P5
3	Guna	Thuraisingham	59 Braeside Street	Collingwood	ON	
4	Wendy	McKenzie	190 Second Street	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 1G1
5	Margaret	Mooy	297 Pine Street	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 2P4
6	Nick	Best	36 Sierra Trail	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 0J5
7	Doug	Linton	30 Findlay Drive	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 0G6
8	Kory	Chisholm	113 Collier Street	Barrie	ON	L4M 1H2
9	Catherine	Daw	19 George Zubek Drive	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 1M4
10	Judy	Shepphard	323 Birch Street	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 2V8
11	Ulrich	Rath	81 St. Lawrence Street	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 4Y3
12	Darlene	Craig	275 Third Street	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 1L7
13	Dennis	Waddell	7 Chamberlain Crescent	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 0E3
14	Kevin	Marshman	19 Woodland Court	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 5B3
15	Gord	Russell	38 Willow Drive	Tiny	ON	L0L 1P1
16	Dicky	Shoulton	121 Chamberlain Crescent	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 0E6
17	Abby	Westlake	68-70 Fifth Street	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 1X1
18	Noah	Kochanowitz	393 Second Street, Apt. 3	Collingwood	ON	L9Y 1G9
19	Thorán	Gopal	148 Braeside Street	Collingwood	ON	