

Growth Management			
Respondents:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > James Dalziel > Louis M Bernard > George Powell > Colin Travis > Wendy & Brian Hickey > Jack & Sue Marley > Murray Knowles > Thomas Vincent > Jeanette Beck > John Belknap > James Britton > Kari Payne > Peter & Patti Daly > Thomas & Suzanne Donohoe > Bridget Doyle > Kory Chisholm > Marianne Lepa > Richard Lex > Margaret Mooy > Dorit Murray > Valerie Orviss > Ruth Plant > Almerinda Rebelo > Tim Shuff > Julia Sievwright > Robert Powadiuk 	<p>Within the topic of growth management a number of the commentors have raised concern about the growth projections that are used within the DRAFT Official Plan, as well as concerns about the role and need to accommodate growth through intensification.</p>	<p>Overall, the DRAFT Official Plan includes a host of new concepts and is forward thinking, while, at the same time, appropriately reflecting the requirements of Provincial legislation and policies. The DRAFT Official Plan includes new concepts related to climate change, sustainability, mobility options, complete streets and active transportation. It also promotes significant changes related to housing affordability, a range and mix of housing types, Additional Residential Units, compact urban form, and support for intensification in an urban structure of key centres and corridors.</p> <p>1. GROWTH FORECASTS - Growth forecasts are to be coordinated with the County of Simcoe, who are responsible to allocate projections provided to them in the Provincial Growth Plan. At the time of the writing of the DRAFT Official Plan, the identification of the projections as "caps" was the correct approach. The Province has subsequently identified that the growth projections in the Provincial Growth Plan, and subsequently, by the County are to be considered as minimum growth targets to be achieved. The DRAFT Official Plan makes the important link between planned growth and infrastructure requirements, ensuring that new development can be effectively supplied with appropriate municipal service infrastructure over time.</p> <p>The subsequent version of the DRAFT Official Plan will reflect updated growth projections and planning horizon as articulated through the County of Simcoe's Municipal Comprehensive Review. In addition, the recently approved Minister's Zoning Order will require consideration as it affects both the type of growth to be accommodates, as well as the evolving urban structure.</p> <p>2. URBAN STRUCTURE - Establishing a clear and identifiable urban structure in Collingwood is about evolving the current urban structure. It is a crucial element of the DRAFT Official Plan to locate higher intensity forms of development in key locations within the Town in order to support an enhanced transit system, achieve the required intensification targets and to support the success of the Downtown, and avoid sprawl.</p> <p>3. INTENSIFICATION - Collingwood is required by Provincial legislation and policy to establish a target for housing intensification and to promote all forms of intensification within the existing Settlement Area. The intensification target of 50% of all new residential dwelling units is established by the County. Intensification is a crucial element of planning for future growth and it is intended to be part of a response to a changing climate - promotion of reduced carbon footprints, support for transit, and the efficient use of land to avoid sprawl and focus growth in a Primary Settlement Area, allowing for the protection of large tracts of environmentally sensitive and agricultural lands in surrounding rural areas. In addition, intensification is seen as a critical element for achieving improved housing affordability and to provide choice of housing options within the community.</p> <p>4. COMPATIBLE DEVELOPMENT - A key principle within the DRAFT Official Plan is the concept of development compatibility and transition, noting that compatibility is not synonymous with "same", and there are very specific polices to ensure that comfortable relationships between different intensities of development can be achieved. The most intense versions of development are directed to the identified centres and corridors. However, existing residential neighbourhoods are required by Provincial legislation to accommodate Additional Residential Units and more modest forms of new development.</p>	
#	Name	Comment	Response
1	Louis M Bernard, P.Eng.	<p>Subject: HIGH RISE BUILDINGS to move future BUILDS to a DENSER POPULATION</p> <p>While I do not live in Collingwood, I see the move to more densely populated living dwellings throughout Ontario, and it is concerning. While 'densification' may solve some of the planning problems now faced with less densely populated dwellings, like single family housing/townhouses, it does not address the Mental Health of the people occupying those 12-story dwellings - and that is a very important aspect of moving to a higher population density in future dwellings.</p> <p>You have to ask yourselves this very important question; "BY DENSIFYING POPULATIONS IN FUTURE DWELLINGS, ARE WE CREATING A NEW PROBLEM FOR THE DWELLERS?" I submit this reference to initiate awareness by Planning staff & decision-makers of the consequences of having high-density dwellings</p>	<p>Collingwood is required by Provincial legislation and policy to promote all forms of intensification within the existing Built-up Area of Collingwood. Intensification is a crucial element of planning for future growth and it is intended to be part of a response to a changing climate (promotion of reduced carbon footprints, support for transit, efficient use of land), housing affordability and to provide choice of housing options within the community.</p>

2	Kari Payne	<p>Strategic Growth Areas The building height allowed in the Mixed -Use Corridor 1 includes mid-rise (minimum 3 storey) and high-rise (? maximum 12 storey). The area on Balsam street south of Harbour Street should NOT include High Rise Buildings and should only allow 3-storey mid-rise buildings. This would be in keeping with residential development in the area along Balsam Street near Harbour Street West (Cranberry (Quay,Shore, Surf), Boardwalk, Mariners Haven and all the properties on the northwest side of Balsam Street)</p> <p>Under the Compatibility Section of the draft Official Plan(Page 60) it is stated that where the Mixed Use Corridor I abuts an existing neighbourhood designation appropriate mechanisms shall (should say WILL) be established in the zoning bylaw or in a site-Specific Zoning by-law to ensure compatibility, sensitive integration and an appropriate transition to those abutting properties.</p> <p>Affordable Housing The following strategies WILL (not shall) be considered by the Town in an effort to incentivize affordable housing: Consider affordable housing as a priority use for surplus Town-owned and County- owned land, and work with all levels of government to make surplus land available to providers of affordable housing at little or no cost; i. Provide targeted relief from Development Charges, planning, permit, and other fees normally charged for projects that provide permanent affordable housing; ii. Apply for government grants and/or subsidies, including land dedication; iii. Ensure that the provision of affordable housing is eligible for grant programs established under the Community Benefits By-law;</p>	<p>Specific interest in future development of 200 Balsam Street. Balsam Street has been identified as a crucial urban corridor in Collingwood and is functionally Highway 26 within the urban part of the Town. Compatibility policies are designed to require appropriate transition between building form, massing, height and typology. A change to the Mixed Use Corridor II has been implemented on Schedule 2.</p> <p>"Shall" equals "will" for the purposes of the OP policy language.</p>
3	Thomas and Suzanne Donohoe	<p>The Town's infrastructure needs updating. The sewage treatment has been running at capacity for a long time. We have lived in the Shipyards for 8 years and we have noticed the smell getting worse. We were part of a petition to bring the smell to the forefront, however, nothing has changed. We also have been told the Town of Collingwood accepts sewage from other areas to be treated. We cannot in all honesty verify if this is true or not, however, this morning being a long week end, I was having coffee on a patio at 4th and Hurontario and I could smell this awful sewage smell. My husband went to Cobs Bread and the sewage smell was being discussed. I believe this issue has to be addressed before introducing a 12 Storey Build.</p> <p>We are not Toronto and never have professed to be. Mandating the 12 Storey apartment rules would push along the route to become another big city.</p>	<p>The existing wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) is currently operating at approximately 70% capacity. Review and management of the remaining capacity is included in the Town's recently adopted Servicing Capacity Allocation Policy. The initiation of a Class Environmental Assessment for the expansion of the WWTP has been included in the capital plan for 2024. Funding has been included in the 2022 Town Budget and is proposed for 2023 and 2024 to carry out an inflow/infiltration study to determine the sources of stormwater that is entering the sanitary sewer system. The study will likely result in a multi-year capital program to reduce these flows. A reduction of these flows will result in a reduction of partial and full bypasses of the WWTP as well as mitigate sanitary back-up situations. Infrastructure upgrades, though informed by the Official Plan, are outside the scope of the review and related to other studies and standards as noted above.</p> <p>See response provided at the beginning of this Section. The DRAFT Official Plan does not promote Collingwood as the next Toronto, which is currently approving developments in excess of 100 storeys.</p>
4	Marianne Lepa	<p>Subsidized Housing - I see areas of town where there is now subsidized housing marked for residential development. I know we need more subsidized units and I know they are the County's responsibility, but please do not allow more soulless buildings like the ones on Second Street. It's no wonder the police are there nearly every night. There is no respect for people in those towers. At the very least, every unit must have a balcony so residents have a bit of private outdoor space where they can enjoy the air and feel safe.</p>	<p>See response provided at the beginning of this Section. It is important to note that the DRAFT Official Plan does not specifically identify any property as appropriate for affordable housing. The primary concern here appears to be related to urban design and architectural detailing and due to recent changes to the Planning Act, the Town has limited ability to influence those matters.</p>
5	Margaret Mooy	<p>Greater enforcement of property standards re cultural and heritage maintenance and preservation. Potential heritage properties should be added to the Municipal List.</p> <p>Height of buildings should not exceed 6 stories. This should include any structures on the roof. Many times 6 storeys actually become 7 or 8. 4 storey height should be preserved in the heritage district, without exceptions like the Monaco.</p> <p>Tree canopy should be preserved. Bylaws are needed to prevent loss of our older, grand trees.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to no cars/ pedestrians only in the downtown during the summer months.</p> <p>Employable lands should be maintained. MZO should not be considered to give certain developers an advantage.</p>	<p>Property standards enforcement is not an Official Plan policy matter, but issue raised with appropriate Town staff.</p> <p>Section 3.6 Conserving Cultural Heritage Resources includes policies that support a heritage inventory and the preparation of a Cultural Heritage Master Plan for the Town. The Downtown includes a Downtown Heritage Conservation District and guidelines for heritage are included in the Town's Urban Design Manual. The Town also has a Heritage Committee that is appointed by Council to advise on matters relating to the Heritage District and Designated buildings.</p> <p>The issue of height is a complex one. Various height minimums and maximums have been identified in the DRAFT Official Plan to help the Town establish an effective urban structure and to support a number of key planning principles. The updated Zoning By-law will interpret the Official Plan and include height requirements in more detail across the Town.</p> <p>The Town has tree canopy preservation tools that include the Planning Act, Official Plan, Tree Preservation By-law, Simcoe County Tree By-law, and the Urban Design Manual. Outside of the Official Plan review, the Town is currently reviewing the Tree Cutting By-law and updating standards as well as examining if new by-laws, such as site alteration, are required.</p> <p>This is an operational issue that does not require an Official Plan policy.</p> <p>The decision to support the Minister's Zoning Order has already been made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, who is the approval authority for such requests, and it is now the job of the DRAFT Official Plan to implement that decision.</p>

6	Ruth Plant	<p>In particular, we need to stop the sprawl and increase the density of housing in town. There are many models of sustainable, low environmental impact, high density housing which could be built to accommodate a mix of income levels. Without affordable housing, our community will not have workers to provide the services to an ageing population.</p>	<p>Agreed. See response provided at the beginning of this Section.</p>
7	James Dalziel	<p>The Official Plan Draft 1 contains some questionable assumptions, presented as fact:</p> <p>1. Under "4.1 Population and Employment Forecasts Residential Growth": "a) The Town of Collingwood will grow from a population of 22,500 people in 2016 to a projected population of 41,500 people by 2041." Comment: Really? A forecast, or prediction, is not a fact. We should say the town "is forecast to grow from ..." And that forecast should be immediately attributed to its source. The employment forecast is similarly debatable and requires attribution.</p> <p>2. Under "Review of the Growth Projections": "c) The population and employment projections included in this Plan are not to be considered as caps, or limitations on development, but rather minimum growth targets to be achieved." Comment: That is quite a leap. Population forecasts, or projections, are to be considered "targets?" I feel this may give developers an improper upper hand on planning approvals. Applications should be considered on the basis of sound planning, the environment, public input and the capacity of town services like sewer treatment and drinking water.</p>	<p>See response provided at the beginning of this Section. In addition, please review Discussion Paper 1 - Growth Management.</p> <p>Growth forecasts are to be coordinated with the County of Simcoe, who are responsible to allocate projections provided to them in the Provincial Growth Plan. The Province has identified that the growth projections in the Provincial Growth Plan, and subsequently, by the County are to be considered as minimum growth targets to be achieved.</p> <p>The subsequent version of the DRAFT Official Plan does reflect updated terminology, as well as updated growth targets that are included in the County's Municipal Comprehensive Review and subsequent County Official Plan Amendment 7.</p>
8	George Powell, Vice-Chair of our Watershed Action Committee	<p>Plan needs to be approved by Council and submitted to Simcoe County for their review and comment. There is a lot of red tape to get through before it is an official OP. The plan looks out to 2041 where it is my understanding the Town will capture 10% Of the Simcoe County's total population for an estimated population of 41,500 persons. I have seen projections for 2051 of 42,000 and the concern of how many non-residents own houses and vacation in the area is not given. Presently there are an estimated 6,000 which would make the population of Collingwood 22,000 plus 6,000 = 28,000. The OP does not address this issue.</p> <p>Increased densities as part of the Ontario policy to intensify should be applied only in new development areas and not in existing residential areas many of which do not have storm sewers.</p> <p>Secondary plans need to look at future requirements for water and wastewater facilities and should if land is not available consider regional facilities in their future planning.</p>	<p>See response provided at the beginning of this Section. Further, based upon the recent Bill 23, it is not clear what the future planning approval role of the County will be. In addition, please review Discussion Paper 1 - Growth Management. An Official Plan cannot control who owns a home in Collingwood, not whether or not they are fulltime or part-time residents.</p> <p>The Province under Bill 23 permits gentle density in all residential areas serviced by municipal water and wastewater, with up to three dwelling units per property with no planning approvals required. In fact, 50% of all new residential dwellings are to be provided through intensification. Official Plans and Zoning By-laws cannot supercede this legislated direction. Further, existing development patterns have contributed to the climate and housing affordability crises and the Town must respond.</p> <p>Agreed. To confirm wording for requirements for Secondary Plans in DRAFT Official Plan.</p>
9	Jeanette Beck	<p>The town of Collingwood is predicted to nearly double over the next two decades. The current outdated model of suburban residential sprawl, single use Commercial Zoning, and transportation prioritizing vehicular flow, along with public spaces and resources being privatized needs to stop. With the current provisions in the Draft Official Plan, our community will continue develop in a way that does not reflect the values of our community, nor the established best practices that other municipalities are adopting to ensure their own economic and environmental vitality. Collingwood is on its way to becoming a recreational community such as Whistler, with its host of problems stemming from a lack of sustainable development. The urgent need to reframe the Goals and Policies to reflect our current needs and to anticipate and plan for a rapidly growing community over the next two decades requires a forward-thinking Vision, Goals and Policies along with detailed Implementation Guidelines.</p> <p>The new OP is a document that has the power to shape our Community in such a way that it benefits all citizens by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating Complete Neighbourhoods where all citizens can meet most of their daily needs • embed a commitment to a rigorous Climate Resiliency Strategy as a universal metric • create Environmentally Sustainable Community which measures mental and physical health in all aspects of living and working. • a plan that meets the urgent need for Equitable and Affordable Housing • identify and enable a diversification of businesses to provide a high Density of Employment within the Community • design a thoughtful integrated framework for Active Transportation where the focus is on Mobility, encouraging and accessible to all citizens • an ambitious plan to set aside land and develop Multi-Scaled Greenspaces including large destination parks like the Waterfront but also medium sized neighbourhoods parks, community gardens and green strips and strict guidelines for preserving and expanding the tree canopy 	<p>See response provided at the beginning of this Section. The DRAFT Official Plan includes a host of new concepts and is forward thinking, while, at the same time, appropriately reflecting the requirements of Provincial legislation and policies. The DRAFT Official Plan includes new concepts related to climate change, sustainability, mobility options, complete streets and active transportation. It also promotes significant changes related to housing affordability, a range and mix of housing types, Additional Residential Units, compact urban form, and support for intensification in an urban structure of key centres and corridors.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan does deal with the majority of these important issues. Some of these issues are appropriately dealt with through planning/design exercises prepared outside of the statutory Official Plan framework, such as a Parks Master Plan.</p>

10	James Britton, President, Mariners Haven Condo Corp. 408	<p>STRATEGIC GROWTH AREAS.</p> <p>I have two concerns with the Update as it applies to the area south of Harbour Street. The first applies to the density. Without any new development, the traffic issues are obvious. Cars from Mariners Haven, Harbour St., and the Balsam St. area all exit onto # 26 via the lights at Balsam St. and # 26.</p> <p>Three storey units would compound the problem. Five story buildings would, with the additional number of occupants and cars turn the existing problem into a disaster.</p> <p>The second concern relates to the affect five storey buildings would have on the residential neighbours. They are not compatible, not sensitive to integration , and do not provide an appropriate transition to those abutting properties.</p> <p>FUTURE TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS.</p> <p>The existing trail runs south of Black Ash Creek out to # 26. This is a pleasant walk along the water. If a pedestrian/bicycle bridge was constructed across Black Ash Creek near the existing vehicular bridge all that used it would exit safely onto an area with either a stop sign or traffic light. In addition there is some history between the town and the Kaufman/Krug property that stipulates the trail should remain in its present location, and not between the property, and Mariners Haven. The proposed trail would be expensive, and a safety risk to all trail users.</p>	<p>Balsam Street has been identified as a crucial urban corridor in Collingwood and is functionally Highway 26 within the urban part of the Town. Compatibility policies are designed to require appropriate transition between building form, massing, height and typology. A change to the Mixed Use Corridor II has been implemented on Schedule 2.</p> <p>The expected update to the Transportation Master Plan is to provide strategies for addressing localized problem areas within the context of the larger transportation network, as well as crafting policies both for effective management of the network as a whole - including future active transportation improvements.</p>
11	Peter and Patti Daly	<p>Official Plan Draft 1</p> <p>1. Timing</p> <p>We've waited many years new OP. We now have a first draft that many feel could be improved in some key areas of vision and a firm description of what we would like to see our Town become in the next 20 years. From comments that we heard at the excellent public consultation, there are many elements that could be added to the OP.</p> <p>The issue I would relate here is to ask: why the rush? We've waited 12-15 years for a new OP, so why are we pushing the first draft through when lots of people are finally able to get away for a needed summer vacation. The last thing that many are connecting to is a new Official Plan for their Town in the first non-pandemic summer in three years. Please extend the timing until late September at least and have more, well promoted Public Consultations on Draft 1.</p>	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan includes a host of new concepts and is forward thinking, while, at the same time, appropriately reflecting the requirements of Provincial legislation and policies. The DRAFT Official Plan includes new concepts related to climate change, sustainability, mobility options, complete streets and active transportation. It also promotes significant changes related to housing affordability, a range and mix of housing types, Additional Residential Units, compact urban form, and support for intensification in an urban structure of key centres and corridors.</p> <p>This was the first DRAFT of the Official Plan circulated for comment. There will be other opportunities for consultation and review of future drafts prior to adoption by Council.</p>
12	Valerie Orviss	<p>As a Collingwood homeowner and full time resident I am very concerned with the Community Information & Feedback Sessions being held in so quickly with little notice to the community. The timing is very suspect with the New Official Plan being presented to Council on July 11th and the Community Feedback being scheduled at peak holiday time when many people may be away and right after a long weekend. I expect more from our Councillors.</p>	<p>This was the first DRAFT of the Official Plan circulated for comment. There will be other opportunities for consultation and review of future drafts prior to adoption by Council.</p>
13	Almerinda Rebelo	<p>An excellent first draft of a strategic growth plan that, at this stage, offers a good base for information and consultations with the Collingwood residents. I am however surprised with the tight schedule for community feedback considering that it is taking place in the summer when people are on vacation, with the information and feedback session scheduled for the day after the August Civic Holiday.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the community engagement period be extended to allow for increased participation? <p>The First Draft Official Plan outlines many important aspects (transportation, waterfront, housing, economic growth, infrastructure, trails, etc.) of future development and growth that will affect all residents. However, I did not find adequate information to assist me to assess the implementation impact of growth and changes to our neighbourhoods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Official Plan should include more information on the proposed plans to assist residents to understand not only its impact on current structures, but also, to start visualizing what a successful and healthier Collingwood would look like in 20 years. <p>At a time when global efforts go into addressing issues relating to climate change, economic challenges, poverty, housing, diversity and integration, this Draft Official Plan offers a great opportunity for the Town of Collingwood to establish its leadership as a model Town. Collingwood is a beautiful town. Its future development requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong Leadership, a Strategic Vision and Innovation <p>I am recommending that the Official Plan include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an implementation evaluation strategy. An evaluation strategy with clear criteria is important to ensure implementation compatibility with the Official Plan's Vision and Values as well as with the overall goals of: • Climate change, Environment, Sustainability, Affordable housing, Accessibility, Diversity, Integration, Social inclusion, Equitable access to services, Quality of life 	<p>This was the first DRAFT of the Official Plan circulated for comment. There will be other opportunities for consultation and review of future drafts prior to adoption by Council.</p> <p>Please review other Sections of this Comment Matrix, as those Sections provide insight to a host of the issues raised.</p>

14	Dorit Murray	<p>Subject: allowing higher building in Collingwood Sooner than later, we will be faced with greater density in small towns. We cannot spread out further and use up precious farmland or clear cut our forests. We need new concepts and new designs for accommodating more people. But with greater density, we also need to think providing recreation opportunities.</p> <p>Presently, in our new apartments, the rooms become smaller and smaller thus useless for bringing up children. We need play grounds. The waterfronts should not be reserved for large houses or private gated communities. Beaches should be available to the general public with affordable parking and change and washroom facilities. Dogs should not be allowed to soil the beaches. Please have a look at some European cities. They are designed for people, not for cars. Look at garage models, some underground using lifts with self parking features. Instead of paving everything solidly over use porous methods for the rain water to sink into the ground. Plant trees for shelter. Build for the future with eco-friendly materials. Sow grass that doesn't need cutting and needs little watering. Insist on eco-friendly house designs to reduce on heating/cooling expenses. Don't build on flood plains.</p> <p>Let's be bold not boring. Let's build for coming heatwaves and storms. Let's build for the water to rise.</p>	<p>Please review other Sections of this Comment Matrix, as those Sections provide insight to a host of the issues raised. The Town needs to prepare a Parks Master Plan, and a corresponding updated Parkland Dedication By-law to ensure appropriate land is set aside for the purposes of recreation. This is underway.</p> <p>> The DRAFT Official Plan recognizes that: All residents will continue to require access to a range and mixture of housing types, community services and recreational amenities to support their well-being.</p> <p>> The DRAFT Official Plan also promotes "a healthy, livable and diverse community, which includes a vibrant downtown, a beautiful and accessible waterfront, cultural and sports facilities, parks, trails and other outdoor leisure and recreational opportunities."</p> <p>> The Town has committed to the preparation of a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan. The results of that Plan may inform a future Official Plan Amendment</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan includes policies on development in flood prone areas, as required by the Province and in consultation with the local Conservation Authorities.</p>
15	Wendy & Brian Hickey	<p>There are many other elements for the people of Collingwood to assess the OP and its influence for the next 20+ years but there is a lot more information that should be acknowledged and supported with numbers, details and projections that appear to be missing, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has long been conversation about the desire for a new Recreational Complex, but we can't find it anywhere. • Also missing is reference to the Parks and Rec Plan, the Waterfront Master Plan, the Cycling and Active Transportation Plan, the Trails link to Blue Mountain Village, etc. etc. These are all documents that are vital to the overall implementation of the OP as considerable time, community effort and resources have been spent of them; they really should be a part of the integrated Official Plan. • Access to the waterfront in Collingwood is severely lacking especially compared to virtually any other areas on Georgian Bay. There is no comment that I can find about how the community can access the waterfront as there is no space for the public to have restaurants, retail shops, public washrooms or other essential elements that can make the waterfront vital. It appears that we are set to have major developers plan for luxury condos in multi-story buildings. Even mention of more places and means for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the busy First St to get to the waterfront. • Where are the future parks, green spaces and public spaces? • The Maps attached are very useful, but it would help if all of the waterways were noted along with the drainage canals (Oak St, Hamilton Drain etc.). There should also be a Map Schedule indicating tree coverage and where this coverage is vulnerable to future development. There are tree removal Bylaws now and they should be referenced as well. • Is there a plan to enlarge, move or close the land-fill and transfer station? • The Official Plan could be improved with a more definitive plan for Trails and Active Transportation by describing the specific future connections that are already in the works. The yellow lines on Schedule 5 are quite vague and unclear. Who can even imagine a trail on some sections of Poplar as indicated in yellow. <p>We do believe that this Plan that is approved will guide our town's future development. Many years have been spent developing the draft if the "Official Plan"; it now deserves a similar opportunity to review its contents and future implications.</p>	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan is an overarching document that is augmented by other studies carried out by the Town and, importantly by the Zoning By-law, which is the appropriate place to further articulate the details of development. This DRAFT Official Plan is supported by a number of Discussion Papers covering a host of important topics.</p> <p>Recreational facilities are permitted in a number of land use designations. It is not appropriate for the DRAFT Official Plan to identify a specific site, unless the Town has made a commitment to a specific site.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan recognizes that other studies and plans that have been prepared by the Town are important and, where appropriate, key recommendations and conclusions, as those recommendations and conclusions support land use planning policy are incorporated into the DRAFT Official Plan. Further, a policy will be indicating that all development must have regard for or be consistent with other master plan studies, guidelines and standards of the Town, covering existing, new or amended documents in the future without need to update the official plan. Including a list is problematic. Any list is typically out of date very quickly, given ongoing work being carried out by the Town during the lifespan of the Plan. An Official Plan Amendments to recognize ongoing work seems an ineffective and cumbersome approach.</p> <p>Acquisition of privately owned waterfront property outside of the development approval process is a decision of Council that does not require Official Plan policy. Council can do that at any time. A Public Realm Plan is ongoing for the Shipyards Area and development is reviewed against the Waterfront Master Plan vision.</p> <p>The Town needs to prepare a Parks Plan, and associated updated Parkland Dedication By-law to ensure that park spaces are provided through the development approval process.</p> <p>The key for this DRAFT Official Plan is to identify all natural heritage features that meet the test of significance. Significant woodlots have been included in the Environmental Protection designation. More detail on the identified elements of the Natural Heritage System is found within Discussion Paper 5- Greenlands. Further, the mapping included in Discussion Paper 5 will be added to the DRAFT Official Plan as an Appendix.</p> <p>This question should be addressed to the County of Simcoe, who is responsible for waste management. However, in their commentary on the DRAFT Official Plan, the County has not specifically indicated a change.</p> <p>Schedule 5 is reflective of the EXISTING Official Plan Schedule, and are purposefully high level until identified trails are actually defined and built. The DRAFT Official Plan can only depict future trails that are supported by the appropriate technical studies and provides the flexibility for the Town to change or add routes in the future. The DRAFT Official Plan does include new policy frameworks for Active Transportation and Complete Streets, among other transportation related issues. The Town is committed to carrying out a new Transportation Master Plan which will review the mapping and policy framework for the Town's Trails and Active Transportation network. Residents of all ages and abilities will continue to require access to a range and mixture of housing types, community services and recreational amenities to support their well-being, including enhanced access to the waterfront, where appropriate.</p> <p>This was the first DRAFT of the Official Plan. Additional opportunity to review and comment on subsequent DRAFTs will be provided.</p>

16	John Belknap	<p>I love the idea of taller buildings. 12 story buildings, we also need a indoor recreation complex. It's insane we don't have one in one of the most adventure based areas in Ontario. People Move here for the active lifestyle and kids programs. I'm a father of 3 young kids and it's crazy how many parents I know driving to Barrie, wasaga or Stayner 3 times a week all year to take their kids to practices. It also acts as a place for seniors in the winter to walk and get exercise. Pro growth! Let's not fight it.</p>	<p>Agree, growth is coming (and required to be accommodated by Provincial policy) and Collingwood needs to be prepared. The DRAFT Official Plan directs the Town to work collaboratively with the community, artists, cultural workers and organizations to implement the Town's Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan to guide the provision of arts and cultural programs, services and facilities that serve a growing and increasingly diverse population. An updated to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan is underway and will be informed by the most recent population projections adopted by Simcoe County.</p>
17	Tim Shuff	<p>I am writing to provide input to the Official Plan Draft 1. I ask that the Official Plan be enhanced in its consideration of an increase in the public ownership of waterfront in the Town of Collingwood, increased public access to waterfront, and improved active transportation linkages between parcels of publicly owned waterfront and through privately owned waterfront. At this time, for example, there appears to be virtually no public waterfront access northwest of the downtown harbour to the boundary of the Town of the Blue Mountains with the exception of Princeton Shores Park, which has minimal parking capacity. At least none that is promoted, signed, with public parking available for town residents. The situation is even worse anywhere east of Sunset Point. Although much to the shoreline is designated Greenlands, it is rendered inaccessible by private residential development, thus is de facto private land inaccessible to town residents.</p> <p>Could more emphasis and detail be placed on the Town's goal of increasing the amount of publicly owned waterfront - how much and how will this be accomplished? And also, could there be an emphasis on improving public access to the existing Greenlands properties, while preserving natural heritage protection?</p> <p>Also, could consideration be given to developing an active transportation linkage for biking and walking along the length of the Collingwood waterfront - for example linking the Harbour trails to Princeton Shores and the Greenlands to the west without forcing users out to Highway 26 or all the way to the Georgian Trail. Could there be a long-term vision to create an east-west waterfront trail that traverses the length of Collingwood on the coastal side of Highway 26 as much as possible?</p> <p>As a new full-time resident to Collingwood who moved from Toronto, which has an extensive and impressive public waterfront, I have observed that Collingwood has missed its opportunity to preserve much of its waterfront from private development, rendering much of it inaccessible to residents and visitors alike. I would like the Official Plan to work towards preserving and maximizing the public benefit of what is left, which seeking to undo past mistakes by reclaiming more land for public use.</p>	<p>This theme is contained in the vision, and alluded to in policy. Challenge to effect change in this regard due to historic land ownership patterns, but the Town can seek public lands/access through development applications. There has been no direction provided that suggests that the Town will be acquiring privately owned waterfront property outside of the development approval process. As for connectivity and linkage opportunities, the Town is committed to carrying out a Transportation Master Plan which will review the mapping and policy framework for the Town's Trails and Active Transportation network. All residents will continue to require access to a range and mixture of housing types, community services and recreational amenities to support their well-being, including enhanced access to the waterfront, where appropriate.</p> <p>Much of the land identified as Greenland in the DRAFT Official Plan is also designated Environmental Protection. The identification of lands as Environmental Protection does not imply that those lands are open and/or available to the public, nor does the DRAFT Official Plan suggest that they should be purchased by the Town. In general, lands designated as Environmental Protection should not be considered as recreational resources, unless it can be demonstrated that recreational use will not negatively impact natural heritage features and functions. The intent is that their environmental features and associated ecological functions be protected from use.</p> <p>Active transportation planning could consider opportunities to improve E-W bicycle access to waterfront. See comment about the Transportation Master Plan. The DRAFT Official Plan should not contain future trail linkages that have not been substantiated by the appropriate technical studies.</p> <p>The Town should be maximizing the public park system adjacent to Georgian Bay, keeping in mind that much of the property is privately owned and/or designated Environmental Protection.</p>
18	<p>Colin Travis Travis and Associates On behalf of Owner: L. Law</p>	<p>Allowing more innovative housing forms in existing neighbourhoods. Older lower density neighbourhoods have the capacity to provide additional and potentially more affordable housing options. Policies can encourage sensitive additional housing such as "Garden Suites". Floor areas and dimension specifications can relate the Garden Suite to the size of the lot and lot coverage conditions. An example of the policy and implementation approach is found in Toronto. Attached is a copy of the Toronto Garden Suite policy and By-law summary.</p> <p>Consider an additional policy that encourages infill lots with the ability to further divide with innovative lotting arrangements.</p> <p>Reconsider the "compatibility" tests. In many respects, one of the fundamental purposes of a Zoning By-law is to help the community determine compatibility of development. However, it is important that detailed and strict compatibility tests not be so prescriptive as to deter innovative design approaches. A simple tool such as the angular plane helps guide such massing attributes as building height and setbacks.</p> <p>With regards to Mixed Use Corridors I and II Draft 1 encourages higher density uses. However, in applying proposed compatibility tests these objectives may not be met., applying the 120 m vicinity definition will eliminate many desirable sites. For example, along these Corridors, there are many sites that are otherwise ideal but abut existing older low-rise developments. In most cases, most lands abutting the Corridor designations are low rise and appear to within 120m of the designated lands. In short, it appears compatibility tests may nullify mixed uses and density goals.</p> <p>Have a policy provision that specifically gives the Town the option of waiving Development Charges.</p> <p>Policies that encourage public/private joint ventures on municipal lands could result in innovative developments.</p>	<p>The Province requires the Town to permit up to three residential units on residential properties. Official Plan policies and Zoning By-law provisions cannot trump this legislative requirement. However, the Zoning By-law update, following the Official Plan Review, can consider changes to lot coverage and setbacks to further encourage detached accessory dwelling units.</p> <p>Acknowledged. Section 3.2 f) supports alternative development standards ensuring the provisions of the Zoning By-Law are sufficiently flexible to permit a range of innovative housing types and tenure models, including Additional Residential Units and tiny dwellings. Further, Section 6.1.8.2 h) iii promotes creative alternatives to development along Arterial Roads such as laneway housing and/or window streets.</p> <p>The definition of compatible development S.3.5 a) is appropriate. An angular plane is a zoning tool, and is supported.</p> <p>The use of "vicinity" is used to establish context. It is not intended to eliminate appropriate development, but to ensure appropriate transitions.</p> <p>Appropriately dealt with in Development Charges By-law. Also, see Section 3.2 g) ii)</p> <p>See Section 3.2 h) ii) and iii).</p>
19	<p>Robert Powadiuk Julia Sievwright</p>	<p>2) From my viewpoint, the wonderful Collingwood today is the direct result of the foresight of previous civic leaders. I hope and trust that today's leaders will demonstrate as much foresight. To that end, I feel it's really important that our crown jewel, the Georgian Bay waterfront, be given special consideration with a minimum 50 year horizon.</p>	<p>The next DRAFT will use a planning horizon to the year 2051 - in line with Provincial and County time horizons.</p>

20	Jack and Sue Marley	<p>We would love to see an OP that was focused more on people and how they would live without the need for endless condos for weekend residences. We need something that will aid in affordable housing, non-car mobility around Town with plenty of easy access to the waterfront. There should be some very specific focus on Parks, Trails and greenspace as well as developing the concept of Complete Streets.</p> <p>During the virtual meeting for the Public, the Planning Consultant said we didn't need to have all of the various Plans referenced in the OP. Frankly, we think the OP should include all of the various elements that will make Collingwood stronger in the future by tying all of the Planning together with the OP, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterfront Master Plan • Parks and Rec Plan with future parks and parkettes • Future Trails Plans • Cycling Plan • Collingwood to Blue Mtn Village Trail Plan, • Active Transportation Plan etc. etc. <p>There are so many elements of this OP draft 1 where it could be made better. This is a document that is to replace one that is 20 years old and one that will live for years to come; please don't rush this OP. Take another 6-8 months to add the meat to the bones and get it right!</p>	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan includes a host of new concepts and is forward thinking, while, at the same time, appropriately reflecting the requirements of Provincial legislation and policies. The DRAFT Official Plan includes new concepts related to climate change, sustainability, mobility options, complete streets and active transportation. It also promotes significant changes related to housing affordability, a range and mix of housing types, Additional Residential Units, compact urban form, and support for intensification in an urban structure of key centres and corridors.</p> <p>The Town is committed to the preparation of a Transportation Master Plan, which may enhance key elements related to trails and complete streets. Further, the Town needs to prepare a Parks Master Plan and parkland dedication by-law to ensure appropriate parkland is acquired in the context of expected growth, this work is underway.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan recognizes that other studies and plans that have been prepared by the Town are important and, where appropriate, key recommendations and conclusions, as those recommendations and conclusions support land use planning policy, have been included in the DRAFT Official Plan. Further, a policy will be included that all development must have regard for or be consistent with other master plan studies, guidelines and standards of the Town, covering existing, new or amended documents in the future without need to update the official plan. Including a list is problematic. Any list is typically out of date very quickly, given ongoing work being carried out by the Town during the lifespan of the Plan. Official Plan Amendments to recognize ongoing work seems an ineffective and cumbersome approach.</p> <p>This was the first DRAFT of the Official Plan circulated for comment. There will be other opportunities for consultation and review of future drafts prior to adoption by Council.</p>
21	Murray Knowles Chair - Trails & Active Transportation Advisory Committee	<p>Having an opportunity to comment on the plan is greatly appreciated, however I would highlight that holding the two feedback sessions on the same day immediately after the Civic Holiday long weekend may prevent some people from attending. I would recommend that another couple of sessions be held later in the month to ensure that everyone has a chance to participate. Please refer to the attached document for my input to the plan.</p> <p>The vision statement from the CBSP, which is highlighted on page 2 of the OP, states quite clearly in its first sentence that the residents are looking for a healthy lifestyle, an active transportation network, an artful community and an animated waterfront. These goals are all expressed in the "Values" section of the plan but I am surprised of the order of these values given the vision statement above with Be a Healthy Community and Development an Active Transportation Network being values 9 and 11.</p>	<p>This was the first DRAFT of the Official Plan circulated for comment. There will be other opportunities for consultation and review of future drafts prior to adoption by Council.</p> <p>The order of the values does not imply any level of priority. They are all of equal importance.</p>
22	Thomas Vincent President, Global Hospitality Inc and Balmoral Village	<p>1. Please make sure that all OP changes are BLACKLINED or COLOUR CODED, so readers do not have to read every word in the OP again looking for changes. Blacklined will assist readers to read only the relevant changes.</p> <p>"Tiny Homes Populations are seeking alternative housing styles that can accommodate smaller family sizes, minimalist lifestyles, affordability pressures, and those looking to downsize. Tiny homes are recognized in certain parts of North America as filling a need in the current housing market. The County is generally supportive of Tiny Homes as an opportunity to contribute to affordable home ownership and increase rental opportunities where there are appropriate lands and servicing available.</p> <p>For the purposes of this Plan, a Tiny Home is defined as a small, private and self-contained unit with living and dining areas; kitchen and bathroom facilities, a sleeping area, and is intended for year-round use. They are generally between 17.5 m2 and 37m2 in total floor area. Tiny Homes should meet all requirements of the Ontario Building Code (OBC), unless other certification standards are defined within local Municipal Zoning By-Laws.</p> <p>Within defined settlement areas, the County encourages Tiny Homes to be considered additional residential units, whereby they should be permanent, built structures, connected to available municipal servicing where available. Outside of settlement areas, tiny homes could be used as permanent additional residential units or as temporary garden suites, per the policies of Section 4.2.6. In the case of tiny homes as garden suites, the County recognizes that these units can create more accessible opportunities for home ownership, whereby a tiny house owner may own the unit and enter into a private land-lease agreement with a property owner.</p> <p>In keeping with Official Plan goals and opportunities of developing complete communities in Section 1.4.1, and complete streets in Section 8.2, minimum lot and unit size standards should be updated within zoning by-laws to allow for more compact development. This will facilitate cohesive community design, where people's needs are easily accessible and convenient. Complete compact communities are aligned with the County's greenhouse gas reduction goals. County planning staff recognize the planning context varies within each municipality, and certain zones within a municipal zoning by-law, and certain neighborhoods may not be suitable for the above noted recommendation."</p>	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan is fundamentally a new Official Plan, and needs to be read and understood in its entirety. Subsequent DRAFTs may be made available by the Town.</p> <p>The issue of tiny homes is interesting. There is nothing in the DRAFT Official Plan that would preclude a Tiny Home in any of the designations that permit single-detached dwellings. In fact, there is a significant new opportunity for Tiny Home development as part of the policy framework that permits Additional Residential Units on an existing residential lot (with some restrictions). See 5.3.2 f) iii) and 5.1.8.4. The Town's Zoning By-law will need to be amended to facilitate these Official Plan permissions, in the meantime, Bill 23 changes to the Planning Act supercede both local Official Plans and Zoning By-laws respecting basic permissions for Additional Residential Units. The important issue here is meeting all of the requirements of the Ontario Building Code. Minimum unit sizes, other than as required by the Building Code, should not be included in the Official Plan or the Zoning By-law and the Province underscored this direction.</p> <p>The entirety of Collingwood is designated as Primary Settlement Area by the Province.</p> <p>It is understood that minimum unit sizes are not appropriate within an Official Plan or Zoning By-law. Neither minimum Lot Sizes, nor Minimum Unit Sizes are prescribed in the DRAFT Official Plan. See above regarding the Provinces direction that minimum unit sizes cannot be prescribed in zoning.</p>

		<p>Definition TINY HOME is defined as a small, private and self-contained residential unit with living and dining areas; kitchen and bathroom facilities, a sleeping area, and is intended for year-round use. They are generally between 17.5 m2 and 37m2 in total floor area (or in accordance with Ontario Building Code criteria)."</p> <p>Cohousing The County supports the creation of new cohousing opportunities, whether in a single building, or through a series of dwellings or units with shared facilities. As the County's population grows and the demographics shift, cohousing is an opportunity to support the physical and mental health of our communities. In some cohousing opportunities residents may own their individual homes, which are clustered around common space or buildings with shared amenities. These amenities may include a common kitchen and dining areas, workshops, guest rooms, home offices, living space, gyms, laundry, etc. Other cohousing opportunities may be individual units within a single building which contain common use or amenity spaces. Cohousing may be established through a plan of condominium, rental, life or land-lease development types.</p> <p>Cohousing opportunities will be permitted within all settlement area land use types of this Plan."</p>	<p>A Tiny Home is quite simply, a single-detached dwelling unit. One key issue is the Building Code, which is applicable, notwithstanding what an Official Plan or Zoning By-law states.</p> <p>Cohousing is an appropriate form of home ownership, keeping in mind the Official Plan and Zoning By-law do not have the express authority to regulate occupancy or tenure of a dwelling. Cohousing may be permitted as an innovative form of home ownership, however, there is nothing in the DRAFT Official Plan that would preclude cohousing. As such, cohousing is not regulated by the Official Plan or Zoning By-law. Legal issues as well as issues with securing financing are likely the only factors that may pose implementation hurdles. However, cohousing is identified as a strategy to assist in achieving affordable housing. See 5.3.2 f) iii)</p>
23	Bridget Doyle	<p>Section 1: Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Nations are only present in land acknowledgement but the Plan lacks any mention or intention for Treaty rights, relationship building and/or reconciliation throughout the Plan • I encourage the Town to avoid using the word 'stakeholder' when referring to Indigenous Nations and Indigenous individuals. First Nations are a level of government, with inherent Indigenous and Treaty rights who hold a special government-to-government relationship. • "At this time of reflection on the relationship with Indigenous peoples both past, present and moving forward, the Town seeks to fulfill this direction and, where possible, help continue on the path of reconciliation." Note: Please clarify the meaning of this sentence, as well as whether the Town of Collingwood has a reconciliation strategy... 	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan appropriately deals with Indigenous communities, in accordance with Provincial requirements, and in manner similar to other municipalities in Ontario. Section 1.1 Engagement with Indigenous Peoples and Section 3.6 Conserving Cultural Heritage Resources will be reviewed and the language strengthened to support the conservation of Indigenous resources. Section 3.6 Conserving Cultural Heritage Resources includes policies that support the preparation of a Cultural Heritage Plan for the Town. Further, under 3.6 h) Archaeological Resources, policies support the cooperation with Indigenous communities with respect to archaeological resources.</p> <p>The Town has circulated the DRAFT Official Plan to all Indigenous communities with a current or historic interest in the geography of Collingwood and will continue to engage with these communities through the balance of the project, incorporating the feedback received.</p>
24	Richard Lex	<p>Public Art The Town shall maintain and enhance its existing inventory of public art, and shall pursue the installation of new pieces of public art in public locations, in accordance with the Town's Public Art Policy</p> <p>Could language be added here to encourage property owners to install public art as well - notably through a public art process.</p> <p>Vision Statement Please consider adding "and built heritage" to the vision statement Collingwood wants to retain and grow its economic prosperity, while protecting its environmental assets and built heritage. The local economy will continue to thrive because it is diverse, entrepreneurial, and adaptable to changing trends, just as it has been over the course of Collingwood's history. Our heritage buildings are one of the most important and identifying features of Collingwood and I believe deserves prominent mention here in the vision statement.</p> <p>Maps The map schedule does not currently include a map showing the Heritage District. Both the Heritage District boundaries and the Part IV Heritage designated buildings outside the district should be identified on a map and included in the official plan.</p>	<p>The primary responsibility for public art lies with public agencies. The Town does not have the ability to "compel" the provision of public art through the Official Plan. However, if the private sector wishes to voluntarily contribute, that should be encouraged. More often, and historically, Public Art was considered a Community Benefit, facilitated through Section 37 of the Planning Act, in exchange for additional height and or density in a development. New legislation has fundamentally changed Section 37 as a tool to generate funds to the municipality through the development process. The DRAFT Official Plan will include Public Art as one of the public benefits eligible for funding from Section 37.</p> <p>This is unnecessary. Heritage legacy is already part of the Vision Statement and is further articulated in Value 4.</p> <p>The Heritage Conservation District and all designated/listed heritage properties will be identified and included as an Appendix to the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p>

<p>25</p>	<p>Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP President Georgian Triangle Development Institute on behalf of Eden Oak (Raglan) Inc. 452 Raglan Street on behalf of Poplar Developments 1 Inc. 7926, 7914 and 7896 Poplar Sideroad on behalf of Wyview Group & FLATO Developments Inc</p>	<p>Policies 4.3 f) – j) speak to a Town “Water and Wastewater Capacity Allocation Policy”. Is this reference to the Town’s current and recently approved “Servicing Capacity Allocation Policy (SCAP) or is this identifying that a new or revised policy will be introduced? If so, would that replace the existing SCAP? Clarification on how this section relates to the existing SCAP would be appreciated.</p> <p>The County of Simcoe recently adopted the Phase 1 MCR County Official Plan Amendment providing population and employment projections to 2051. Can the Town confirm the 2nd DRAFT of the Town’s OP Update will be revised to reflect the now approved 2051 Growth Projections?</p> <p>The Town OP Update Project Team has concluded that no additional lands are required to be designated for development in order to meet the 2041 population projections. It is requested that the Town provide the calculations and mapping that were completed as part of this analysis. It would be helpful to understand how much future population is being assigned to different land use designations within the Town.</p> <p>Policy 7.1.5.1 i) ii – Why is the Town handcuffing itself to providing a maximum cumulative draft plan extension of 3 years? At a minimum this should be revised to a “shall generally only” type policy. Many circumstances that can delay the registration of a subdivision are completely outside the Owner’s control and they should not be penalized for that, a recent example being the water capacity-related interim control by-law.</p> <p>Policy 3.5 k) & L) – public art, if public art is required and is paid by the developer would this be credited through a reduction in DCs or parkland dedication? Or is the intent for this to be an additional financial burden over and above the existing requirements?</p> <p>Policy 5.2.2.3 c) identifies that each of the identified DGA-Residential Communities shall achieve a minimum density of 55 persons and jobs combined per gross developable hectare. Please define what is considered a DGA-Residential Community? Many of the lands identified as DGA-Residential Community on Schedule 1 appear to be standalone properties. Are these each considered as a DGA-Residential Community? The minimum density of 55 persons and jobs combined per gross developable hectare should be read as a Town wide target and not measured on an individual site by site basis, as the respective built forms already have separate min/max density ranges associated with them.</p> <p>Policy 5.1.2 a) i) identifies – 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. Beyond providing a buffer, what is meant by providing opportunities to enhance a feature?</p> <p>5.2.2.3 d) – e) Neighbourhood Centres – Can the Town confirm if the intent of these policies is to mandate a “Neighbourhood Centre” on each parcel of land identified as DGA-Residential Communities on Schedule 1? Or do these policies only apply should a “Neighbourhood Centre” be pursued?</p> <p>Policy 5.2.2.4 Design Policies b) iv. identifies that back lotting of the natural heritage features shall be discouraged. Policy 5.2.2.4 d) vi. identifies that back lotting of parks and open spaces shall be avoided. While it is acknowledged that road frontage/appropriate access should be provided to parks, open spaces and natural heritage features, these requirements will lead to inefficient road patterns within one of the five primary settlement areas of the County of Simcoe. Most greenfield sites are often ringed with natural heritage features. By discouraging back lotting of those features the Town is promoting inefficient single loaded roads wrapping around much of the development, increasing servicing and infrastructure costs both in the short and long term and actively working against policies promoting increased densities within the greenfield areas. Additionally as it relates to parks, the Town often wants these centrally located within a development, but discouraging any back lotting of a park will again increase the amount of inefficient single loaded roads if a centrally located park is completely surrounded by road with no lots backing onto it at all.</p>	<p>The policy will be adjusted to be consistent with SCAP.</p> <p>Yes, 2051 will be the planning horizon in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Please refer to Discussion Paper 1 - Growth Management. In addition, please review the County’s Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p> <p>This policy is aligned with the Town’s SCAP, with the goal of ensuring timely performance and not unduly retaining servicing capacity commitment without development activity.</p> <p>The Town cannot compel a public art contribution without compensation. It is expected that public art will be a recognized community benefit for consideration under Section 37 of the Planning Act.</p> <p>Yes, DGA - Residential Communities are identified on Schedule 1, some are large, some smaller. A new policy will be added to 5.4.3 providing limited flexibility for achievement of the minimum density target.</p> <p>It is expected that opportunities to enhance the integrity of the natural heritage features will be explored through the required Environmental Impact Study. Enhance means to further improve the quality, value, or extent of the natural heritage feature and/or its ecological functions.</p> <p>They are "permitted" and strongly encouraged for larger parcels or where block/secondary planning exercises are required.</p> <p>The wording of this policy inherently includes flexibility. Backlotting on NHS features is discouraged, not prohibited. Implementation will be dependent on the feature and Environmental Impact Study recommendations.</p> <p>Agree, will add "generally".</p>
-----------	---	---	---

	<p>Policy 5.2.2.4 ix. requires built form that is a minimum of three storeys in height around parks, neighbourhood centres and at prominent locations. It is questioned whether this is appropriate in a development of 1-2 storey dwellings to mandate that all dwellings adjacent to a park must be 3 storeys. If this is an objective of the Town, we suggest this be revised to a "shall generally" or "are encouraged to", so that not every deviation from this provision should require an Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Policy 5.2.2.4 e) v. reads Ensure publicly accessible open spaces such as parks, stormwater management facilities, and the Natural Heritage System have significant frontage on internal public roads. The word "significant" should be removed from this policy and the word "ensure" should be revised to "encourage". In the context of this policy what is considered "significant" frontage is unclear and the policy should not be written as to require an Official Plan Amendment to deviate from its' intent should individual site circumstances warrant it.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.1.3 e) reads – All development within the Downtown Core Designation shall incorporate a floor to ceiling height on the ground floor of 4.25 metres; This is a prescriptive design policy and should be a "shall generally" or "are encouraged to provide" type policy. Much of the existing built form within the Downtown Core is historic and may not have an existing ground floor height of 4.25 metres and should that be desirable to be maintained through a redevelopment it should not warrant an Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.1.3 g) reads – All new development with frontage along Hurontario Street within the Downtown Core Designation shall have at least 50% of its ground floor Gross Floor Area dedicated to non-residential uses ... This is a prescriptive design policy and should be a "shall generally" or "are encouraged to provide" type policy. Many zoning by-laws include a provision such as this for downtown areas and it is very common that even while providing a mixed use building a minimum of 50% of the ground floor area cannot be dedicated to non-residential as there are many additional uses required to facilitate residential above (service rooms, corridors, mail rooms, security desk, foyer, storage rooms etc.). This is better suited as an Urban Design Guideline and/or zoning provision and not require an Official Plan Amendment to deviate from.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.2.3 e) reads – Where residential development is proposed, it is a requirement of this Plan that all buildings include a minimum of 75 percent of the at-grade Gross Floor Area for active, non-residential land uses, to the satisfaction of the Town This is a prescriptive design policy and should be a "shall generally" or "are encouraged to provide" type policy. It is questioned how feasible it is to provide a mixed use building that is restricted to only 25% of the at-grade gross floor area for residential related use and this should not warrant an Official Plan Amendment to deviate from with sufficient justification.</p> <p>Policy 5.6.4.1 a) reads – In addition to the Natural Heritage System identified on the Schedules to this Plan, it is a requirement of this Plan that all applications for development, regardless of whether they are within a defined element of the Natural Heritage System, be accompanied by an analysis of Species at Risk, in accordance with Provincial legislation and policies to ensure the long-term conservancy of habitat for threatened and endangered species. This policy should be revised to not be read as an absolute requirement for "all applications for development". Many applications for development are related to existing developed properties within the urban area that pose no threat to Species at Risk, this should be revised to have flexibility in interpretation.</p> <p>Policy 5.6.1.4 i) should be revised to make it clear that if/when a negative impact is unavoidable and a compensatory mitigation approach is pursued, the test is to demonstrate no net loss in natural heritage features and/or their supporting ecological functions is achieved and that this compensatory approach can be implemented on a different property within the watershed. The Policy currently reads as if the test is to still demonstrate no net loss of the specific natural heritage feature and/or their supporting ecological functions on the site. It is often the case when a negative impact is unavoidable that a feature or a portion of a feature may need to be removed and compensatory enhancements completed elsewhere offsite.</p> <p>Policy 6.1.3 d) iii. Can the Town confirm that all the requirements that are being listed can practically fit within a standard 20m right-of-way?</p> <p>Policy 7.1.2.4 – This needs to be revised, it currently reads that every individual parcel that is designated DGA-Residential Community requires a Secondary Plan (OPA) to be prepared. This is unnecessary and will increase both cost and time in providing new housing supply within the community.</p> <p>New Environmental Protection Areas have been identified on Schedules 1, 2 & 3 of the DRAFT Updated OP that are not identified today. Can the Town Project Team clarify what background work and methodology lead to these additional areas being identified as Environmental Protection Areas?</p> <p>Policy 3.5 d) provides a definition for Compatible Development which clearly states compatible does not mean the same as. This is supported.</p> <p>Policy 7.1.5.1 i) ii – Why is the Town handcuffing itself to providing a maximum cumulative draft plan extension of 3 years? At a minimum this should be revised to a "shall generally only" type policy. Many circumstances that can delay the registration of a subdivision are completely outside the Owner's control and they should not be penalized for that, a recent example being the water capacity-related interim control by-law.</p>	<p>Agree. Will add "encourage" instead of "require"</p> <p>Disagree. Flexibility is provided through the word "significant". As with all policy, the determinant of significant will be to the satisfaction of the Town.</p> <p>Agree. Wording changes to be implemented.</p> <p>Agree somewhat. Will change non-residential uses to a prohibition on residential dwelling units at grade.</p> <p>Agree somewhat. Will change non-residential uses to a prohibition on residential dwelling units at grade.</p> <p>Disagree. This policy is a requirement of the Province.</p> <p>No. Approach and outcome to be determined through an Environmental Impact Study to the satisfaction of the Town. Location is not dealt with in this policy.</p> <p>Policy to be adjusted to delete the list of potential active transportation facilities.</p> <p>Agree. Will reiterate new policy from Section 4.3</p> <p>Please review Discussion Paper 5. Environmental mapping to be provided as an Appendix in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Acknowledged. Response to be provided.</p> <p>Strong direction from Council to include appropriate tools to close old files that have not progressed. Flexibility in both the DRAFT Official Plan and SCAP for demonstrated extenuating circumstances.</p>
--	---	--

Housing			
Respondents:			
> Affordable Housing Task Force > Colin Travis, on behalf of L. Law > Kory Chisholm > Luba Mifflin > Marg Scheben-Edey > Jack & Joan Vanderkooy			
#	Name	Comment	Response
1	Affordable Housing Task Force	<p>Overarching Principle: The Affordable Housing Task Force (AHTF) supports and encourages intensification in key nodes and corridors, and in existing residential neighbourhoods in Collingwood. The AHTF recognizes that intensification is a key factor in affordability, and our community must grow in a balanced way that prioritizes building 'up' within our existing urban area. Accommodating intensification in taller buildings along major transportation corridors encourages more housing in the traditional commercial areas, and is intended to increase housing options and affordability, walkability and transit use. Allowing a broader range of permitted residential dwelling unit types as-of-right in existing neighborhoods, that have traditionally been reserved for low-density single-detached dwellings, will create a well-rounded, inclusive and people-first community.</p> <p>Specific Points: Terminology The AHTF suggests that the word "attainable" be removed throughout, as it has no accepted definition and varies widely in usage. If the intent is to refer to workforce or market housing, then it should be redefined as such. (For example, it could say, market housing for the 4th to 7th income percentile.) The definition of affordable housing should be clearly articulated and, it is critical that there is a differentiation of incomes of renter households versus homeowners. Since renters earn on average, 50% of homeowners, any discussion about rentals should use renter incomes to determine affordability. The definition of affordable housing should be clearly articulated and a differentiation should be made between renter households vs. homeowners.</p> <p>Section 3.2 Providing Housing Opportunities Under point "f) ii", standardized designs that have already been approved, should be included to help expedite approval processes. Under point "g)" wording can be strengthened to "land designated for the public good". In addition to Town and County owned lands, when school or hospital lands become available, rather than selling them to the highest bidder, the land can be retained for community benefit purposes including affordable housing.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>The use of attainable was at the request of many stakeholders, including members of Council. Discussion Paper 3 - Housing Options does provide details on how attainable is to be defined. Further, recent legislative changes from the Province are now also utilizing the "attainable" concept.</p> <p>Partly agree. Will add a policy regarding standardized design, where standardized design means design pre-approved by the Town's Building Services Division. "The public good" is not a land use, and would not be an appropriate designation in the Official Plan. However, in the end, the entire Official Plan needs to be representative of "good planning, in the public interest."</p> <p>The Town's Official Plan can not encumber the disposition of school board property, or the Hospital lands through policy, unless the appropriate authorities agree to do so.</p>
		<p>Section 5.1.8.4 Additional and Accessory Units Under point "b) ii", the words 50% of the primary dwelling unit's gross floor area should be changed to 50% of the existing primary dwelling. This will help close a loophole for homeowners who have added large additions and then used 50% of the newly expanded size. Further on the 50% issue, they are currently subject to DC's if 50% which is a disincentive to creating additional units and that barrier should be removed.</p> <p>Section 5.1.8.8 Bed and Breakfast Establishments Point 'b)' says one bedroom is "available" for the exclusive use of the permanent resident. This could be construed as a loophole allowing STAs, and should be changed to say that at least one bedroom is occupied by the owner or their representative, as a permanent resident.</p>	<p>The section on Additional Residential Units will be updated based on recent legislative changes provided by the Province.</p> <p>The next DRAFT of the Official Plan will be updated to be in line with the Town's overall approach to Bed and Breakfast establishments.</p>

		<p>Section 5.1.8.9 Short-Term Accommodations Has consideration been given to limiting the number of permits by area? For example, no more than 5 permits in a certain block, etc.?</p> <p>Opportunities for the OP to provide policy direction for implementation in the zoning by-law: - Is there an intent to reduce or eliminate setbacks for affordable housing?</p> <p>- There should be some specific reference that permits rooming houses in all residential zones and possibly commercial as well, if mixed-use.</p> <p>- How much consideration has been given to identifying lands suitable for affordable housing and designating higher density zoning for those areas? School or hospital lands could also be considered for affordable housing or community benefit purposes. For timely development, the future need for OP amendments could be removed now by pre-zoning.</p> <p>- One-story buildings should be prohibited in all commercial and institutional zones.</p> <p>- Elimination of R1?</p>	<p>Traditionally, this type of approach has not worked, and is typically considered discriminatory, but ultimately, the Town will make a determination through the STA regulatory review (licensing by-law), not the Official Plan review. The next DRAFT of the Official Plan will be updated to be in line with the Town's overall approach to Short Term Accommodations.</p> <p>No. That would create unnecessary impacts on adjacent lands, not to mention building code/fire code issues and zoning cannot be based on tenure or purchase price.</p> <p>Rooming houses are defacto permitted in residential dwellings given that there is no authority to regulate occupancy/tenure, unless there is a licencing regime in place.</p> <p>The identification of property for affordable housing is not an appropriate Official Plan exercise. The land use is residential, and affordable housing is permitted everywhere residential development is permitted. The Town can identify their own property for such purposes, but that does not require OP policy to do that.</p> <p>Height regimes in the DRAFT Official Plan are considered appropriate and, in some instances, minimum height requirements are prescribed.</p> <p>That is a decision to be made through the preparation of a new Zoning By-law.</p>
2	<p>Colin Travis Travis and Associates</p> <p>On behalf of Owner: L. Law Cranberry Golf Course</p>	<p>General Comments Mr. Law believes additional innovative measures could be considered that will further assist in providing affordable housing. These include:</p> <p>Reducing parking requirements for certain housing forms and tenures. If the focus of intensification is to be on transit routes, perhaps consider reducing parking requirements for developments fronting onto transit routes.</p> <p>In addition, consider reducing parking standards.</p> <p>Consider allowing on-street parking in certain areas and in certain circumstances to account for required parking of infill housing. This is a more urban approach found in larger centres. In many respects, Draft 1 is bringing more contemporary urban development and management approaches, so this aspect is worth considering.</p> <p>Expand upon shared parking approaches and calculations.</p> <p>Allowing more innovative housing forms in existing neighbourhoods. Older lower density neighbourhoods have the capacity to provide additional and potentially more affordable housing options. Policies can encourage sensitive additional housing such as "Garden Suites". Floor areas and dimension specifications can relate the Garden Suite to the size of the lot and lot coverage conditions. An example of the policy and implementation approach is found in Toronto. Attached is a copy of the Toronto Garden Suite policy and By-law summary.</p> <p>Consider an additional policy that encourages infill lots with the ability to further divide with innovative lotting arrangements.</p> <p>Reconsider the "compatibility" tests. In many respects, one of the fundamental purposes of a Zoning By-law is to help the community determine compatibility of development. However, it is important that detailed and strict compatibility tests not be so prescriptive as to deter innovative design approaches. A simple tool such as the angular plane helps guide such massing attributes as building height and setbacks.</p> <p>With regards to Mixed Use Corridors I and II Draft 1 encourages higher density uses. However, in applying proposed compatibility tests these objectives may not be met., applying the 120 m vicinity definition will eliminate many desirable sites. For example, along these Corridors, there are many sites that are otherwise ideal but abut existing older low-rise developments. In most cases, most lands abutting the Corridor designations are low rise and appear to within 120m of the designated lands. In short, it appears compatibility tests my nullify mixed uses and density goals.</p> <p>Have a policy provision that specifically gives the Town the option of waiving Development Charges.</p> <p>Policies that encourage public/private joint ventures on municipal lands could result in innovative developments.</p>	<p>Section 3.2 g) vii. of the DRAFT Official Plan establishes reduced parking requirements for projects that provide affordable housing. Section 5.3.1.3 I) iii considers reduced parking standards for urban mixed-use developments, including opportunities for on-street parking and shared parking for development applications within the Downtown Core Designation. Parking will be further addressed through the zoning by-law update.</p> <p>Please review Section 3.2 - Promote Affordable Housing, as well as, policies for Additional Residential Units. The section on Additional Residential Units will be updated based on recent legislative changes provided by the Province.</p> <p>Please review Section 3.2 - Promote Affordable Housing - 3.2f (iii).</p> <p>The compatibility definition and associated tests within that definition are appropriate.</p> <p>See Section 3.5 e) - "vicinity" can be flexible and does not eliminate development but rather is a generalized reference for how the principles of compatibility are to be applied and what distance of surrounding existing development is taken into account when determining compatibility. Importantly, the concept of compatibility is not synonymous with "same".</p> <p>Official Plan policy is not required to allow the Town to provide grants in lieu of DCs. Further, Provincial legislation under Bill 23 already provides for DC credits for affordable, attainable and assisted housing units.</p>

<p>3</p>	<p>Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP President Georgian Triangle Development Institute 452 Raglan Street</p>	<p>As discussed with Town Staff and their Consultant Team at the Public Engagement Session held on August 2nd, 2022 it is understood that active planning applications that were deemed complete by the Town prior to the date the Updated Official Plan eventually comes into force and effect would continue to be considered and assessed under the policies of the then previous Official Plan which were in effect at the time the application(s) were deemed complete. In order for greater certainty we request that a transition policy be inserted into the Updated Official Plan, potentially in Section 7.2 – Interpretation – which clearly states this transition provision in order to avoid any interpretation discrepancy in the future.</p> <p>General Concern over many prescriptive design type policies throughout the Official Plan that are written in an absolute – “all development shall provide X”. While the intent of most of these policies is understood, they should never be written in an Official Plan document in absolute terms thus requiring an Official Plan Amendment to deviate from them when there may be very reasonable and desirable reasons to deviate from them. All of these types of policies should be written with inherent flexibility as “shall generally” or “are encouraged to”...</p> <p>Policy 3.5 d) provides a definition for Compatible Development which clearly states compatible does not mean the same as. This is important as it is our experience this is one consideration or test that is often misunderstood or misinterpreted. The DRAFT OP signals a shift in the type of built form that Collingwood has traditionally seen, especially within the Downtown and the Mixed Use Corridors, and while compatibility will be an important consideration when evaluating future development proposals it is clear by the built forms and heights contemplated in the Updated OP that most new developments will not be the same as the built form immediately surrounding it.</p>	<p>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>Prescriptive language is used to ensure that "conformity" is the test. Less prescriptive language is also used in the DRAFT Official Plan where there is an intent for some level of flexibility.</p> <p>That interpretation is generally correct, however, the definition does identify a number of crucial elements that ensure that context is considered, including - enhance the community and ensuring no undue, adverse impacts.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Luba Mifflin</p>	<p>Primary concerns are with the classifications of STA's, Additional and Accessory Residential Units, and Bed & Breakfasts.</p> <p>As I said in a deputation to the Development & Operations Services Standing Committee meeting on Nov 9, 2020, after the Short Term Accommodation Report was presented, and again to Mayor Saunderson by email shortly thereafter, there is not enough clarity in the descriptions of the three.</p> <p>I understand that the definition of an STA will be further fine tuned when that Review is completed but without a clear definition of Accessory Units and B&B's at this higher level, there will still be misunderstandings and no possible enforcement!</p> <p>During our neighbourhoods 2 year attempt to have an illegal STA closed down, it became very clear that our Bylaw Officers, our Planning and Building Departments and even our Fire Department and the OPP were confused and ineffectual because of this lack of clarity.</p> <p>The culmination of our skirmish was that the STA said they were a B&B, therefore not illegal. They did reduce the number of guests per unit from 6 to 2, which the neighbourhood was thankful for, however, you can imagine how many man hours and town finances were involved to achieve that result!</p> <p>After looking at this version of the Official Plan, I can see that there is still no clarity in the difference between 'units'. All can be in an owner occupied, principal residences. Not occupy more than a certain % of the building. Have a bedroom for the owner in the dwelling. Serve food or not. Be on town services, or with approval, not. The necessary off street parking and screening is clearly defined BUT An STA can satisfy all of these requirements since a Guest Room is not further defined!</p> <p>There is no maximum occupancy, per guest room or in total, stipulated; no mention of cooking facilities being allowed or not; nothing to say that a Guest Room can't be in combination with another mode of accommodation, such as an Accessory Unit, roomer or boarding house; no requirement that the owner is present overnight; no maximum for off street parking; no entry requirements.</p>	<p>The Short-Term Accommodation issue is still under review by the Town. The DRAFT Official Plan will be fully informed by the results of that work. The issue of Additional Residential Units is led by Provincial legislation and the specific regulation of the Province will be identified in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Very importantly, the Planning Act does not provide the legislative authority for a municipality to regulate occupancy or the tenure of a dwelling. It is only through licensing under the Municipal Act where the authority to regulate can be implemented.</p> <p>Much of this type of concern is appropriate in a licensing regime, and is not appropriate Official Plan policy.</p>

<p>5</p>	<p>Marg Scheben-Edey</p>	<p>In the housing section, I would suggest that the word "attainable" be removed throughout as it has no accepted definition and varies widely in usage. If the intent is to refer to workforce or market housing, then I would suggest redefining it as such. For example, it could say, market housing for the 4th to 7th income percentile, or something like that. I would also add that the definition of affordable housing should be clearly articulated and, it is critical that there is a differentiation of incomes of renter households versus homeowners. Since renters earn on average, 50% of homeowners, any discussion about rentals should use renter incomes to determine affordability.</p> <p>In section 3.2, e), it says "the provision of attainable housing that will be provided by the private sector..." needs to be changed. See the point above</p> <p>In Section 5.1.8.4 Additional and Accessory units, point b) ii. - the words 50% of the primary dwelling unit's gross floor area should be changed to 50% of the existing primary dwelling... What we've seen is people adding on large additions and then using 50% of the newly expanded size. That loophole has to be closed.</p> <p>Further on the 50% issue, they are currently subject to DC's if 50% which is a disincentive to creating additional units and that barrier should be removed. I'm not sure if this is an OP issue or comes later.</p> <p>In 5.1.8.8 about B and B's, section b) says one bedroom is "available" for the exclusive use of the permanent resident. I would suggest that is a big loophole that will allow STA's too easily and should be changed to say that at least one bedroom is occupied by the owner as a permanent resident.</p> <p>In 5.1.8.9 about STA's, has consideration been given to limiting the number of permits by area? For example, no more than 5 permits in a certain block, etc?</p> <p>One-story buildings should be prohibited in all commercial and institutional zones.</p>	<p>The use of attainable was at the request of many stakeholders, including members of Council. Discussion Paper 3 - Housing Options does provide detailed on how attainable is to be defined. Policies to be reviewed to ensure consistency. The Province is now including a definition of "Attainable" housing in a future regulation under the Development Charges Act, through legislative changes associated with Bill 23</p> <p>Rooming houses are defacto permitted in residential dwellings given that there is no authority under the Planning Act to regulate occupancy/tenure, unless there is a licensing regime in place. In fact, a municipality cannot establish a licensing regime unless the use is a permitted use.</p> <p>Please see responses provided under 1. Affordable Housing Task Force, at the beginning of this matrix.</p>
		<p>While I think this is more of a zoning bylaw issue, is there an intent to reduce or eliminate setbacks for affordable housing?</p> <p>Again, may be a zoning issue but we need some specific reference that permits rooming houses in all residential zones and possibly commercial as well if mixed-use</p> <p>We need a rental replacement bylaw</p> <p>In regard to neighbourhood compatibility, this has become a significant issue in the Town and I would suggest more detailed provisions need to be established to define this issue.</p> <p>How much consideration has been given to identifying lands suitable for affordable housing and designating higher density zoning for those areas? For example, the land from the Leisure time Club through to the police station? What about the Town owned Birch St properties? For timely development, the future need for OP amendments could be removed now by pre-zoning.</p>	<p>No. It is a zoning issue, but other than Section 3.2 f ii), Official Plan and Zoning must comply with building code/fire code issues. Further, zoning by-law provisions cannot be based on tenure or price point.</p> <p>Rooming houses are defacto permitted in residential dwellings given that there is no authority under the Planning Act to regulate occupancy/tenancy, unless there is a licencing regime in place. See previous response.</p> <p>A rental replacement by-law does not require authority within an Official Plan for a municipality to pursue, but may be subject to other legislative and regulatory requirements.</p> <p>The compatibility definition and associated tests within that definition are appropriate. Compatibility can be used as a NIMBY argument and therefore, significant policy has been added in this regard to clarify expectations and mitigate impacts, while still allowing for positive change, noting that compatible does not equate to "same".</p> <p>The identification of property for affordable housing is not an appropriate Official Plan exercise. The land use is residential, and affordable housing is permitted everywhere residential development is permitted. The Town can identify their own property for such purposes, but that does not require OP policy to do that.</p>

6	Jack & Joan Vanderkooy	<p>As much as I understand the need to increase density and allow taller structures (up to 12 storeys), this does not necessarily translate into healthier communities. Therefore I would caution that there should be language included which ensures that any higher density proposals include addressing quality of life towards healthy communities which are people centric. This has been partially addressed in the requirement for access to public transit, walkable distance to key shopping areas and provision of adequate green space.</p> <p>I note with interest the requirement that all housing developments include 25% affordable. This is an honourable goal but it needs much more substance in order for this goal to be realized and enforced</p> <p>Could the OP include a definition of "affordable" with specific metrics as defined by CMHC where affordable housing represents units whose cost does not exceed 30% of household gross income? Can this then be tied to median incomes in the community with the goal to reach a lower median income decile as outlined in the Affordable Housing Task Force report of November 1 2021? These numbers are available from Stats Canada and can be updated annually based on CPI to give a true picture of median income in our community. Distinction should also be made between renters and owners as median incomes are quite different for each of these groups</p> <p>Can the OP provide guidance on legally enforcing this requirement in its approval process?</p> <p>Can there be language added to address the problem of NIMBYism in our community? We should be encouraging a culture of NIMBYism (Yes in my backyard).</p> <p>You may be interested to know that the Institute of Southern Georgian Bay has extensively studied and researched, in cooperation with Social Innovation Canada, a municipal toolbox with the goal to increase affordable housing in our community. We would be happy to provide these resources to the planners who are working on the 2nd draft of the plan if you wish.</p>	<p>This issue of affordable housing is complex. Please see Discussion Paper 3 - Housing Options. It is crucial that Collingwood diversify its housing stock to include a range and mix of apartments, townhouses and singles, semis and duplexes. The DRAFT Official Plan also includes a framework to facilitate Additional Residential Units throughout the Town's existing neighbourhoods. It is the objective of the DRAFT Official Plan to promote a range of opportunities to enhance the supply of housing, while promoting built forms and unit sizes that can generally be more affordable.</p> <p>The Province has defined just what affordable housing is (two definitions in the Provincial Policy Statement and a third definition in the Development Charges Act), and requires a municipality to include a target in their Official Plan, the 25%, without substantive legislation to achieve the target, with the exception of Inclusionary Zoning, which is a tool not yet available to Collingwood. It is important to recognize that the 25% target is a Town-wide target, and not applicable to individual development projects. Further, there is no statutory ability to enforce, or compel the target.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan does include a section on achieving affordable housing, with much of the emphasis on tools that the Town can utilize to be part of the affordable housing solution. In addition, the DRAFT Official Plan implements the principle of inherent affordability, where housing is more affordable by being denser (reducing per unit land cost) and units are smaller (which means they cost less to build). Not all tools to support affordable housing can be initiated through an Official Plan and the Affordable Housing Master Plan will recommend a suite of priority actions that the Town could undertake for various levels of investment.</p> <p>See above comments.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate for the Town to restrict anyone's ability to support or object to a development proposal. That is an enshrined principle of the Ontario Planning Act. The Town's Affordable Housing Task Force is working on a YIMBY campaign.</p> <p>Yes, this document has been considered.</p>
---	------------------------	--	---

Climate Change (sustainability, resilience, biodiversity, agriculture)

Respondents:

<p>> George Powell, Vice-Chair of our Watershed Action Committee > David Ohrling, Community Engagement Group, Collingwood Climate Action Team > Murray Knowles, Chair - Trails & Active Transportation Advisory Committee > Ian Chadwick > Tori Daly > Bruce Clark > Carolyn Davies > Irene Denver > Bridget Doyle > Elise Durie > Mary Farncomb > Ulli Rath > Owen Gray > Jessica Lehr, Director, Pollinate Collingwood > Kathy Thompson > Kevin Tone & Val Mitchell > Jeff Young</p>	<p>Many respondents included commentary that was overarching input to the DRAFT Official Plan, related to the broad topic of Climate Change such as:</p> <p>> The Official Plan be enhanced to take into consideration for all components of the plan the use of a Climate Lens for all decisions and actions. The plan needs to ensure that we are being proactive as it relates to the need for significant changes to mitigate and adapt to our changing climate and its impacts on our community.</p> <p>> The Official Plan must support our community direction and initiatives for the next 20 years. During that period, Climate Change impacts will increase and will require direct interventions to protect and support our community while maintaining a resilient and sustainable environment.</p>	<p>To begin, it is the responsibility of Council to determine the relative importance of Climate Change in the context of their decision making. It is the role of the Official Plan to identify the array of community values, and associated policies that will assist Council in making informed decisions.</p> <p>The Climate Change comments require a response that is general in nature, and is as follows:</p> <p>Climate change is addressed in the DRAFT Official Plan in a number of ways. However, it is important to note that the DRAFT Official Plan is not, and should not be the Town's Climate Change Action Plan. In fact, the Town is committed to the preparation of a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan in the coming months.</p> <p>Section 3.7 of the DRAFT Official Plan does deal specifically with Climate Change and Sustainability. In addition to that specific Section, the DRAFT Official Plan, through numerous policy Sections, does inherently deal with the issue of Climate Change in the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GET DENSER - the DRAFT Official Plan promotes intensification within existing Collingwood and supports higher density development in identified mixed-use centres and corridors, allowing for transit-supportive development and reducing sprawl; 2. SUPPORT A MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM - The DRAFT Official Plan supports a defined urban structure that supports the use of transit, as well as policies for Active Transportation and Complete Streets; 3. PROTECT THE NATURAL HERITAGE SYSTEM - The DRAFT Official Plan has identified the key elements of the Town's Natural Heritage System and lands that are susceptible to natural hazards such as flooding, and protects it from future development, noting that concentrating development in Primary Settlement Areas like the Town of Collingwood allows for the conservation of large tracts of environmentally sensitive and agriculturally productive lands outside of the settlement boundary; and, 4. SUPPORT SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - The DRAFT Official Plan includes policies that promote green building technology, the development of green infrastructure, environmental design, and the protection/enhancement of an urban forest. <p>It is also crucial to point out that while many of the comments focus specifically on new development, the more significant part of the equation related to climate change and sustainability is about dealing with the existing mobility choices and development forms within Collingwood that currently contribute to ongoing problems. The Climate Change Action Plan must deal with both new forms of growth and development, as well as the existing community.</p>	
	<p>In addition to those overarching comments, there were a number of specific comments that require a response.</p>		
<p>#</p>	<p>Name</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>1</p>	<p>George Powell, Vice-Chair of our Watershed Action Committee</p>	<p>The maximum water level used for floodplain mapping is 178.00 and the GSCA should be using this level in their flood plain mapping in Collingwood. I believe the maximum water level should be reviewed and agreed to by MNR who have the ultimate responsibility. Global Warming may have an impact and needs to be addressed.</p>	<p>The assessment used to help establish the Natural Heritage System within the DRAFT Official Plan is wholly based on information provided to the team by the Conservation Authorities and from other Provincial government sources. The floodline elevation to be confirmed by appropriate authorities.</p>

2	Carolyn Davies	<p>Some important aspects to consider are the health of our waterways and the reestablishment of our meandering rivers and their associated water cooling and filtering riparian areas. In addition, the official plan must consider our existing use of green spaces and a reduction in turf grass, which further contributes to both climate change and biodiversity loss, through soil loss, erosion, pesticide use and other damaging impacts. The improvement of woodlands and coastlines, including managing invasive garlic mustard, Phragmites and purple loosestrife must be a priority along with the establishment of native grasslands to support carbon sequestration and diverse and resilient pollinators.</p> <p>While I do support the growth of Collingwood, the focus on short term economic growth, rather than long term community health and resilience in a changing climate must be put first. The use of nature based solutions to proactively mitigate the loss of biodiversity and climate change is the only long-term solution. These solutions must be used in all areas, including business areas, residential areas and in the development of future land uses - native plants should be exclusively required for all new plantings and residents should continue to be encouraged to incorporate more native plants through tax incentives and bylaw improvements.</p>	<p>The protection of the Natural Heritage System is a requirement of the Provincial Policy Statement, which states in Section 2.1.1 Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term. It is also important to note that it is the responsibility of the Town to define the Natural Heritage System in accordance with the Provincial Natural Heritage Reference Manual, and to preclude or require a higher level of review for development and site alteration in those defined areas, with particular emphasis on Provincially significant features and functions. 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 is an important piece of background information incorporated into the DRAFT Official Plan.</p> <p>The policy framework includes a host of significant natural heritage features and functions, hazard lands, lands subject to flooding and a 30 metre buffer included within the defined Environmental Protection Designation. Those specific areas are identified fundamentally as areas where no site alteration or development is permitted.</p> <p>The Official Plan does not prioritize short-term economic growth. It does identify a number of key community values, including both economic and ecological sustainability.</p> <p>It is important to note that the DRAFT Official Plan identifies the Natural Heritage System comprehensively, and protects that system for the long-term. The DRAFT Official Plan, however, is not the appropriate vehicle to fully articulate a remediation or enhancement strategy for the Natural Heritage System. That work is crucial, but should be done outside of the statutory planning policy framework of the Official Plan. As noted, the Town is committed to the preparation of a Climate Change Action Plan that will inherently deal with a number of the issues raised. Other work to be carried out by the municipality should be considered to enhance the ongoing management of the Natural Heritage System.</p>
3	Elise Durie	<p>I see a need to specifically improve the proposed Development Review that ensures the priority is growing Collingwood with a climate lens. We need to emphasize densification within the existing core, protect existing natural spaces, and ensure that stricter environmental regulations will be applied on new developments.</p>	<p>The development approval process utilized in Collingwood follows the legislative process established through the Planning Act. The Province, the County and the Town have a host of priorities to consider, and it is agreed that climate change, sustainability and resiliency are important matters for consideration.</p> <p>The development review process is expected to ensure appropriate studies (environmental and otherwise) are carried out through the complete application process.</p>
4	Owen Gray	<p>I am writing to provide input for the Official Plan update. I am requesting that the Official Plan be changed to be much more proactive with regards to climate in all areas of the plan. As we know, climate change is already here, and we need to take meaningful action in our Town to address it for the wellbeing of all residents today and in the future. We need to meaningfully reduce our emissions. This means making concrete plans to improve safe active transportation options in our town for all ages and abilities, not just boast about our glorious 'recreation' trails. This means requiring all the new growth that our town is expected to absorb to be 'clean growth' - every new residential unit built in our town going forward should be RESTRICTED from using fossil fuels, instead required to have electric heat pumps for heating and AC and required to install rooftop solar as well. Plenty of other progressive municipalities have made these requirements already and it is a simple way to 'grow smart' and 'grow clean' without having to retrofit all of these buildings later to transition them off of fossil fuels.</p> <p>We all love our town but we need bigtime changes to the housing stock and bigtime transition away from the personal vehicle if we want to have a hope of continuing to enjoy it in the future as we double in population.</p>	<p>The Draft Official Plan does incorporate a number of these suggestions, however, some of the suggestions go beyond the mandate of an Official Plan, and some beyond the legislative authority of the Town. Again, it must be stressed that the focus on new development is only part of the solution - a comprehensive response to climate change must also deal with existing mobility choices as well as existing built forms.</p>
5	Jessica Lehr Director, Pollinate Collingwood	<p>Please ensure that the two words 'native plants' are used within the document. Native plants are valuable for carbon sequestration as well as doing well in drought conditions. In addition, they support native pollinators which in turn help crop pollination. While 'native plantings' can be insinuated within the document under various sections, I did not find direct use of the words. This is important so that there is a reference point for next steps to be taken from, including the creation of a Town Pollinator Strategy (which in many ways is much more than just about pollination, due to the plantings abilities within stormwater management, drought mitigation, and carbon sequestration).</p> <p>The Urban Tree Program is mentioned, but again no mention of the value of native plants, including mid growth shrubs. Native plants can easily be combined with such a program (as shown in the Bee + Tree Canopy Program this spring).</p> <p>2020-2030 has been declared as the 'Decade of Restoration' by the United Nations, which recognizes the value of green assets. Restoration can include the rewilding of roadsides, marginal areas, and sections of parkland, as well as personal property. The Official Plan must support our community direction and initiatives for the next 20 years. During that period climate change impacts will increase and will require direct interventions to protect and support our community while maintaining a resilient and sustainable environment.</p>	<p>We will look for opportunities to include the phrase "native plants" into policy where appropriate. The Town should consider - outside of the Official Plan - the establishment of a list of appropriate native plant species for use in both municipal projects, as well as for use by private citizens and businesses.</p>

6	Kathy Thompson	<p>I believe that protection of sensitive environments (i.e. wetlands) should be top priority.</p> <p>Maintaining and improving walkability and bikeability of our community is also essential.</p>	<p>The protection of the Natural Heritage System is a requirement of the Provincial Policy Statement, which states in Section 2.1.1 Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term. It is also important to note that it is 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 establishment of the Natural Heritage System is based on the information and data sources identified in Discussion Paper 5 Greenlands, dated July 2020, which is an important piece of background information incorporated into the DRAFT Official Plan.</p> <p>The policy framework includes a host of significant natural heritage features and functions, hazard lands, lands subject to flooding and a 30 metre buffer included within the defined Environmental Protection Designation. Those specific areas are identified fundamentally as areas where no site alteration or development is permitted.</p> <p>Section 3.4 iv "Supporting a Healthy Community" of the DRAFT Official Plan provides policy on enhancing the active transportation network. Schedule 5 "Active Transportation Plan" anticipates Future Trail/Trail Improvements throughout the Town. As a note, the Town's Trails and Active Transportation Committee is now recommending separated multi-use pathways in favour of bike lanes.</p>
7	Tori Daly	<p>... In the plan it says you will "Create a connected, pedestrian-oriented and highly interconnected street and block pattern, with connections to adjacent communities and to community amenities/ destinations;" ...bicycle-oriented street patterns must be added as well as specific ways in which this will happen. For example: ___% of all streets must have bike lanes, ___% of our towns roads must be car-free, etc.D13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there must be more specific mention of ensuring native plants are planted in new developments and when enhancing current green spaces - measurable CO2 reduction plan with specific goals and steps - enforcing more eco-friendly building materials and sustainable infrastructure in new builds (green roofs, heat pumps, solar panels, etc.) - increase number of trees required to plant in new developments, focusing on native trees 	<p>The Town is committed to the preparation of both a Transportation Master Plan and a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan in the coming months. Most of the suggestions identified by this respondent are levels of detail that are appropriate topics for that work. There is a potential to provide strategic amendments to the Official Plan, once that work has been completed. As a note, the Town's Trails and Active Transportation Committee is now recommending separated multi-use pathways in favour of bike lanes. This is one example of why the official plan should set general guiding principles, with the implementation documents subject to change.</p>
8	Murray Knowles Chair - Trails & Active Transportation Advisory Committee	<p>The statements concerning water conservation and the development of a Climate Change Action Plan should also be more forceful.</p> <p>The statement that the Town should "promote and support complete streets also needs to be more forceful. Designing for a complete street should essentially be mandatory any time work needs to be done on a roadway.</p> <p>Having a target of a 30% tree canopy by 2041 seems like a very unambitious goal. If we are serious about Climate Change we should be moving to implement this goal much more quickly.</p>	<p>The Town is committed to the preparation of both a Transportation Master Plan and a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan in the coming months. However, the choice of wording is very deliberate, attempting to provide Town Council with the flexibility of if, and/or when more detailed work is to be carried out - keeping in mind changing priorates over time, and the ability to fund the necessary work.</p> <p>The 30% Tree Canopy target is an "minimum" target. The next DRAFT Official Plan will raise the target to 35%. A higher target could be supported by a Town-wide tree planting strategy, with recognition that focusing growth to Primary Settlement Areas reduces sprawl and allows for larger tracts of environmentally sensitive and/or agricultural land to be protected.</p>
9	Bruce Clark	<p>There are too many areas which indicate what the Town "may" do or consider. While I appreciate the need for flexibility, such language leaves a gaping hole for what the Town is committed to and prevents any meaningful accountability both for Town Council and for staff;</p> <p>I would like to see Collingwood kick the natural gas "habit". Smart cities and towns are doing so. We need to stop any new developments that use natural gas infrastructure. We know that there are better, smarter and ultimately cheaper alternatives. Ground source heat pumps and air source heat pumps are available now for our climate. Unless we make mandatory rules, the fossil fuel companies will continue to focus on short term profits, not the long term health of our citizens, our town or our planet.</p>	<p>The Town is committed to the preparation of both a Transportation Master Plan and a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan in the coming months. However, the choice of wording is very deliberate, attempting to provide Town Council with the flexibility of if, and/or when more detailed work is to be carried out - keeping in mind changing priorates over time, and the ability to fund the necessary work.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan includes policies that promote green building technology, the development of green infrastructure and the planting of an urban forest. The Town does not have the statutory authority to make broader decisions about types of fuel that are utilized.</p>

10	Ian Chadwick	<p>The width of future sidewalks connecting major facilities, recreational, and cultural sites should be considered; where possible they should be designed for multiple uses such as bicycles and pedestrians (e.g. the 3m sidewalk on the north side of First St.).</p> <p>Sec. 3.7 says "The Town may develop a Climate Change Action Plan..." and "The Town may prepare reports to monitor the Town's progress towards climate change..." and "Town may request an assessment demonstrating how the natural hazards are avoided or mitigated." May is a weak verb that allows the town and its council to avoid commitment. It should be changed to a verb which requires action such as "should" or "must." But while the OP recognizes climate change may have an impact, it is woefully thin on specifics.</p> <p>There is no definition of what sort of measures and technologies should be explored to deal with the effects of climate change on our built infrastructure, or how often that infrastructure should be monitored for those effects (see https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-slow-bake-of-our-infrastructure/).</p> <p>While 5.6.3.2 says "Utilize best practices and building/landscape techniques to mitigate the impacts of climate change in all public realm and construction activities within or abutting the Shore Lands," there is no definition of "best practices" or techniques. And why limit this to the Nottawasaga Bay Shore Lands? This should be standard for all areas.</p> <p>While floodplains and flooding are mentioned, I can find nothing to indicate how the town should deal with water levels dropping in Georgian Bay. Do lower levels affect the intake protection area? The outflow of the wastewater treatment plant? The WHPAs? What about the shoreline and natural heritage areas along it? Are there areas in the harbour that are significantly challenged? At what lower level does the town become concerned with the drop?</p> <p>Sec. 6.1.1 lists as a goal "To enhance the Town's transit system and active transportation network ensuring multiple mobility opportunities, linking significant community facilities, major development areas and public uses..." How does this fit with council's decision to make the public transit system less affordable (by raising the rates) and less accessible (by making it an on-call system)?</p>	<p>The word "may" is specifically used in this DRAFT Official Plan to identify the opportunity to carry out subsequent work, without compelling the municipality to do so. The DRAFT Official Plan is not, and should not be the Town's Climate Change Action Plan. In fact, the Town is committed to the preparation of a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan in the coming months.</p> <p>It is appropriate to identify measures and technologies within the comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan. Further, there is no definition of measures and technologies because those things need to be explored in the Climate Change Action Plan.</p> <p>The Shore Lands are given specific mention because they are a specific component of the Natural Heritage System under stress for the development of public parks and access to the water's edge. Best practices is a common phrase used to indicate the exploration of the most appropriate approach available to advance a desired outcome.</p> <p>With respect to floodplains, they are defined by the Conservation Authority, and are based on historic maximum flood events. The water level in the Great Lakes naturally fluctuates. If the long-term trend is for lower water levels, then the Conservation Authority will need to update their mapping, which would trigger an amendment to the Official Plan. That would apply to the Intake Protection Areas as well.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan supports a defined urban structure that supports the use of transit, as well as policies for Active Transportation and Complete Streets.</p>
11	Irene Denver	<p>The reason why I am mentioning this is, because food consumption has a large impact on both climate and health. It is a well known fact that, animal based, foods have twice the foot print of plant based (PB) foods and average meat consumption in North America needs to fall by 79% to meet Paris goals. Dietary changes can lead to a huge reduction (34-72%) reduction in Green House gas (GHG) emissions. Canada has the largest GHG producer in the G20 and food production and therefore consumption accounts for over 1/3 of global emissions.</p> <p>In addition to the impact on climate change, PB foods have also shown to have many health benefits and have been well documented. According to the British Nutrition Foundation, the typical western diet includes more daily protein than we need, mostly from animal products, while the World Health Organisation classifies processed meats as Group 1 carcinogens, with red meat (beef, lamb and pork) generally linked to killer diseases such as cancer, heart disease and stroke.</p> <p>Here are just a few examples of how cities are operationalizing their in house commitments:</p> <p>Vancouver recently unanimously passed a motion to shift 20% of municipal animal based food purchases to plant based food. The motion cites the huge impact of animal agriculture industry's contribution to climate change & cites savings for the city</p> <p>Kelowna,BC. In 2019, the mayor of Kelowna named annual "Vegan Awareness Week" to promote plant-based diets. The event highlights the personal and planetary health benefits of plant-based foods.</p> <p>Montreal,QC. Montreal City Council recently voted unanimously to join the C40 Good Food Cities Declaration, making specific commitments including: aligning food procurement policies with the Planetary Health Diet; supporting an overall increase in consumption of plant-based foods in the city; offering a minimum of 75% of vegetarian food at events it organizes; communicating a copy of their declaration to school administrations and boroughs to encourage healthy, local food that makes more room for alternatives to animal proteins.</p>	<p>The Official Plan does not take a position on personal choices, such as farming practices or food consumption, but does support and promote urban agriculture, including community gardens, food cooperatives, and local food sourcing programs under Section 3.4 Supporting a Healthy Community. Further it is the intent of the Rural/Agricultural Lands policies under Section 5.5 to promote the continued use of lands currently being used for non-intensive agricultural/rural purposes</p> <p>Municipalities can pass motions on a host of topics, however, that does not mean that those motions represent appropriate land use planning policy for inclusion in an Official Plan.</p>
12	Mary Farncomb	<p>Climate initiatives should be addressed more aggressively The town is currently allowing WAY TOO MUCH latitude on 'cutting and clearing of trees' on lots .as is evidenced by many 'new builds'. As well as the poor care of city planted trees for survival as is evidenced by dead trees on many streets.</p>	<p>Acknowledged, higher order urban forest policies are include in the DRAFT Official Plan and tree preservation is also being addressed through a multi-pronged project outside of the Official Plan Review including a review of the tree cutting by-law, forestry practices and resources, engineering/urban design standards, and site alteration.</p>

13	Jeff Young	<p>I have a few comments on the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like a CO2 reduction plan with targets and how they will be achieved. • I would like to see a tree program such as the tree giveaway in London, ON. While the canopy program is great, it's not getting the pickup I hoped for. Trees should be free to residents https://www.reforestlondon.ca/programs/neighbourhood-releaf/ • I would like to see a rewinding plan put into place for city properties. This will help our natural areas, the canopy program and reduce costs for maintenance. Pollinate Collingwood would be a great organization to work with (full disclosure, I'm part of the board) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o allowing for wild lawns would be an easy way to lower CO2 usage by residents (no mowing) and increase biodiversity 	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan is not, and should not be the Town's Climate Change Action Plan. In fact, the Town is committed to the preparation of a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan in the coming months where it may be appropriate to establish targets.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan includes policies that promote green building technology, the development of green infrastructure, environmental design, and the protection/enhancement of an urban forest. More detailed strategies for dealing with tree planting/rewilding on public lands can be established by the Town outside of the Official Plan policy context. Tree preservation is being addressed through a multi-pronged project outside of the Official Plan Review including a review of the tree cutting by-law, forestry practices and resources, engineering/urban design standards, and site alteration.</p>
14	Kevin Tone & Val Mitchell	<p>An Official Plan for 20 years is a long time, and during that time climate change impacts will most likely increase.</p> <p>We would also like to see aspirational goals for the infrastructure that would be able to provide the electrification of our transit vehicles...as well as a timeline for NOT allowing natural gas heating in new single family homes, entire subdivisions and low, mid and high rise buildings.</p>	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan is not, and should not be the Town's Climate Change Action Plan. In fact, the Town is committed to the preparation of a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan in the coming months where it may be appropriate to establish targets. The Official Plan also will be required to be updated every 5 to 10 years and official plan amendments are permitted anytime in between to address changing circumstances.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan includes policies that promote green building technology, the development of green infrastructure, environmental design, and the protection/planting of an urban forest. The Town does not have the statutory authority to make broader decisions about types of fuel that are utilized.</p>
15	Ulli Rath	<p>Remove All References to 8 and 12 Storey Buildings</p> <p>I am not a Climate Change denier. I support all initiatives to develop meaningful science based initiatives to mitigate emission of greenhouse gases and the warming of the Earth's atmosphere. With that said, I find the pretext in the draft Official Plan that refers to Climate Change to be shallow, unscientific and full of self-serving platitudes. The MCR/Official plan update cycle should produce a meaningful Background Paper given the importance that the Town consultant has placed on this subject.</p> <p>The most objectionable part of the draft Official Plan is that the Town will grow at "nodes and corridor" intersections with construction 8 to 12 storey buildings. All in the name of mitigating against climate change.</p> <p>There is no, none not one peer reviewed science based study which shows that climate change can be mitigated by tall buildings at nodes where corridors intersect. This idea is hogwash, and the Town should be embarrassed to release a draft Official Plan based on this ill conceived idea. All references to buildings over 6 storeys should be deleted from the plan; and the section on climate change should be modified to include practical initiatives such for example as mandated tree canopy covers for new developments which can not be offset by sending money as was done with Huron House that was allowed a 15% tree canopy cover.</p>	<p>It is important to note that this comment is the only one to suggest that the DRAFT Official Plan downplay the role that climate change should play in future decisions about land use planning. Most comments have requested that climate change become even more prevalent in the text of the DRAFT Official Plan - see comments on Climate Change. Please see Discussion Papers in support of the DRAFT Official Plan.</p> <p>The issue of promoting a rational urban structure that includes taller built forms is not wholly in support of a response to climate change. The concept is supportive of a whole host of important planning principles. See response provided at the beginning of this Section.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan includes a tree canopy target to be applied Town-wide. In addition, tree preservation is being addressed through a multi-pronged project outside of the Official Plan Review including a review of the tree cutting by-law, forestry practices and resources, engineering/urban design standards, and site alteration.</p>
16	Bridget Doyle	<p>Section 3: Building a Successful Community</p> <p>Each of the priority focus areas relates to climate change. Climate change is a cross cutting issue. I suggest naming climate change in each of these to establish a climate lens in building a successful community. I've provided specific suggestions below.</p> <p>Providing Housing Opportunities should be addressed with a climate lens in order to build climate mitigation and resiliency within our community, while also contributing to a strong and healthy community, economy and urban design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town is encouraged to seek every opportunity to develop affordable housing with passive and low carbon design technologies. Affordable housing should be designed to be fully electric • New housing developments should prioritize the retention of the natural environment - sufficient riparian areas must be left intact, and new by-laws should seek to retain natural habitats and rehabilitate or restore more substantial green spaces • New housing developments should immediately be required to incorporate sustainable design standards such as the use of permeable pavement, reduced impermeable surface area, use of rain gardens on boulevards, etc., integrated stormwater management plans, green roofs, etc. The Town should develop a suite of green development standards for all new developments. • I encourage the Town to pass a ban on natural gas hookups for any new housing developments within the timeline of this plan and preferably by 2030. • Town buildings and infrastructure should adhere to green design standards. Town buildings should achieve a target for a combination of rooftop solar arrays and green roofs, and should be deeply retrofitted for other energy efficiency and renewable energy alternatives • ... the Town may benefit from seeking examples of creating 'village centres' across the Town to develop hubs of social and economic activity - where individuals and families can quickly (by foot, bike, or transit) access food, health, and other services at dispersed village centres to reduce the reliance on personal vehicles to drive downtown for essential goods 	<p>Acknowledged. The principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation are interwoven through the DRAFT Official Plan.</p> <p>The Town does not have the authority to compel the development of affordable housing, or the related green technology solutions identified.</p> <p>The Environmental Protection designation is intended to achieve this objective.</p> <p>The objective is positive. The Town should consider creating additional, more detailed sustainable design guidelines to be applied within both existing and new developments</p> <p>Not within the authority of the Town.</p> <p>This is a decision of Council, and can occur outside of the Official Plan.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan does this through the establishment of a defined urban structure that promotes higher intensity and, importantly, mixed-use centres and corridors, as well as walkable neighbourhood centres in existing and future neighbourhoods.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Assets, Green Infrastructure and Nature Based Climate Solutions provide ecosystem services, support biodiversity, offer climate adaptation and mitigation, and contribute to community health and well being while offering the same function of traditional built infrastructure. The Town is encouraged to use development approvals, permitting and bylaws to incorporate green infrastructure and Nature Based Climate Solutions. The valuation of natural assets should be incorporated in transparent decision-making processes... • Town incentivize or require a percentage of homes to opt out of front lawns and instead establish a combination of pollinator gardens, rain gardens or community vegetable gardens? How might the Town re-purpose laneways and easements (thinking laneways that I know of in the Tree Streets neighbourhood but I'm sure there are others) to establish community gardens, pollinator gardens, or establish urban forest tracts? • Bylaws need to be in place that protect existing tree canopy and green space to prevent individual property owners from cumulatively degrading, destroying or reducing overall canopy coverage. Permit requirements for removing trees must not be limited to large developments. <p>Section 3.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town is encouraged to use development approvals, permitting and bylaws to incorporate green infrastructure and Nature Based Climate Solutions. The valuation of natural assets should be incorporated in transparent decision-making processes. The incorporation of natural assets, green infrastructure and NBCS is often less expensive with less operational and maintenance costs but many co-benefits including to public and community health and wellbeing. • Climate change is a severe public and community health risk. There is currently no mention of climate change in Section 3.4 as it relates to the health and resilience of the community during extreme events such as heat waves, flooding, drought, storm events, power outages, and other climate-related impacts. Further, the Town already has water insecurity concerns. Climate change will exacerbate existing stresses within our water, wastewater and stormwater systems. The climate crisis is a water crisis and needs to be centered when considering the health and growth of the community over the next 20 years. • It is very encouraging to read "Collingwood shall be planned around cycling and pedestrian activity...". We need to stop designing towns and cities to cater to the automobile and this is a promising statement in the Plan, but it needs concrete policy recommendations to support it. <p>Section 3.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The establishment of a Design Review Panel is an interesting idea. I would strongly recommend the proposed Design Review Panel operating with a commitment to the Town's Climate Declaration and be well versed in low carbon resilience, green development standards, energy efficiency and energy alternative methods. • The Town is encouraged to commission the installation of local Indigenous art to create a deep sense of place and history, as well as demonstrated commitment to reconciliation and a shared future. • All new development reviews should include a climate test which includes how the development impacts the climate as well as how the development is vulnerable or susceptible to climate risks. <p>Section 3.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through government-to-government relationships building, the Town is encouraged to ensure local Indigenous cultural heritage resources are reflected in the Plan, conserved and, where appropriate celebrated, in a manner consistent with local First Nation policies and protocols, and in collaboration and reciprocity, including repatriation where applicable. • The Town is encouraged to examine, in collaboration with local First Nations, how its Heritage Inventory is vulnerable and at risk to climate related impacts. 	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan includes policy frameworks for all of these topics. In terms of the "valuation" of natural asset, the test for significance is fundamental. The requirement for Environmental Impact Studies is a key element of the Plan.</p> <p>These are ideas with potential. To be reviewed as part of the comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan.</p> <p>The Town has a Tree Preservation and Protection By-law No. 2012-084. Tree preservation is being further addressed through a multi-pronged project outside of the Official Plan Review including a review of the tree cutting by-law, forestry practices and resources, engineering/urban design standards, and site alteration.</p> <p>These topics are dealt with in the DRAFT Official Plan. Nature Based Climate Solutions start with the protection of the Town's Natural Heritage System.</p> <p>Climate Change is dealt with through a host of initiatives in the DRAFT Official Plan (see explanation at the beginning of this Section).</p> <p>The Town is committed to preparing a Transportation Master Plan in the coming months. That study may result in Amendments to the Official Plan.</p> <p>Council will determine the mandate and priorities, should a Design Review Panel be established.</p> <p>Council can do that anytime. This action does not require Official Plan policy.</p> <p>The Town is committed to the preparation of a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan in the coming months. That document may result in Amendments to the Official Plan.</p> <p>See Cultural Heritage policies.</p> <p>The Town can do this at anytime. Official Plan policy is not required. Indigenous communities are circulated in the Town's development review process and fostering enhanced relationships is undertaken by many internal departments as an ongoing objective.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>Section 3.7 Comprehensive Approach</p> <p>a. vi) 'Preparing enhanced sustainable development guidelines and/or a climate change lens as tools to evaluate development proposals and encourage the incorporation of sustainable design elements;</p> <p>'b) 'The Town may develop a Climate Change Action Plan that will commit to:'</p> <p>- The Town must develop a Climate Change Action Plan to achieve stated climate targets. The Town may establish an emissions target such as 50% reduction of GHGs by 2030 and net zero by 2050, or the Town may establish a specific, robust and ambitious target for each sector (ex. Buildings, transportation, etc.)</p> <p>- The Town is strongly encouraged to include timelines for each step in 3.7 part (b), as well as ratcheting mechanisms to expedite actions if GHG reduction targets are not being met.</p> <p>- We must act now; time is not on our side with the climate crisis. All climate action and every dollar invested in transitioning to low carbon resiliency is encouraged. While I do not advocate for wasting any unnecessary time on bureaucratic planning processes - I think the Town has enough information and examples from other municipalities that they can act and put things in place NOW, ahead of any formal climate plan. In parallel to acting immediately, the Town is strongly encouraged to undertake a Community Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment to understand the potential impact of climate change hazards to the Town's environmental, social, cultural, economic, and built environments. Based on the vulnerability assessment, develop a Community Climate Change Adaptation Strategy to act in parallel with the mitigation strategy proposed in the Plan.</p> <p>- The Town is strongly encouraged to undertake an extensive GHG inventory and develop a Community Energy Plan to strategically improve energy efficiency, reduce demand and reduce reliance on fossil fuels with a goal to eliminate new sources of fossil fuels and significantly reduce the use of existing fossil fuels..</p> <p>- 3.7 (c) iii/ iv (p.19). Note: Strongly encourage the Town to adopt more decisive language than "help guide" and "more sustainable and resilient". Development and redevelopment must be approached from a climate lens. Priority should be given to green developments.</p> <p>- 3.7 (g) ii (p. 20) "Promote a development pattern where public parks are provided within an approximate 5 minute walk from all residents" Note: The majority of parks lack adequate shading. As part of the Towns commitment to Air Quality and Carbon Mitigation, as well as to community health, the Town is strongly encouraged to reconsider how parks are designed and develop a strategy to re-wild park lands to establish tree canopies and other native vegetation.</p> <p>- 3.7 i) The Town may prepare reports to monitor the Town's progress towards climate change and environmental resiliency...' Note the Town must "prepare reports to monitor the Town's progress..."</p>	<p>The Town is committed to carrying out a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan. These specific comments will be provided by the Town to the project team for consideration, and potential implementation. The comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan may result in an Amendment to the Official Plan.</p> <p>Wording in the DRAFT Official Plan has been carefully considered to ensure that Council retains the flexibility to do additional work, at the appropriate time, and in consideration of budgeting constraints.</p>
17	<p>David Ohrling</p> <p>Community Engagement Group Collingwood Climate Action Team</p>	<p>1.1 Engagement with Indigenous Peoples, a) First Nations still walk on and care for the land. Suggest remove past tense - '<i>... the First Nations have walked on and cared for, the lands we now also call home.</i>' Suggest rewording this phrase to complete the sentence, remove past tense and also prevent unintentionally suggesting the way settler communities live, interact, and relate to the land is comparable to that of First Nations. First Nations have a unique cultural, spiritual, and legal relationship with the land which we should not assume but can learn from.</p> <p>1.2 f) "...today's needs can be met, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. This implies that we cannot externalize or defer environmental, social and economic costs onto future generations. It can be argued that we already have compromised the ability of future generations to meet their needs and we have an obligation to rectify that situation. CCAT would encourage an approach that strives for net-gain as opposed to no net-loss. Also see comment on 2.1 a) re 'sustainable'.</p> <p>2.1 - CCAT would like to see the Town adopt a definition and approach to 'sustainable' and 'sustainability' that strives to achieve an abundance (i.e. net-gain) as opposed to utilization in the present that hopefully leaves enough for the future (i.e. no net-loss). A 'no net loss' approach will result in net loss of environmental assets as a result of timing delays, habitat design, function, monitoring and maintenance deficiencies. Striving for 'net gain' is the only way to achieve a minimum of 'no net loss'.</p> <p>2.2 a) It should be recognized that there is no natural heritage that is 'insignificant'. As a society, we have come to assume that clean air, water and a stable climate are free and undervalue the environmental services that our natural heritage areas and systems play. We would suggest the word 'significant' be removed.</p> <p>Value 9 - Be a Healthy Community, Consider also including 'public greenspace' which is essential for physical and mental health and should be equitably accessible.</p>	<p>Agree, language to the reviewed and adjusted.</p> <p>Agree. Definition of sustainable to be included.</p> <p>The definition of "significant" is provided by the Province, and it is the Town's responsibility to identify the Natural Heritage System in recognition of that definition.</p> <p>Agree, wording to be reviewed and adjusted.</p>

	<p>3.1 c) "Decision making must be interdisciplinary, integrated, and strategic..." CCAT contends that applying a 'climate lens' is a necessary inclusion in all decision making if we are to adequately address the climate crisis which Collingwood has recognized. Other lenses are relevant to ensure that other spheres are also considered. An approach whereby Town policies and decision making explicitly identify how they have been viewed through the various lenses would ensure that a complete interdisciplinary approach has been taken.</p> <p>3.1 c) vi. Suggest for consideration as in other sections: Replace 'Promoting' with 'Prioritizing' which we contend expresses an increased level of intent to address. Suggest ' , <i>action to address a changing climate, protection of natural resources and implementation of green building technologies.</i>' which is action oriented as opposed to 'and promotes a response ...' which sounds ambivalent.</p> <p>3.2 f) In addition to targets for affordable units available, it is important to acknowledge that lower income and marginalized communities are disproportionately exposed to poor environments (busier roads, more noise, poorer air quality, less tree cover) and affected by the impacts of climate change (in particular heat). Ensuring housing is not only affordable to attain but also affordable to maintain requires applying a climate and environmental justice lenses to design and location and ensuring healthy environments in proximity for all.</p> <p>3.4 d) " <i>It is a requirement of this Plan that at least 75 percent of all dwelling units throughout the Town must be situated within 1200 metres (a 15 minute walk) of 4 or more of the following existing or planned categories of services and facilities...</i>" All dwelling units should be located within stated proximity to transit, retail and public green space at a minimum. It is interesting the Plan will 'require' proximity for a defined percentage of dwelling units leaving others isolated (and presumably car dependent) while only 'suggest'</p> <p>3.4 e) Urban Agriculture - Small scale agriculture can also be promoted on private lands. Whether for community or private purposes, this can serve many purposes and accomplish objectives that lawns cannot.</p> <p>3.5 Ensuring High Quality Urban Design c) ii. A Design Review Panel. This is an excellent idea. We suggest it should be versed in low carbon principles (both embedded and operational), green development standards, energy efficiency and energy alternative methods and operate with a commitment to the Town's Climate Declaration as well as other relevant lenses. New development reviews should include a climate test which includes how the development impacts the climate as well as how the development is vulnerable or susceptible to climate risks.</p> <p>3.7 Promoting Environmental Sustainability and Adapting to Climate Change. Thank you for explicitly including this section in the OP Update. We suggest consideration of replacing 'Promoting' with 'Prioritizing' which implies action beyond words.</p> <p>3.7 a) We suggest consideration for ' <i>the Town recognizes the need to adopt comprehensive climate change mitigation and adaptation measures and to enhance the resiliency.....</i> ' All municipalities have a role to play in reducing absolute GHG reductions in addition to preparing for the effects of climate change. Replace 'Promoting' with 'Prioritizing'</p> <p>3.7 a) v. Developing new communities and buildings that are energy and water efficient and that promote - Suggest 'incorporate' or 'include'</p> <p>3.7 a) vi. ...enhanced sustainable development guidelines and/or a climate change lens as tools to evaluate development proposals and encourage the incorporation of sustainable design elements... If appropriate, suggest referring also to as 'Green Development Standards' or 'High Performance Development Standards' or at minimum change the word 'guidelines' to 'standards' if that is the intent of this phrase. If it is not please consider. 'and utilizing' - Please requalify - both of these tools should be used and a climate change lens is essential not optional if we are to achieve sustainability objectives.</p> <p>3.7 b) The Town may develop a Climate Change Action Plan that will commit to: i. Undertaking an energy and greenhouse gas emission inventory; ii. Setting a greenhouse gas reduction target; Change to 'will'. There are many instances in the OP First Draft where language is weak or ambivalent. This is arguably the most important of those. We have a Climate Change Specialist who is working on the plan. This plan is essential and will be foundational for how we move forward. The steps outlined in this section are excellent and lay out the pathway forward.</p>	<p>To begin, it is the responsibility of Council to determine the relative importance of Climate Change in the context of their decision making. It is the role of the Official Plan to identify the array of community values, and associated policies that will assist Council in making informed decisions.</p> <p>Wording in the DRAFT Official Plan is deliberate for a number of reasons. Council will determine priorities for implementation.</p> <p>Acknowledged. This is a broad statement, which may, or may not, be true in Collingwood. The concept of "affordable to maintain" will be considered for inclusion in the Official Plan.</p> <p>This is a Town-wide objective, and it may not be possible to achieve everywhere. The 75% is a minimum objective.</p> <p>Not sure that the DRAFT Official Plan precludes this on private lands. Of course, there would be a lack of municipal oversight. The next DRAFT Official will consider opportunity for policy that could encourage urban agriculture on private lands, subject to any other applicable legislation or regulation.</p> <p>Council will establish the mandate, and the priorities for consideration by a Design Review Panel, should one be established.</p> <p>The Town is committed to carrying out a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan. These specific comments will be provided by the Town to the selected consulting team for consideration, and potential implementation. The comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan may result in an Amendment to the Official Plan.</p> <p>Language to be reviewed and considered in next DRAFT Official Plan.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>3.7 c) ii. leaves the necessary leeway as to what actual steps may be taken but Collingwood needs to, is already obligated to and 'will' develop a Climate Change Action Plan. The Town is strongly encouraged as part of this plan to undertake a Community Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment to understand the potential impact of climate change hazards to the Town's environmental, social, cultural, economic, and built environments. Based on the vulnerability assessment, develop a Community Climate Change Adaptation Strategy to act in parallel with the mitigation strategy proposed in the Plan. There is a noticeable absence of detail in relation to Green Infrastructure. Large impermeable surfaces (such as parking lots and widened roads as well as bare roof tops) displace green space, prevent water seepage into the ground and create urban heat islands... Please consider expanding on the important role of green infrastructure and include strategies to prevent greenfields from being paved over unnecessarily.</p> <p>3.7 c) iii. "Utilize the Urban Design Manual to help guide development and redevelopment to be more sustainable and resilient to climate change;" The Urban Design Manual (UDM) should be reviewed with a view to addressing inherent issues with 'Car Oriented Commercial' developments which in their current form encourage sedentary activity and vehicle idling (inconsistent with Town bylaws). Suggest remove 'more'. The UDM indicates its purpose is '..... to encourage the design of a sustainable built environment...' The use of 'more' without a reference sets the bar low when the goal although undefined needs to be high.</p> <p>3.7 c) iv. Consider the use of tools such as the Community Benefits By-law, Community Improvement Plans,... suggest adding Green Development Standards</p> <p>3.7 g) To reduce the frequency and length of vehicle trips that contribute to poor air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, the Town shall: Suggest explicitly including: ii. Prioritize active and public transportation when infrastructure plans are made thereby making it more efficient to walk, ride or take public transport. i. Promote development in a compact urban form that encourages walking, cycling, and the use of public transit - Change to "Develop"</p> <p>3.7 h) "To support reducing emissions in transportation sector, the Town shall encourage the installation of a publicly accessible electric vehicle charging network across the Town." The intent should be for the Town to encourage the commercial installation of publicly accessible chargers in appropriate locations but not necessarily provide them.</p> <p>3.7 i) "The Town may prepare reports to monitor the Town's progress towards climate change We need to commit and be accountable to making progress in these areas." Suggest 'will prepare reports...' and have this included in the Climate Action Plan</p> <p>Forest Resources - Consider also including establishing and maintaining an appropriate tree cover and rewilding in municipal parks (where in some cases adequate shading and tree cover is not currently present) 3.7 k) Tree Preservation Plan - a Tree Preservation Plan should also require that any lost trees be replaced in a suitable alternative site with compensation being provided for the loss of the full value of the ecological services that those trees would have provided had they been left standing.</p> <p>4.3 Accommodating Projected Growth, k) All development approvals within the Town shall be explicitly linked to the ability of the Town to provide municipal service infrastructure and transportation system capacity. - The wording and use of 'capacity' implies the planning of roads to meet projected vehicular volumes. The emphasis should remain on prioritizing active and public transportation - not the expansion of roads to accommodate personal vehicles and induced demand. Suggest '.... the ability of the Town to provide appropriate (or necessary) municipal services and transportation infrastructure.'</p> <p>5.1.2 Development Review, a) viii. That utility networks, municipal servicing infrastructure and transportation systems have capacity to serve the proposed development... - As previous, transportation 'capacity' needs to include active, public and personal transportation and not imply free flowing vehicular traffic at the expense of other community needs.</p> <p>5.1.8.1 Low-Rise Buildings c) Low-Rise Buildings shall have a minimum density of 15 dwelling units per gross hectare and a maximum density not exceeding 20 dwelling units per gross hectare . - This is a very narrow range which limits density especially in situations where a 3 storey building is built.</p> <p>5.1.8.4 Additional and Accessory Residential Units c) ii. The creation of the additional residential unit (detached) shall not require a second driveway on the property. However, an additional required parking space may be accommodated as a tandem parking space on the lot; - Permeable surfaces should be required. Excessive impermeable surfaces come at a cost to the community.</p> <p>5.1.8.9 Short-Term Accommodations a) iii Adequate off-street parking.. - same as above - additional parking should be on permeable surfaces</p> <p>5.1.8.10 Day Care Facilities - These facilities are likely to be situated in high density areas where road traffic will also be higher. The 'hazard' will likely be to the Day Care attendees. This policy item implies that traffic flow and vehicles are prioritized over people and services.</p>	<p>This should be part of the work in the comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan.</p> <p>Agree. This should be part of the work in the comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan.</p> <p>Acknowledged. This should be part of the work in the comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan.</p> <p>Language to be reviewed.</p> <p>Wording in Section 4 to be reviewed comprehensively.</p> <p>Capacity is created through a host of tools. Council will decide which means have priority, or if all means have equal priority.</p> <p>To review density ranges.</p> <p>Should be subject to a guideline, such as the Urban Design Manual, not a policy.</p> <p>Should be subject to a guideline, such as the Urban Design Manual, not a policy.</p> <p>No priority is assigned or assumed.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Requiring parking encourages driving. Pick up and drop off facilities should not be required to be off road in situations where other road users will not be excessively impeded or where safety hazards do not exist. Slower speed limits in these zones would improve safety for all and not result in unacceptable congestion or inconvenience for any road users.</p> <p>The removal of these requirements would allow more facilities to be located in more locations which has the potential to increase proximity to residents and reduce the need for attendees to be driven to the site. It would also promote density and reduce impermeable surfaces.</p> <p>Other than emergency service vehicle access, barriers should not be in place to siting these facilities, which can service multiple purposes (i.e. as a preschool, voting station or group meeting place), in denser areas in proximity to residents. This will increase the likelihood that less people will need or choose to drive a personal vehicle.</p> <p>Multiple reasons why the requirement for on-site vehicle parking should be limited. Parking for bicycles should be required.</p> <p>5.1.8.12 Neighbourhood Supporting Uses b) <i>iii. Parking and servicing areas shall be located at the side or rear of buildings, and appropriately screened from adjacent residential development;</i> <i>iv. Distinct parking areas shall be provided for the residential uses and neighbourhood supporting uses...</i> A requirement for bicycle parking should be included with its placement to be close to the building's access. Creative approaches to minimizing the amount of parking required between uses should be encouraged.</p> <p>5.1.8.13 Elementary Schools a) <i>iv. Adequate parking and pick-up/drop-off facilities for automobiles and buses shall be provided on site; and,</i> This requirement is counterproductive. It does not promote active transportation during a child's formative years. It encourages vehicle traffic near large numbers of children increasing the risk of collision and exposing them (in the case of ICE vehicles) to pollutants. It encourages school employees, who are the mentors of students, to drive their own vehicles to the school. Elementary schools should be exclusion zones to motor vehicles with limited exceptions (emergency services, special needs considerations) during school in/out times.</p> <p><i>v. Direct access shall be provided to elementary schools through a comprehensive active transportation network.</i> Excellent. Would suggest the 'comprehensive active transportation network' specifically indicate that it will target all ages and abilities to ensure inclusivity and recognize the spectrum of needs from youngest to oldest to promote and learn active transportation skills and behaviours. A requirement for adequate bicycle parking in a favourable location should also be required.</p> <p>5.1.8.14 Public Service Facilities d) <i>ii. The site is large enough to accommodate the building, on-site parking areas and appropriate amenity areas and buffering, where required</i> Vehicle parking should be limited to the extent possible for the reasons outlined above with the provision for adequate parking for those with accessibility issues. Induced demand to drive should be prevented. Bicycle parking in proximity to building access should be required.</p> <p>5.2.2 The Future Neighbourhoods Designation, 5.2.2.2 Permitted Built Form/Uses b) <i>ix. Neighbourhood Centres.</i> Why is this land use type not included in those permitted in Existing Neighbourhoods ? There are a number of existing neighbourhoods not in close proximity to services (including food stores/small markets) that would benefit from having these in closer proximity.</p>	<p>These comments are primarily aspirational and would need to be fully considered on a site-by-site basis and some matters may be addressed through the Transportation Master Plan.</p> <p>Their removal may also raise issues of compatibility, operational effectiveness, and safety.</p> <p>Parking and loading is regulated in the Zoning By-law. Bicycle parking is a requirement in the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Will review Section 5.1 to ensure requirements for bicycle parking are considered.</p> <p>These facilities are necessary for traffic management and safety.</p> <p>Active transportation is to be for everyone. Wording is non-discriminatory, and that includes all ages and abilities, as well as, ethnicities, incomes, religious affiliation, etc.</p> <p>Vehicle parking to be regulated by the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Please see Section 5.2.1.2 b). The Existing Neighbourhoods designation permits a full range of neighbourhood supportive land uses.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>5.2.2.4 Design Policies, Sustainability c) <i>Development within the identified Future Neighbourhood Designation, as identified on Schedule 2 are encouraged to be developed</i> Suggest strengthening 'are encouraged' to 'are required' and referring to: 'any sustainable development standards' and 5.2.2.4 c) i. 5.2.2.4 c) ii. would be appropriate to be 'encouraged' though no less beneficial.</p> <p>Road Pattern e) i. <i>Maximize number of connections to surrounding Collector and Arterial Road network;</i> There is no explicit mention of connections to active transportation networks for Future Neighbourhoods. These need to be present to connect these neighbourhoods to others and to services, businesses and places of work elsewhere. Will this not promote vehicle traffic shortcutting through neighbourhoods? Access and egress to the neighbourhood should be easier by active means than for vehicles which should be able to leave the collector / arterial road but then have their direct route hindered</p> <p>iv. Provide a well-connected internal road network designed to calm through traffic; - This will also promote vehicle traffic shortcutting through neighbourhoods unless there are planned interruptions to the internal network that do not allow vehicles to pass through.</p> <p>5.2.3.3 Land Use/Built Form Specific Policies, Hospitals b) iv. <i>Direct access shall be provided to hospital facilities from all parts of the surrounding community through a comprehensive active transportation network.</i> - Parking for bicycles and other vehicle alternative means should be required close to building access sites. Same comment for Large-Scale Places of Worship</p> <p>5.2.4 The Parks and Open Space Designation, Permitted Uses, Golf Courses. These facilities are usually privately owned and do not allow public access. They take up a large amount of land and serve a small percentage of the population. They traditionally are dominated by monocultures of non native grasses requiring significant chemical inputs which limit biodiversity for the given amount of green space. Collingwood currently has 2 golf courses within its boundaries and it should be questioned whether or not, with land at a premium, any more golf courses are of value to the community. They should not be considered equivalent to a park.</p> <p>5.3.1 The Downtown Core Designation, Parking/Transportation Management - Private vehicles will be necessary for some people however evidence supports active transportation corridors and access in business districts is associated with increased economic activity. An explicit recognition of the need to connect the Historic Downtown to the Active Transportation network and prioritize convenient bicycle and other non vehicle modes of transport parking is warranted.</p> <p>5.3.2 The Mixed-Use Corridor I Designation, 5.3.2.4 Design Policies d) iv. <i>Bicycle parking and racks shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning By-law. Bicycle parking shall be provided in locations that are close to building entrances, but situated to avoid any conflicts for movement along pedestrian routes.</i></p> <p>The new development plaza on the north side of First St situated on the east side of the Shoppers Drug Mart parking lot is a good example of inadequately accessible bicycle parking. It is non existent and as a result, bicycles are discouraged from this plaza. An appropriately placed bike rack is present near the Shoppers entrance which is often used. Both sides of the parking lot should have bicycle parking. Protected racks on some of the preferred vehicle parking spaces could be a consideration to prioritize bicycle parking while avoiding pedestrian conflicts.</p> <p>6.1 A Multi-Modal Transportation System, 6.1.3 Active Transportation and Complete Streets a) <i>While Collingwood already has a well-established active transportation network, as shown on Schedule 5, the Town will have regard for the long-range active transportation opportunities...</i> The proposed bike friendly routes shown in Schedule 5 should be more forward thinking in order to meet the needs of the community over the next 20 years. We do not feel that they meet the level of commitment made in the Active Transportation text within the OP Update. We would also recommend 'Safe School Streets' at all current and proposed schools. We are also looking for more safe biking routes on existing streets for trips to destinations such as Town recreation facilities, shopping, health and other appointments, personal grooming etc. including to the Hurontario, Pine & Ste. Marie St. area (downtown core).</p> <p>e) Active Transportation facilities shall be designed to: v. Minimize hazard and conflict exposures through the provision of adequate lighting, signage and wayfinding, as well as the management of vehicle speeds; - Suggest 'vehicle' be replaced with an appropriate term relevant to 'active transportation'. Vehicles should be addressed in a separate section to allow future flexibility in how they are managed.</p> <p>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; - Snowmobiles do not constitute 'active transportation' and their inclusion in this section is inappropriate. If the intent is to include snowmobiles in the OP it is suggested that be done explicitly in a separate section. Powered means of transportation should be defined and addressed separately from active transportation.</p> <p>6.1.4 Public Transit a) The Town will ensure that all development proposals in areas serviced by public transit are designed to support the provision of an efficient, convenient, and safe public transit service. - Appropriate zoning to allow charging /refuelling of electrified or other emissions free public transit is necessary so that when available, the Town can invest in the infrastructure needed to support the it's own emissions free fleet. The Town should stay updated on Metrolinx's testing of electrified public transit buses.</p>	<p>"Require" is not appropriate, however, the Town needs to explore mechanisms to "encourage". The concern is a clear lack of legislation to "require".</p> <p>Agree. Connectivity is a principle that is fundamental. Transportation-related comments to be fully considered through the Transportation Master Plan, that, when complete, may result in Amendments to the Official Plan.</p> <p>There is an inherent conflict with promoting connectivity and regulating traffic patterns. Roads are a public resource. Review Active Transportation Policies to ensure bicycle parking is identified.</p> <p>The Parks and Open Space designation specifically does not assign ownership. The designation is intended to provide development regulations for such uses, and does recognize existing golf courses.</p> <p>Agree. Will look for opportunity to make this link explicitly.</p> <p>The Town should be looking for opportunities to retro-actively achieve Active Transportation facilities throughout all of Collingwood. Will consider a policy to this effect.</p> <p>It is difficult to anticipate facilities at this time. Needs to be reflective of any recommendations from the Master Transportation Plan, which may provide Amendment to the Official Plan.</p> <p>This DRAFT Official Plan will only include existing routes and routes endorsed within a master planning document or technically supported. The new Transportation Master Plan may explore additional opportunities, and may result in an Amendment to the Official Plan.</p> <p>The management of speed is the only element related to "vehicle". "Vehicle" is appropriately generic to cover a full range of existing and future modes of transportation.</p> <p>To review and consider.</p> <p>Agree. No need for Official Plan policy. Best resolved through Zoning.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>6.1.8.3 Road Network Improvements, Road Widening <i>b) For the purposes of the Planning Act, each road to be widened are generally outlined in the Town's Transportation Study, as updated periodically. As the traffic conditions warrant, road improvements be undertaken in accordance with the long-range road needs projections. Improvements should be made based on community needs. The road is secondary. A 'complete street' approach with the principles outlined in section 1 should determine road improvements, not solely 'traffic conditions'</i></p> <p>6.2.8 Renewable Energy - How many wind turbines and solar farms are we going to see on land within the town boundary - land that would generate much more \$ being used for other things such as development?</p> <p>6.2.9 Gas and Oil Pipelines <i>a) Gas and oil distribution will be encouraged will be encouraged to locate within a road right-of-way or easement. They will be encouraged to locate in such a manner that does not negatively impact. ... This suggests that new gas infrastructure is important. They should be 'required' to locate in a way that does not negatively impact</i> <i>b) The Town acknowledges the importance of incorporating consideration for pipeline systems ... - The Town has declared a climate emergency and should also acknowledge the importance of not 'baking in' new emissions with new fossil fuel infrastructure</i></p>	<p>This will be reviewed in the Transportation Master Plan.</p> <p>Renewable energy is part of a response to Climate Change and the Town has declared a Climate Change Emergency and is preparing a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan.</p> <p>The need for gas and oil pipelines will remain until alternative energy sources are established, and become prevalent. In the interim, this policy is intended to recognize that if oil and gas is required, a pipeline is an efficient method to transport the commodity.</p>
--	--	---

15 Minute Communities			
Respondents:			
> Jack and Sue Marley > Jeanette Beck > Peter and Patti Daly > Elizabeth Sweet > Andre M Dempsey			
#	Name	Comment	Response
1	Jack and Sue Marley	3. Vision The vision statement and other language throughout the OP do not really develop new ideas of 15-Minute Cities that are being adopted successfully elsewhere in Ontario and around the globe.	Collingwood is, for the most part, already a 15-Minute Community. Further, the concept of a 15-Minute Community is already included in Section 3.4, subsection d) in the DRAFT Official Plan.
2	Jeanette Beck	<p>The goal is to create an integrated Visionary Official Plan for the town of Collingwood where the different policies come together in a multi-disciplinary format and with implementation guidelines that are measurable. What makes a quantifiable successful OP is the simplicity and directions that guide and inspire the zoning, transportation plans, complete street design and other guidelines to follow.</p> <p>The economic success and environmentally sustainable growth of Collingwood is only attainable with a rigorous OP that can be supported by future councils and staff. It is my wish that a careful and detailed review and examination of this OP will be done, and current best planning practices will be applied, such as “walkability, 15 minute city”. It seems only reasonable to strive for excellence and to adopt forward thinking planning practices while drafting and refining such an impactful plan for our Town.</p> <p>It is logical that if the OP strives and continues to be relevant over the next two decades it should embrace leading current best planning practices. Collingwood would benefit by adopting a simple overarching concept such as “Walkable, 15 minute city”, a very simple planning concept that actually mimics the present appeal of the existing historic Downtown Collingwood. When applying this walkable, 15-min city Vision to all of the Community Values 1-11 (as laid out in the OP Draft) a cohesive environmentally sustainable model emerges.</p> <p>A tool that has been developed to address the housing crisis called IZ (inclusionary zoning) enables and encourages equitable and affordable housing to be built. There are a host of other current best planning practices being adopted worldwide, in cities such as Bogota, New York, Paris, Copenhagen and cities in Ontario like Ottawa, Collingwood would benefit from adopting and embedding these in the OP.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The DRAFT Official Plan includes a host of new concepts and is forward thinking, while, at the same time, appropriately reflecting the requirements of Provincial legislation and policies. The DRAFT Official Plan includes new concepts related to climate change, sustainability, mobility options, complete streets and active transportation. It also promotes significant changes related to housing affordability, a range and mix of housing types, Additional Residential Units, compact urban form, and support for intensification in an urban structure of key centres and corridors.</p> <p>Collingwood is, for the most part, already a 15-Minute Community. Further, the concept of a 15-Minute Community is already included in Section 3.4, subsection d) in the DRAFT Official Plan.</p> <p>The Town of Collingwood is NOT yet enabled by Provincial Legislation to utilize the Inclusionary Zoning tool, however high level foundational policies are included in the DRAFT Official Plan should the tool become available in the future.</p>
3	Peter and Patti Daly	<p>The vision statement and other language throughout the OP do not really develop new ideas of 15- Minute Cities and Complete Streets that are being adopted successfully elsewhere in Ontario. We would love to see an OP that was focused more on people and how they would live without the need for endless condos for weekend residences. We need something that will aid in affordable housing, noncar mobility around Town with plenty of easy access to the waterfront. There should be some very specific focus on Parks, Trails and greenspace as well.</p> <p>During the virtual meeting for the Public, the Planning Consultant said we didn't need to have all of the various Plans referenced in the OP. Frankly, we think the OP should include all of the various elements that will make Collingwood stronger in the future; e.g., the Waterfront Master Plan, Parks and Rec Plan, future Trails Plan, the Cycling Plan, Collingwood to Blue Mtn Village Trail Plan, Active Transportation Plan etc. etc.</p> <p>There are so many elements of this OP draft 1 where it could be made better. This is a document that is to replace one that is 20 years old and one that will live for years to come; please don't rush this OP. Take another 6-8 months to add the meat to the bones and get it right!</p>	<p>Collingwood is, for the most part, already a 15-Minute Community. Further, the concept of a 15-Minute Community is already included in Section 3.4, subsection d) in the DRAFT Official Plan. Further, the DRAFT Official Plan includes a host of new concepts and is forward thinking, while, at the same time, appropriately reflecting the requirements of Provincial legislation and policies. The DRAFT Official Plan includes new concepts related to climate change, sustainability, mobility options, complete streets and active transportation. It also promotes significant changes related to housing affordability, a range and mix of housing types, Additional Residential Units, compact urban form, and support for intensification in an urban structure of key centres and corridors. Commit to targets for unit types.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan makes generic reference to all studies adopted by Council. Making a specific list ensures that the Official Plan is out of date when new Plans are done, or old plans are updated. Further, these Plans are not prepared under the legislative authority of the Planning Act, and simply naming them in the Official Plan does not give them any enhanced authority. However, the DRAFT Official Plan does require all development applications to have regard to and be consistent with such studies, guidelines, standards or plans.</p> <p>This is the first draft of the Official Plan circulated for comment. There will be other opportunities for consultation and review of future drafts of the Official Plan. Further, the Official Plan Review project has been ongoing since 2020 and provided upfront opportunities for engagement on the vision, background papers, and preliminary policy directions.</p>
4	Elizabeth Sweet	I would like to see an OP that prioritizes creating 15 minute cities.	Collingwood is, for the most part, already a 15-Minute Community. Further, the concept of a 15-Minute Community is already included in Section 3.4, subsection d) in the DRAFT Official Plan.

5	Andre M Dempsey	<p>Thank you for taking time to read some thoughts concerning the proposed changes to our town which could have the effect of changing this beautiful place for years to come.</p> <p>First of all I am concerned that so much reliance is being placed on the OP which has been in place for a long time before cars and trucks and traffic have taken over our town with no plan in place for how to deal with this invasion. I urge you to make haste slowly, adopting life changing decisions such as turning streets , i. e. second and third , runs the real threat of turning these magnificent streets into unrecognizable major thoroughfares. This whole area should be protected from this fate. I urge you all to do some research and see what cities like Ottawa have done.</p> <p>Familiarize your selves with the concept of complete streets and fifteen minute cities. These ideas are wonderful blueprints that will help in our discussions so relevant today. It all comes down to communication which I urge all of you to do.</p> <p>Bottom line please do your best to preserve our beautiful town the way it's been for years. More consultation is required.</p>	<p>Collingwood is, for the most part, already a 15-Minute Community. Further, the concept of a 15-Minute Community is already included in Section 3.4, subsection d) in the DRAFT Official Plan.</p> <p>In addition, the DRAFT Official Plan includes a host of new concepts and is forward thinking, while, at the same time, appropriately reflecting the requirements of Provincial legislation and policies. The DRAFT Official Plan includes new concepts related to climate change, sustainability, mobility options, complete streets and active transportation. It also promotes significant changes related to housing affordability, a range and mix of housing types, Additional Residential Units, compact urban form, and support for intensification in an urban structure of key centres and corridors.</p> <p>This is the first draft of the Official Plan circulated for comment. There will be other opportunities for consultation and review of future drafts of the Official Plan. Further, the Official Plan Review project has been ongoing since 2020 and provided upfront opportunities for engagement on the vision, background papers, and preliminary policy directions.</p>
---	-----------------	--	--

Bill 23			
Respondents:			
> George Powell > Christopher Baines > Jeffrey Brydges			
#	Name	Comment	Response
1	George Powell, Vice-Chair of our Watershed Action Committee Christopher Baines	Parkland dedication needs to look at impact of intensification should be increased from the present 5% in residential areas. Cash in lieu of park land dedication should be eliminated if it impacts green space.	The legislation around parkland dedication has recently be changed by Provincial legislation, and the next version of the DRAFT Official Plan will include the most up-to-date requirements. How the Town implements that authority is to be considered through a Parks Plan and, subsequently an updated Parkland Dedication By-law.
2	Jeffrey Brydges	The Town should not be waiving or reducing development charges through the official plan process; there are established public processes and legislation to determine, set and revise these charges The Town should not be waiving or reducing community benefit charges through the official plan process How are the new hospital site and old hospital site addressed through the update or will it be updated again before any changes are required?	Issues related to Development Charges and Community Benefits are to be part of legislation related studies and by-laws, prepared in accordance with the Planning Act and the Development Charges Act. The Official Plan will include appropriate policies to empower the Town to utilize these tools. Through Bill 23, the Province will be requiring municipalities to reduce or eliminate development charges for affordable, attainable and rental housing, including opportunities to consider reductions/grants to achieve key Town-building objectives. Development of the hospital lands has not been contemplated within the DRAFT Official Plan. The OP cannot pre-emptively determine the outcome of the phased assessment approach being undertaken by the hospital and where the Province ultimately will determine the location of the hospital. The decision of what the current hospital site should be used for, if the hospital relocates, will be determined through a detailed Block Plan process to be implemented through an Official Plan Amendment, and be fully considered through a robust public consultation process.

Natural Heritage		
Respondents:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Julie Watene > George Powell > Neil Morris > Christopher Baines > Paul Anthony Bernard > Bridget Doyle > Katherine Holmes > Elizabeth Sweet > Jeff Young 		<p>It is important to note that it is 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 is an important piece of background information incorporated into the DRAFT Official Plan. Key elements, including the mapping that is included in Discussion Paper 5, will be included in the Official Plan as an Appendix.</p> <p>The Natural Heritage System in the DRAFT Official Plan, including both the Environmental Protection designation and the Adjacent Lands Overlay, have been defined in accordance with Provincial guidelines, and utilizing the most up-to-date information provided by the Conservation Authorities and other agencies. The work in Discussion Paper 5 was carried out by a fully qualified environmental scientist.</p> <p>> The EP designation includes all identified significant natural heritage features and associated ecological functions, plus a 30 metre buffer. Policies preclude development within the EP designation; and,</p> <p>> The Adjacent Land Overlay adds an additional 90 metre identifier that is intended to act as a "trigger", requiring any future development within the Adjacent Lands Overlay to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIS), prior to any development being permitted.</p> <p>The 30 metre buffer plus the 90 metre trigger constitute a 120 metre zone adjacent to identified natural heritage features and associated ecological functions where detailed EIS work is required prior to future development being approved to ensure that significant natural heritage features and their ecological functions are adequately protected from the impacts of development.</p> <p>It is important to note, however, that development may be permitted, both within the EP designation and within the Adjacent Land Overlay should the required EIS indicate a different configuration of the feature/function or that it can confirm that no negative impacts on the Natural Heritage System would result from the proposed development. EIS work must be to the satisfaction of the Town, including a third party peer review.</p> <p>In accordance with Provincial policy, it is a requirement that the Town identify and protect from the impacts of development all significant natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions. To this end, the Town retained a fully qualified environmental scientist who utilized the most up-to-date information to establish the Environmental Protection Designation and the Adjacent Lands Overlay that are identified on various schedules included in the DRAFT Official Plan.</p> <p>Importantly, the policy framework included within the Environmental Protection Designation Section of the DRAFT Official Plan (see Section 5.6.1) does provide the opportunity to adjust the boundaries of that designation (through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement), and deals specifically with circumstances related to existing uses and structures, as well as existing development approvals.</p> <p>In the next DRAFT of the Official Plan, providing an additional specific policy that deals with existing lots of record will be considered. That policy may identify the permission for the development of the property, subject to a number of criteria that may include a requirement for frontage on a public road, the ability to accommodate, or connect to appropriate sewer and water facilities and a requirement to conform with the regulations of the implementing Zoning By-law. If a rezoning is required, it would need to be supported by an Environmental Impact Statement.</p>

#	Name	Comment	Response
1	George Powell, Vice-Chair of our Watershed Action Committee	<p>Large developments in EP lands should not be allowed i.e. Bridgewater, Huntingwood Trails.</p> <p>Define no negative impact</p> <p>Buffers should be not less than indicated in the Provincial Planning document and should with respect to watercourses be from the edge of the watercourse bank.</p> <p>Under the Value Section, community values are stated and states: "Value 1 Conservation of the Natural Heritage System - The Georgian Bay Shoreline and associated river systems will be protected and their natural beauty, water quality, historic legacy, and recreational amenities will be enhanced for the enjoyment of residents and visitors. The Town will demonstrate environmental leadership by protecting all its significant natural heritage system, and will implement high standards for resiliency, sustainability, green infrastructure, and climate change mitigation and adaptation." This value needs to be front and centre with residents, town staff and developers.</p> <p>The Provincially Significant Silver Creek Wetland is not specifically mentioned in the draft. The Shipyards and 80 Madeline are, I trust this will be rectified and expanded upon or the Community Values stated in the OP are simply not taken seriously.</p> <p>Townline Creek should be a named watercourse in Collingwood it is based on the work we did for over 10 years show it as the most polluted watershed. Did not meet MECP Total Phosphorus concentrations during runoff events and Environment Canada standards for Total Suspended Solids . As well, drains running through the Town are an issue and can cause local flooding if not well maintained and kept clear.</p> <p>Town needs to separate environmental issues from planning to eliminate conflicts.</p> <p>Increased level of monitoring is needed during construction and in the longer term to ensure environmental issues are not overlooked.</p>	<p>As noted, the Environmental Protection designation has been established in the DRAFT Official Plan specifically to preclude development. However, as always, through detailed Environmental Impact Study the limits of the Environmental Protection designation can be refined. There are no specific buffers included in Provincial policy, however these recommended buffers are consistent with the Province's Natural Heritage Reference Manual. The DRAFT Official Plan has little effect on existing development approvals, unless those approvals come forward with amendments or request for extensions, at which time the new policies would apply.</p> <p>Negative Impact is specifically defined in the Provincial Policy Statement (2020).</p> <p>A 30 metre buffer is included within the Environmental Protection designation, subject to refinement through an Environmental Impact Study. The DRAFT Official Plan also includes a 90 metre Adjacent Lands Overlay requiring any future development to carry out an Environmental Impact Study(EIS) - that is a total 120 metre area where the requirement for an Environmental Impact Study is triggered. There are no specific buffers included in Provincial policy.</p> <p>The order of the community values does not imply any relative importance. They are all important.</p> <p>It is not possible, or appropriate to identify every significant natural heritage feature by name in the Official Plan. It is, however, crucial that they all be included within the Environmental Protection designation. The wording in the DRAFT Official Plan will be reviewed to ensure that the descriptions within the Environmental Protection designation are not specific, unless there is a specific policy related reason to do so. The key is what is the policy framework saying, not whether a feature is specifically identified, if the feature exists, it will be subject to the policies.</p> <p>All planning applications are required to consider environmental issues, including potential impacts on the Natural Heritage System, as well as potential impacts on endangered species/species at risk. Not sure how the interrelated issues could be separated, or when/how environmental issues would be considered outside of the planning approval process.</p> <p>Monitoring is a good idea, and would typically be identified through conditions of approval for major developments. Will consider a policy to identify monitoring in Section 7 of the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p>
2	Paul Anthony Bernard	<p>Collingwood has established a unique Community that has leveraged it's location to the 'Green' aspects of the area environment. It is the value of the proximity to the outdoors and outdoor activities that increases the Townships image, reputation and worth. Any diminishing of the 'Green' components presents potential community harm.</p> <p>Developers and developments that do not support the underlining wellness sensitivities as they exist now and should expand strengthening the community need be rejected. Research as to the nature of organizations seeking to impact the community must be undertaken as part of the best practices that need to be in place within the Official Plan. It cannot be 'anyone apply'. High standards wins the day.</p> <p>Collingwood has valuable wetlands, marsh areas and green spaces that must be regarded as it's #1 asset. The larger environment adding additional outdoor benefits. The values of the Township should be home grown and our environment specific. The main environmental issue facing us and much of the world is and will continue to be flooding as it does structural and infrastructure damage. The sudden marriage of high volume rain (particularly at a time of high ground water) high wind and depleted run off capacity must no longer be regarded as a 100 year event. Evidence within our own province going back a decade illustrates what will one day come to Collingwood. My input would be for the Township to take firm control over development and developers by setting specific requirements in the coming Official Plan that provides the scope and understanding for the businesses building and ensures the goals of the community are met. Land water flow a necessary verifiable component.</p> <p>Currently the control of development is all in the hands of the developer(s). This must stop, all around the province, but if only in Collingwood then so be it. Green space in every new development must be 15% as a minimum. Wellness facilities must be within all high(er) rise facilities.</p>	<p>Growth and change are coming to Collingwood, as the Town continues to evolve over time and as required by Provincial legislation and policy. The DRAFT Official Plan is intended to provide a clear framework for future decisions to be made by Council through the required public consultation process. Focusing growth in a structure of Nodes and Corridors reduces sprawl and allows for larger tracts of environmentally sensitive and/or agricultural land to be protected. The Official Plan, Zoning By-law and, for some forms of development, Site Plan Approval are intended to ensure that the Town can appropriately manage change. Legislation does not permit the Town to discriminate by the type of organization or their background, in fact, anyone is legally entitled to apply for development anywhere, anytime, provided that they own the land or are an authorized agent of the owner. However, the Town must demonstrate that the proposed development is good planning in accordance with the policies and regulatory instruments in force and effect.</p> <p>As noted, the Natural Heritage System in Collingwood has been defined and protected through policy. The Environmental Protection designation includes Floodplain/Hazard Lands, as well as all other identified significant natural features, and applies a 30 metre buffer. The strategy employed includes recognition that water flow related to major storm events has an impact. Engineering standards for SWM facilities are also being studied and refined by the Town.</p> <p>Parkland dedication for residential development has recently been refined and also restricted by the Province through Bill 23. In general, parkland dedication will be limited by legislation, depending on the land use and the intensity of development. More green space requires higher buildings, or the result will be sprawl.</p> <p>> For industrial and commercial development - 2% of gross land area; and, > For residential development, anywhere from 5% to 15% depending on the lot size and other context specific circumstances, noting that for the Town to diverge from the 5%, an updated Parks Master Plan is required, work has started in this regard.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan will include the appropriate policy framework to empower the municipality to create a Parks Master Plan, and associated Parkland Dedication By-law that will apply to all forms of development within the Town.</p>

3	<p>Christopher Baines</p>	<p>Buffers for protection - should not be less than indicated in the Provincial Planning document and should be from the edge of the watercourse bank.</p> <p>The Committee of Adjustment should be involved in Minor Variances and not issues that impact the environment (70 Madeline comes to mind)</p> <p>The Provincially Significant Silver Creek Wetland deserves to be specifically referenced in the draft.</p> <p>Townline Creek should also be a named watercourse in Collingwood.</p> <p>Value Section - Value 1 - Conservation of the Natural Heritage System needs to be front and centre with residents, town staff and developers</p>	<p>A 30 metre buffer is included within the Environmental Protection designation, subject to refinement through an Environmental Impact Study. The DRAFT Official Plan also includes a 90 metre Adjacent Lands Overlay requiring any future development to carry out an Environmental Impact Study - that is a total 120 metre area where the requirement for an Environmental Impact Study is triggered. There are no specific buffers included in Provincial policy.</p> <p>Some Minor Variance applications are subject to natural heritage and natural hazard policies where those features/hazards exist, and all Committee of Adjustment decisions must conform to applicable policies and regulations.</p> <p>The Silver Creek watershed is noted in natural hazard policies and the Silver Creek Wetland Complex is contained within the Natural Heritage mapping on Schedules 1, 2, and 3 of the DRAFT Official Plan. There are policies that protect these features. In accordance with Provincial policy, development is permitted adjacent to significant natural heritage features if it is demonstrated that no negative impacts would result.</p> <p>Townline Creek is shown as a watercourse on Schedule 1 now, but is one of the smaller watersheds, and is not specifically named. However, the four major river systems are noted in Natural Hazard Policies 5.6.3.1 and 5.6.3.3 (one-zone concept). All watercourse names will be removed from the Schedules, however the watershed boundaries are shown on Schedule 3 and an Appendix to the OP. Include a general policy set that applies to 'other watercourses' that are not named by area specific policies</p> <p>The order of the community values does not imply any relative importance. They are all important.</p>
4	<p>Bridget Doyle</p>	<p>The stream (and its floodplain) that flows through the Tree Street neighbourhood appears to be absent from the Plan map.</p> <p>Lack of green space and parkland between High Street and St, Marie, 2nd and Poplar.</p> <p>According to my review, the Plan does not explain how the Town is considering water conservation through development and growth. This needs to include water quality and quantity (including minimum environmental flows) for both surface water and groundwater and should include green infrastructure as much as possible.</p>	<p>The Town is working with the NVCA on a preferred method to identify and define flooding hazards associated with the Oak Street Canal, which would be added to the next DRAFT Official Plan, when appropriate.</p> <p>In accordance with Bill 23, the Town needs to prepare a Parks Master Plan and a Parkland Dedication By-law. It would be appropriate to consider park space deficiencies comprehensively through the required Parks Plan.</p> <p>Section 3.7 a) vi of the DRAFT Official Plan directs the Town to prepare enhanced sustainable development guidelines and/or a climate change lens as tools to evaluate development proposals and encourages the incorporation of sustainable design elements. Section 3.7 c) directs the Town to consider, encourage and provide policy direction on initiatives related to water conservation, energy conservation, air quality protection, and integrated waste management opportunities.</p> <p>Also, see what the SWM Section includes.</p>
5	<p>Katherine Holmes</p> <p>Sunny Wiles, Sharon Carr, Julie Watene, Lisa Wilson and Andrea Mandel-Campbell</p> <p>The Friends of Silver Creek Wetland</p>	<p>We read with interest the most recent draft of the Official Plan for the Town of Collingwood. We are offering a few additional recommendations and suggestions for greater clarity which are a reflection of input from the Friends of Silver Creek Wetlands (SCW) and our intense desire to see the Silver Creek Wetland Complex completely preserved and protected on both sides of Hwy 26.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for all Environmental Impact Studies (EIS) to be undertaken by independent, third-party consultants (not paid by developers) with timely and complete updates. In the case of SCW the last complete EIS was done in 2007 when water levels in Georgian Bay were low. The SCW needs to have a new EIS completed to remap the area before any further action on the Huntingwood Trails development should take place • Any adjacent wetlands to Provincially Significant (PS) areas must also receive environmental protection designation to protect endangered species that roam beyond the PS borders. • Buffers for all Provincially Significant natural heritage sites to follow Ministry of Natural Resources guidelines of 120 metre buffers • Please add proper zoning to protect all natural heritage sites in Collingwood • Under the Greenlands System section, please list all natural heritage features of Collingwood in an addendum so there is no question as to the possibility of development on these lands in the future • In the Environmental Protection Designation section please list all current protected features and increase buffers to 120 metres • Prior to any development which involves "unevaluated wetlands" (as identified by the NVCA) the Ministry of Natural Resources must do a re-evaluation of those unevaluated wetlands and this would be done by an approved MNR representative at the expense of the developer • In the Removal or Destruction of a Natural Feature section, please increase the penalties beyond financial charges to a criminal offence with mandatory jail sentences for any destruction. <p>We want you and your colleagues, to recognize, respect and enforce environmental protections and zoning currently in place and permanently protect the Wetland from development. To this end, we expect the Town to use and enforce all available means to ensure that any development is done to the highest standard of environmental protection. We expect this at every stage of the process - during approvals, construction and post-construction stages. In addition, we would like to see developers accountable for any future damage, flooding, loss of ecosystems, etc. in the communities surrounding the development.</p>	<p>The Silver Creek wetland is included within the Environmental Protection designation - which does not permit development. In accordance with Provincial policy, development is permitted adjacent to significant natural heritage features if it is demonstrated that no negative impacts would result.</p> <p>Lands in proximity to the wetlands are within the Adjacent Lands Overlay, which requires that an Environmental Impact Study be carried out to ensure any development proposed will appropriately protect the environmental features and its ecological functions.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that significant level of protection any landowner can propose any development, but any application for major proposals must be accompanied by a detailed Environmental Impact Study that ensures that any development will appropriately protect the features and their functions. The policies around the Environmental Impact Study will be revised to read that all Environmental Impact Studies will be prepared to the satisfaction of the Town in consultation with any agency having jurisdiction. Environmental Impact Studies shall be peer reviewed by the Town, at the full cost of the proponent.</p> <p>Provincial Policy does not establish a buffer of 120 metres. The Natural Heritage Reference Manual recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study when development is proposed within 120 metres of the feature in order to demonstrate no negative impacts would result (which is a Provincial Policy requirement). The policy framework in the DRAFT Official Plan does just that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Environmental Protection designation includes a 30 metre buffer; and, > The Adjacent Lands Overlay is applied abutting the Environmental designation, and covers 90 metres. <p>Together, the buffer within the Environmental Protection designation plus the Adjacent Lands Overlay equals 120 metres.</p>

6	Elizabeth Sweet	I know you are fully aware up to 70% of Wetlands in Ontario have been destroyed or degraded in settled areas. Please set clearly defined policies no development will take place on, near or adjacent to our Silver Creek Wetlands. Actually, I'm not asking you, I'm pleading with you!	The Silver Creek wetland is included within the Environmental Protection designation - which does not permit development. In addition, the Adjacent Lands Overlay provides for an Environmental Impact Study to evaluate lands within 90 metres of the Environmental Protection designation. In accordance with Provincial policy, development is permitted adjacent to significant natural heritage features if it is demonstrated that no negative impacts would result.
7	Jeff Young	The silver creek wetland should be fully protected within a radius around the area Develop a pollinator strategy	The Silver Creek wetland is included within the Environmental Protection designation - which does not permit development. In addition, the Adjacent Lands Overlay provides for an Environmental Impact Study to evaluate lands within 90 metres of the Environmental Protection designation. In accordance with Provincial policy, development is permitted adjacent to significant natural heritage features if it is demonstrated that no negative impacts would result. The Town can carry out a Pollinator Strategy at any time. Official Plan policy is not required.
8	Save Silver Creek Wetland Petition Julie Watene	South Georgian Bay's last remaining intact coastal wetland is being threatened like never before by rampant overdevelopment. Time is of the essence and the costs are very real: the destruction of endangered wildlife habitat, heightened risks for severe flooding, and the permanent loss of our natural heritage.	CAN'T SEEM TO FIND THIS COMMENT IN ANY OF THE CORRESPONDENCE? REFERS TO THE SILVER CREEK WETLAND, WHICH EXPLAINS THE DRAFT RESPONSE ABOUT HUNTINGWOOD AND BRIDGEWATER... HESITANT TO MENTION THESE SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENTS WITHOUT THEM BEING EXPLICITLY REFERENCED IN THE COMMENT Neither the EXISTING nor DRAFT Official Plan permit development on wetlands, but development adjacent to wetlands may be permitted subject to demonstration of no negative impacts, outlined in Provincial Policy and subject to an Environmental Impact Study.
9	Neil Morris	Environmental Protection (EP) lands are indicated (Section 5.6.1.3, pg 90) as including a variety of specific natural heritage features, including Provincially Significant Woodlands. The Draft OP does not explicitly mention any mapping of such woodlands or the process and criteria that have been applied in any woodland mapping for the Town. Are there supporting materials available which identify Significant Woodlands and document the process through which they were delineated? Previous iterations of the Collingwood OP have identified some specific criteria for Category 1 and Category 2 lands. For example, Category 1 and 2 woodlands were previously identified and delineated in part on the basis of size and age. Do these various criteria still have any relevance to the "Environmental Protection" designation, or are woodlands no considered strictly in context of PPS criteria? The Draft OP (pg 91) notes that EP designation also reflects "Other natural heritage features", including woodlands that are less than 4 hectares. Is this reflective of the size-related criteria outlined in the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (NHRM)? Are there other criteria from the NHRM or other sources that are relevant in this context? The Draft OP also notes that "locally significant" wetlands are among the "other natural heritage features" which may confer an EP designation. Are there supporting materials available which identify locally significant wetlands and document the process through which they were delineated? The Draft OP notes (pg 91) that EP lands will include a 30 m buffer and that this buffer "is a minimum buffer that may be adjusted as a result of further analysis carried out in an EIS". Is the intent that a buffer of less than 30-m will not be permitted, regardless of EIS findings that indicate that a reduced buffer would be acceptable?	Mapping for the elements of the Natural Heritage System is provided in the Discussion Paper 5. The next DRAFT of the Official Plan will include that mapping as an Appendix. The intent of the DRAFT Official Plan is to simplify the policy framework by identifying all significant natural heritage features and their ecological functions into one category and apply a 30 metre buffer. This takes away the interpretive issue of Type 1 versus Type 2 and defers all of that investigation to an EIS, should development be proposed. Please refer to Discussion Paper 5 Please refer to Discussion Paper 5 The intent is to start with a 30 metre buffer. In all cases, the nature and extent of the feature and the required buffer can be adjusted through an Environmental Impact Study that definitively shows that the features and their ecological functions are protected. That is a scientific approach, and yes, the 30 metre buffer could be reduced if justified by a peer reviewed Environmental Impact Study.

Transportation			
Respondents:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Paul Frayne > George Powell > Murray Knowles > Kari Payne > Ian Chadwick > Bruce Clark > Bridget Doyle > Mary Farncomb > Owen Grey > Paul A. Gurr > Karen Ide > Justin Jones > Richard Lex > Mike Magnacca > Donna Menage > Margaret Mooy > Ruth Plant > Elizabeth Sweet > Kevin Tone > Val Mitchell > Alicia Tone Virtanen > Jeff Young > Thomas & Suzanne Donohoe 	<p>The majority of the comments are focused on the need for a Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and suggested changes or additions to Schedule 5 Active Transportation.</p>	<p>Those comments related to the TMP require a response that is general in nature, and is as follows:</p> <p>A new Transportation Master Plan (TMP) has not been developed for the Town. The DRAFT Official Plan relies upon the EXISTING Official Plan, as well as transportation studies carried out in 2012 and 2019 which focused on improvements required to the road network in order to accommodate increased growth in traffic.</p> <p>The Transportation Section (Section 6.1) of the DRAFT Official Plan is a carry-forward of the principles, policies and categorizations that are included within the Existing Official Plan.</p> <p>All correspondence that has been provided will be circulated to the TMP team.</p> <p>A NEW TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN (TMP)</p> <p>1. The Town is committed to carrying-out an update to the Transportation Master Plan (budget 2023) that will include analysis on traffic management based on current volumes and anticipated growth. The objective of the TMP is to ensure major goods movement facilities and corridors are protected for the long term and to ensure a safe, efficient, and integrated system for the movement of people and goods throughout the Town. Within this integrated system it remains a priority to develop strategies to effectively accommodate high seasonal traffic volumes while minimizing the impact of peak period and surge traffic on residents and residential neighbourhoods.</p> <p>2. The TMP will be a comprehensive review of vehicle and active transportation movements throughout the Town. This will include a review of potential future movement corridors to be protected. The TMP also intends to develop a Complete Streets Policy to further implement policies identified in the Town Official Plan update. A key goal of this policy will be to balance the needs of all transportation modes and users. Further, The TMP is to provide strategies for addressing localized problem areas within the context of the larger transportation network, as well as crafting policies both for effective management of the network as a whole and for evaluating ongoing requests for traffic calming and controls.</p> <p>3. The TMP process will provide more detailed responses to all of the relevant comments on transportation issues received to date on the DRAFT Official Plan. It is expected that the Transportation Master Plan, when complete, may result in an Amendment to the Official Plan.</p> <p>4. Public consultation throughout the development of the TMP is essential to its success. Participation by residents will be key to ensure that all issues and opportunities have been identified so that appropriate policies can be developed. In order to ensure meaningful consultation. Town staff are considering the following as the minimum requirements for the TMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > 2 rounds for formal public consultation including preparation of the presentation materials; > workshops with community stakeholder groups; > public survey/questionnaire (web, social media, mobile, etc.); > Ongoing communication through the Town's "Engage Collingwood" portal; and, > Council presentations. 	
#	Name	Comment	Response
1	George Powell, Vice-Chair of our Watershed Action Committee	Town needs to look at impact of closing Simcoe Former County Road at Duntroon as it will place additional traffic on to Hwy 26 in to Collingwood and exasperate the present traffic congestion. A by-pass around Collingwood is being looked at by MTO and needs to consider improving not only Collingwood's road network but also Town of the Blue Mountain and Clearview road networks. Traffic going north up the Bruce does not necessarily want to go through Collingwood and TBM.	Detailed comments regarding changes to the road pattern will be appropriately considered through the new Transportation Master Plan.

2	Ian Chadwick	<p>The staff report on the draft Official Plan (OP: staff report P2022-23) only mentions traffic calming four (4) times (pages 46, 67, 110, and 135). The Appendix A to Report P2022-23 only mentions traffic calming four (4) times as well. These references are only in the most vague form, without any specifics or diagrams. For example, "Provide a well-connected internal road network designed to calm through traffic." This does not explain what measures are contemplated or how such measures will be implemented, or where. Nor does the OP identify areas where traffic density or speeds are already problematic and should be addressed in priority with traffic calming methods (e.g. four-way stop signs instead of two-way).</p> <p>The Collingwood Transportation Study Update (Aug. 2019) does not mention traffic calming even once. Nor does there appear to be any other document on the town's website that specifically discusses a plan for traffic calming. Given the continued increase in traffic through town, projected to double within the decade, in particular in residential areas and on designated collector roads, this is a significant oversight.</p> <p>Plans to encourage traffic through residential areas via widened and upgraded collector roads are the sort of vehicle-centric thinking that pervaded urban planning through to the 1980s. Modern thinking is pedestrian-centric, emphasizing walkability and alternate transportation, public spaces over parking spaces, slower speeds, and increased urban forest along boulevards. But the draft OP does not even mention preserving and maintaining trees along boulevards. In fact, the OP does not contain even a single reference to the boulevards which are so important to the town's character and quality.</p> <p>Boulevards are important for more than aesthetic reasons: they provide a safe barrier between pedestrians and traffic (especially important around schools); they encourage walking; they provide space for trees (thus reducing urban heat effects and providing shade during heat events); they provide space for snow storage in winter. Sixth Street is a prime example of poor, vehicle-centric design where a reduced boulevard on the north side causes problems in winter for snow storage (residents have complained that plows speeding by often throw snow from the road onto the sidewalk and their lawns and even porches).</p> <p>The OP's section on forest resources (p.20) also fails to address issues about trees along boulevards and in residential areas. There is no policy about maintaining or expanding the treescape within residential areas. A comprehensive tree strategy should be part of the OP, at the very least in an appendix. The Planners' Guide to Trees in the Urban Landscape (https://www.archdaily.com/800562/the-planners-guide-to-trees-in-the-urban-landscape) recommends among its 12 principles that municipalities "Adopt clear standards for the protection, care, and planting of trees in local plans" and embed them in official plans.</p> <p>Making parking areas around new or rebuilt commercial and retail spaces pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly should also be included in the OP. The current box store and grocery store mall parking lots in Collingwood are NOT properly designed to accommodate bicycle riders or pedestrians, and can present serious safety challenges to people because of their egregiously vehicle-centric design. Safety corridors with appropriate hard-surface buffers should be mandatory in such designs. Also, the placement of bicycle racks is far too often an afterthought (many are placed in awkward or inconvenient locations or obstructed by sidewalk displays) and placement should be more properly defined in the OP.</p>	<p>One of the purposes of the DRAFT Official Plan is to highlight topics that require further actions for consideration by the Town. If the Town wants to establish more detailed "action plans" on key topics like traffic calming, road and boulevard design, tree planting and design requirements then they will need to carry out more detailed study to establish the appropriate requirements, which would then be implemented within the Zoning By-law, as part of a Site Plan manual, engineering standards and/or urban design guidelines.</p> <p>The Town of Collingwood presented a Traffic Calming policy received by council in July 2021. The purpose of this policy is to provide a systematic procedure for the initiation, investigation and implementation of traffic calming measures on roads within the Town of Collingwood. This policy and associated procedures also ensure that there is a formal process defined by which all candidate traffic calming sites and/or traffic calming requests can be evaluated against the same screening and criteria – thus ensuring a consistent approach throughout the Town. Alternative traffic calming infrastructure features are detailed in this policy.</p> <p>The new TMP is to provide strategies for addressing localized problem areas within the context of the larger transportation network, as well as crafting policies both for effective management of the network as a whole.</p> <p>The primary changes found within the DRAFT Official Plan from the EXISTING Official Plan include enhanced policy frameworks related to Active Transportation and Complete Streets (Section 3.4 and Section 6.1.3) and Public Transit (Section 6.1.4). These new elements of the DRAFT Official Plan, while high level, are considered crucial components for consideration and implementation going forward into the next 20 or 30 years.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan provides overarching policies that are intended to complement the more detailed requirements and guidelines identified in the Town plans such as the Transportation Update, Active Transportation Plan, Cycling Plan, Waterfront Master Plan, etc. If a Council-approved final TMP identifies changes in the transportation policies contained within the Official Plan, these can be incorporated through an Official Plan addendum.</p> <p>Acknowledged. The Town has an existing Tree Preservation and Protection By-law No. 2012-084. Tree preservation is being addressed through a multi-pronged project outside of the Official Plan Review including a review of the tree cutting by-law, forestry practices and resources, engineering/urban design standards, and site alteration.</p> <p>Acknowledged. Sections 5.3.1.4 i) to iv. and 5.3.2.4 d) provides design policies for vehicular parking facilities aimed "to minimize the number of potential pedestrian-vehicle movement conflicts" and locations for bicycle parking. The detailed design of surface parking lots are considered at the site plan level.</p>
3	Bruce Clark	<p>...Too much of the document implies a "business as usual" attitude to development, to active transportation development for all ages and abilities, and to catering to moving cars as the most important priority above all others. The OP is our chance to build better and smarter in Collingwood. If the attitude that car centered transportation is what will make Collingwood better, I fear we are headed in a very backwards direction.</p> <p>...Although Collingwood has a wonderful network of cycling trails, it is NOT a bike-friendly town. The fact that even the watered down Maple Street plan was abandoned, is not a good sign. It is ridiculous that it is not safe to ride a bicycle downtown. It is hardly surprising that more people are not commuting by bike - it isn't safe to do so. This needs to change and the OP needs to incorporate the necessary language to get us there.</p>	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan promotes intensification within existing Collingwood and supports higher density development in identified centres and corridors; and promotes a multi-modal transportation system through a defined urban structure supporting the use of transit, as well as policies for Active Transportation and Complete Streets.</p> <p>The primary changes found within the DRAFT Official Plan from the EXISTING Official Plan include enhanced policy frameworks related to Active Transportation and Complete Streets (Section 3.4 and Section 6.1.3) and Public Transit (Section 6.1.4). These new elements of the DRAFT Official Plan, while high level, are considered crucial components for consideration and implementation going forward into the next 20 or 30 years.</p> <p>See above, Re: TMP #2</p>
4	Bridget Doyle	<p>The Plan could significantly improve on transportation options. While the Plan recognizes the need to reduce the frequency and length of vehicle trips, the Town is encouraged to incorporate other strategies to reduce car use (and therefore carbon emissions) such as Car Share Programs, publicly accessible charging network, reduction of street parking, strategic placement of one-way streets, signal lights that prioritize people over cars, reduction in speed limits, etc.</p>	<p>See above, Re: TMP #1 and #2</p>

5	Mary Farncomb	<p>Please note a few of my concerns below.</p> <p>1. Transportation The current schedules that have been provided are very poorly thought out. The obvious choice for a 'natural EAST - WEST collector crosstown' should naturally flow with the current geographic street plan, 26 straight onto HUME, NOT 26 to Pretty River Parkway to Left on Ontario. This draws into question the validity of Schedule #6 which should be Re evaluated and not considered part of the OP.</p> <p>2. Transportation The lack of speed limitations or inhibitors on residential streets is non-existent. The use of speed bumps etc. stops signs discourage traffic trying to bypass main arteries and destroying residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>3. Transportation The use of 'roundabouts' should be a priority in many of the main intersections.</p>	<p>A new TMP has not been developed for the Town. The DRAFT Official Plan relies upon the EXISTING Official Plan, as well as transportation studies carried out in 2012 and 2019 which focused on improvements required to the road network in order to accommodate increased growth in traffic.</p> <p>See above, Re: TMP #1 and #2</p>
6	Paul Frayne paulfrayne@gmail.com	<p>I would like to ask how the draft plan is going to address the issue of through traffic and traffic speed in residential areas.</p> <p>I live in a residential area a 10 min walk to downtown in the neighbourhood known as the tree streets. I walk and bike in Collingwood as my primary mode of transport. I have a 5 year old son and he also walks and bikes around Collingwood with me. I'm concerned that what is stated in the draft plan -like - walkability, cycle friendly, sustainable transport, healthy living, access to downtown, and the waterfront - are not being met with concrete action and specific plans. The car, planning for car transport, seems to be the focus of action on the ground - rather than the vision outlined in the draft plan.</p> <p>I would like to know how the draft plan will address excessive through traffic and traffic speed in residential areas.</p> <p>In section 5 of the draft plan in the Design Policies for future development - section E) states - to provide a well connected internal road network designed to calm traffic. What about existing neighbourhoods? Traffic calming should be a town initiative written into the draft plan.</p> <p>In section 6 - in reference to local roads - it states it should be designed to discourage the movement of through traffic. The draft plan should plan for action on how to limit/discourage through traffic.</p> <p>There are other points from the draft plan with respect to promoting healthy transport, cycling, walkability, and climate action. - all of these positive visions are in direct contrast to the residential neighbourhoods being used as cut through traffic routes at speeds that take away from the character, safety, and vitality of the town.</p> <p>I believe the draft plan should include steps to address the issue of through traffic and traffic speed - this will help the town develop into the healthy, sustainable, multimode transport, climate friendly, economic prosperous town that we all want.</p>	<p>See above, Re: TMP #1 and #2</p> <p>The Town has retained a consultant to conduct a Town Wide Speed Limit Reduction Study. Included in the study is research on what has been done in other municipalities, public engagement through online surveys, identify options to implement lower speed limits and how enforcement is to be carried out.</p> <p>All of the subsequent comments will be items for consideration through the TMP.</p>

7	Paul A. Gurr Gurr & Associates Inc.	<p>As a relatively new resident (full time) of Collingwood (5 years), I have witnessed our unprecedented population growth as well as the countless broad based structural issues (i.e. fresh water availability) that have inevitably followed. Exciting and challenging times to say the least.</p> <p>In order to ensure a future town environment in which we, our children, and all future residents will flourish; our long term plan must, as an example, reflect such elements as a strong active transportation plan (walking/riding/public transportation), environmental processes based on sound sustainability practices, affordable housing, access to 1st class healthcare, the waterfront and accessible recreation. Our plan must reflect the best practices of similar communities across the country and around the world.</p> <p>To this end, I ask that you temporarily suspend the Official Plan Draft and work to ensure that all critical plan considerations and elements expressed through past and future public consultation are seriously vetted and integrated as appropriate. We have great potential for such a wonderful future, we must take the time to ensure our long term planning documents are aligned to our vision, are achievable and inspiring!</p> <p>Lastly, I wanted to express my serious concern about the implications associated with the Schedule 6 Transportation Plan (street designations and dotted lines). The plan to divert traffic through the heart of residential Collingwood is both short sighted and dangerous in my opinion. I would ask that this plan be removed immediately with more study and thought applied against alternative options that are consistent with our long term vision of traffic and active mobility within our town.</p>	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan supports a defined urban structure that supports the use of transit, as well as policies for Active Transportation and Complete Streets. Section 3.2 provides policies for providing housing opportunities, including affordable housing. Section 3.3 c) supports tourism, and a healthy liveable community, which includes a "beautiful and accessible waterfront".</p> <p>See above, Re: TMP #1 and #2</p> <p>This is the first draft of the Official Plan circulated for comment. There will be other opportunities for consultation and review of future drafts of the Official Plan.</p> <p>A new TMP has not been developed for the Town. The DRAFT Official Plan relies upon the EXISTING Official Plan, as well as transportation studies carried out in 2012 and 2019 which focused on improvements required to the road network in order to accommodate increased growth in traffic. The Town may adjust the location and/or alignment of existing and future roads as identified on Schedule 6 to accommodate the actual on-ground route, and to respond to new opportunities and/or constraints that arise from time-to-time, without the need for an Official Plan Amendment, subject to a Secondary Plan and/or any required technical studies (such as a Transportation Master Plan), to the satisfaction of the Town.</p>
8	Karen Ide	<p>I'm liking the food trucks at the pier.</p> <p>But all beaches need more parking. I can never find a spot on the weekend. And I love I there. Please take away the rocks and add more parking!!!!!!</p> <p>We need waterfront restaurants and patios on our beautiful shoreline!</p>	<p>The requirement for a waterfront restaurant was recently addressed though the approval/adoption of planning applications for the Collingwood Quay at the Shipyards. Comments about additional parking are acknowledged and should also be submitted through public consultation regarding the upcoming Parks Master Plan project. Additional parking should be balanced against the promotion of active transportation and transit, many other commentors would like to see the Town develop in a way that makes it more challenging to travel by personal vehicle.</p>
9	Mike Magnacca	<p>I have reviewed the official plan and have concerns for traffic calming measures. With the population expected to double by 2024, I am particularly worried that the roads through residential areas will create less safe neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Please strongly consider planning routes that do not run through residential areas, like Third Street and Minnesota.</p>	<p>See above, Re: TMP #1 and #2</p> <p>The Town may adjust the location and/or alignment of existing and future roads as identified on Schedule 6 to accommodate the actual on-ground route, and to respond to new opportunities and/or constraints that arise from time-to-time, without the need for an Official Plan Amendment, subject to a Secondary Plan and/or any required technical studies (such as a Transportation Master Plan), to the satisfaction of the Town.</p>
10	Donna Menage	<p>Mountain road quite dangerous for Bikes.</p>	<p>Schedule 5 "Active Transportation Plan" to the DRAFT Official Plan anticipates Future Trail/Trail Improvements to Mountain Road.</p>
11	Margaret Mooy	<p>There should be much more focus on safe streets. Speeds should be reduced. Street calming methods should be enforced. One way streets for the tree streets could be beneficial for reducing traffic.</p>	<p>See above, Re: TMP #1 and #2</p>
12	Ruth Plant	<p>The Official Plan also needs to ensure there are alternatives to individual car ownership by increasing the walkability of the town, providing shared car service parking areas, electrifying public transportation and providing better cycling routes for commuters on Town streets. Many towns/cities have eliminated private vehicles from their interior cores and provide free or inexpensive shuttle services (e.g., Denver, USA; Curitiba, Brazil). This increases the number of people shopping/strolling the main street making for a more appealing setting. Many European communities could also be looked to for alternatives to downtown traffic. Alternatives such as this should be part of the Official Plan. Attempts need to be made to protect neighbourhoods and reroute traffic around the Town centre.</p> <p>In the plan, there are many tentative words like "may" which provide a way out for taking the action which is needed to create an innovative plan for the future. If we don't envision a better town, we will not be contributing to creating a better world. The Town needs to take a firm stand and take climate action seriously in everything it does. The Official Plan should reflect that.</p>	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan supports a defined urban structure that supports the use of transit, as well as policies for Active Transportation and Complete Streets. The TMP will be a comprehensive review of vehicle and active transportation movements throughout the Town. This will include a review of potential future movement corridors.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan is not, and should not be the Town's Climate Change Action Plan. In fact, the Town is committed to the preparation of a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan in the coming months. The DRAFT Official Plan does reflect an appropriate land use planning approach to the issue of Climate Change.</p>

13	Elizabeth Sweet	Please remove the dotted line sections that deal with future roads through the heart of Town until there is proper consultation, planning and creative means to divert traffic. Have you driven through the town of Maple or Kleinburg in Vaughan? The constant increase in heavy traffic through these towns has completely transformed what were once charming historical communities and turned them into unimaginative busy disorderly cities.	See above, Re: TMP #1 and #2
14	Kevin Tone & Val Mitchell	<p>We are writing to provide input to the Town of Collingwood's Official Plan Draft 1. We are grandparents to seven grandsons and are concerned with the (highly probable) effects of climate change during their lifetimes.</p> <p>We are 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. (Growing Up...Not Out) - Lots of mentions about the commitment to increased transit and Active Transportation to increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists and reduce automobile gridlock <p>We would like to pass on our observations for specific areas of improvement...</p> <p>In our opinion, Schedule 5, which shows the planned future bike friendly routes, is missing the following components.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Safe School" zones at all current and future schools. - More bike friendly routes on existing streets from all directions to the Town recreation areas (Central Park, Sunset Point and the Pool and Ball Diamond on Spruce from 2nd to 3rd) - More bike friendly routes to the Downtown core. It's great that Pine St. from 3rd to 1st is already shown as a bike friendly route...could Ste. Marie St. from Hume to 1st be added so that cyclists could have safe access to the Hurontario shops and restaurants, through those street's parking lots, whether they are coming from the East or West side of town. 	<p>Please see the Climate Change comments and responses.</p> <p>The opportunity for additional routes can be accommodated through Policy f) under Section 6.1.3 that states "The Town may adjust the location and/or alignment of existing and future Active Transportation facilities as identified on Schedule 5, to accommodate the actual on-ground route, and to respond to new opportunities and/or constraints that arise from time-to-time,..."</p> <p>The Town has a Cycling Plan, dated 2019, that provides a long-term vision, strategy and implementation plan to develop, strengthen and support a cycling culture in Collingwood. The Plan identifies policies, programs and facilities needed to make cycling an everyday mobility option for residents. The Cycling Plan includes a map identifying a future cycling network. This was used in the preparation of Schedule 5.</p> <p>Town standards refer to Ontario based guidelines for cycling infrastructure. For example, the Ontario Traffic Council Book 18 Cycling facilities guideline has recently adopted off road cycling lanes over separated on road facilities. This is one example of why the official plan should set general guiding principles, with the implementation documents subject to change.</p> <p>Additional policy will be considered for safe school zones, which will standardize the identification and implementation of 'safe school' zones at all existing schools.</p>
15	Jeff Young	<p>I would like bike lanes to be a priority on any new road build or updated. Bikes are not allowed on sidewalks within the town and i've never seen the town put in a new bike lane since i moved here (8 years ago)</p> <p>Focus on reducing speeding. Permanent speed bumps or traffic calming should be put in near all schools and school routes</p>	<p>Section 3.4 iv "Supporting a Healthy Community" of the DRAFT Official Plan provides policy on enhancing the active transportation network. Schedule 5 "Active Transportation Plan" anticipates Future Trail/Trail Improvements throughout the Town. As a note, the Town's Trails and Active Transportation Committee is now recommending separated multi-use pathways in favour of bike lanes. This is one example of why the official plan should set general guiding principles, with the implementation documents subject to change.</p> <p>The new TMP is to provide strategies for addressing localized problem areas within the context of the larger transportation network, as well as crafting policies both for effective management of the network as a whole and for evaluating ongoing requests for traffic calming and controls.</p> <p>As a note, the Town's Trails and Active Transportation Committee is now recommending separated multi-use pathways in favour of bike lanes. This is one example of why the official plan should set general guiding principles, with the implementation documents subject to change.</p>
16	Thomas and Suzanne Donohoe	<p>We believe our area is already overcrowded and adding more people by way of 12 Storey Builds, would be a mistake. Firstly, if you look at where Collingwood is situated, there is one road in and one road out. The traffic has become impossible, no matter where one drives. On First Street, the third lane is a real danger. People drive too fast, while anxious to turn right or left to get to their destination, and forget there is a two way access via this third lane. Pedestrians try to cross the street without the help of a traffic light, and it is a real nightmare. Parking lots are full and frankly, it is sometimes scary to get on the roads.</p> <p>Our streets need to be fixed. There are so many potholes everywhere, it is frustrating to take a new car on such streets.</p>	<p>Section 5.1.8.3 provides policies for ensuring compatibility of new high-rise buildings permitted through a site specific Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The Town may adjust the location and/or alignment of existing and future roads as identified on Schedule 6 to accommodate the actual on-ground route, and to respond to new opportunities and/or constraints that arise from time-to-time, without the need for an Official Plan Amendment, subject to a Secondary Plan and/or any required technical studies (such as a Transportation Master Plan), to the satisfaction of the Town.</p> <p>The Town has retained a consultant to conduct a Town Wide Speed Limit Reduction Study. Included in the study is research on what has been done in other municipalities, public engagement through online surveys, identify options to implement lower speed limits and how enforcement is to be carried out.</p> <p>Capital construction projects for roads are outside the scope of the Official Plan.</p>

<p>17</p>	<p>Murray Knowles Chair - Trails & Active Transportation Advisory Committee</p>	<p>There is much attention given to car parking in the plan by encouraging good lighting, good access, landscaping, signage, etc. whereas bicycle parking "shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of the zoning bylaw." If we are to truly embrace active transportation, then some of the criteria for car parking should also be applied to bicycle parking. Bicycle parking should be a requirement for all municipal buildings and facilities as well as for many commercial establishments.</p> <p>Schedule 5 – I would suggest that the legend for this map be altered to be more consistent with the categories in OTM Book 18 plus the future expectations for active transportation within the town as laid out in the Cycling Plan. Book 18 designates 3 major categories – Physically Separated Bikeways, Bicycle Lanes, and Shared Cycling Facilities with subcategories for each. In Collingwood's case, we are predominantly looking at the subcategories labelled Multi-use Pathways, Bicycle Lanes, Neighbourhood Bikeways, and Paved Shoulders. I would recommend a different colour for each subcategory with a solid line for existing facilities and a dashed line for future while eliminating the current yellow lines. The Official Plan could be improved with a more definitive plan for Trails and Active Transportation by describing the specific future connections that are already in the works. The yellow lines on Schedule 5 are quite vague and unclear. The Trails and Active transportation Advisory Committee can provide much more comprehensive information for this schedule.</p> <p>The statement that "Local roads "should" be designed to discourage through traffic" should be more forceful.</p> <p>Section 3.1 states: "A Successful Community recognizes existing historic land use patterns and development trends and builds upon these patterns and trends to promote efficient, cost-effective development and land use changes that will stimulate economic growth while protecting the natural environment and public health". If we look too heavily to the past to define our future, the priority of cars (as an example) will continue to rise to the surface.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Promotion of parking facilities for bicycles will be included in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Schedule 5 will reflect the existing trails network, as well as those routes identified in the Town Cycling Plan, 2019.</p> <p>Local roads are part of a broader network and the connectivity within that network needs to be recognized. Connectivity is a positive aspect of healthy communities, providing such benefits as traffic dispersion, multiple routes for emergency vehicles, and reduced emissions, etc.</p> <p>Accommodation of automobiles will continue to be part of the development framework for some time. Section 3.1 is appropriate as written. The goal of the DRAFT Official Plan is to augment and promote mobility options to reduce the reliance on the automobile over the long term.</p>
<p>18</p>	<p>Kari Payne</p>	<p>Active Transportation Plan (Schedule 5) - Future Trail Improvements</p> <p>The future trail improvement plan in Yellow shows the trail by black Ash Creek continuing north along the property line between the Krug/kaufman lands and mariners haven. This is a very bad idea. I wrote to Council in October 2016 about this same proposed pathway and said:</p> <p>What is the purpose? It does not offer any water views, and exits onto a busy road (Harbour Street East), adjacent to Mariners Haven's gate-arm exit.</p> <p>Calvin Brook, Brook McIlroy, stated at the October 3, 2016 Public Engagement Session:</p> <p>"The city owns a piece of land between the Kaufman site and Mariners Haven."</p> <p>This statement is very misleading to the public. The Town does not own any land at the back of the factory lands. The current trail location, at the front of the Kaufman/Krug factory lands, was negotiated by Kaufman and the Town between 1996 - 2000. Kaufman/Krug gave the Town \$35,000 and some land to build an undulating trail through a park-like setting that was well removed from Hwy 26. The 'Trail' Agreement was between The Town of Collingwood and Krug Inc., dated November 7, 2000 and signed by the Mayor (Terry Geddes) and the CAO (Carman K. Morrison). Section 4 outlines that the trail will continue to traverse the frontage of the factory lands; and Krug is released from its obligations in the 1986 site development agreement (i.e. 1986 obligations refer to the possibility of a Town trail at the back of the factory lands)</p> <p>Most importantly, this proposed future trail location creates a safety issue and involves an additional and unnecessary expense. The safety issue - exiting onto Harbour Street at a location where there is an abundance of vehicular traffic from Living Waters & their restaurant, the 350+ car parking lot behind Living Waters, the marina boaters, the public boat launch and exiting traffic from Mariners Haven is not only ludicrous, but dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>In contrast, the existing trail brings trail users safely to an area where there is a stop sign or alternatively a traffic light.</p> <p>A new pedestrian/bicycle bridge across Black Ash Creek is needed. Constructing a new pedestrian bridge close to the existing vehicular bridge compliments the use of the existing trail system. This eliminates the additional & unnecessary expense of constructing a new trail through dense trees/foliage and the planting of new buffer trees.</p>	<p>The Waterfront Master Plan (2016) identifies a future trail connection in this area.</p> <p>A new TMP has not been developed for the Town. The DRAFT Official Plan relies upon the EXISTING Official Plan, as well as transportation studies carried out in 2012 and 2019 which focused on improvements required to the road network in order to accommodate increased growth in traffic.</p> <p>The Town will rely upon the new TMP to consider these detailed comments, and confirm future trail locations where appropriate, may result on a future amendment to the Official Plan.</p> <p>The opportunity for additional routes can be accommodated through Policy f) under Section 6.1.3 that states "The Town may adjust the location and/or alignment of existing and future Active Transportation facilities as identified on Schedule 5, to accommodate the actual on-ground route, and to respond to new opportunities and/or constraints that arise from time-to-time,..."</p> <p>See above, Re: TMP #4</p>

19	Owen Gray	<p>I was hoping to request some changes for the Town of Cwood official plan.</p> <p>I love the spirit of enhancing active transportation in our community, and I think many more people would start to use active transportation instead of their vehicles if they felt safer on the streets of our town.</p> <p>I would love to see the plan include best practices for designing our streets in the best interest of our most vulnerable citizens, particularly children, youth, seniors and people with disabilities.</p> <p>I would love to see the policies be modified to reflect the stated desire to prioritize active transportation, including more mentions of restricting driving on specific corridors. I believe there have already been some studies done on certain corridors in our town which ought to be "bicycle priority" streets.</p> <p>Lastly, I would love to eliminate requirements for new schools to provide drop off and pick up areas for private automobiles. School boards could still request these types of facilities, but mandating them when communities around North America are moving towards restricting vehicular access near schools does not align with global best practices now, much less in 20 years.</p> <p>Let's plan now to make Collingwood a truly great place to be safe on our streets for everyone. Taking concrete steps to reduce the privilege of cars and to prioritize bicycles, scooters, and pedestrians not only makes our town safer and better, but also helps address air quality and climate change which is an urgent issue and we have an emergency declaration about.</p>	<p>See above, Re: TMP #2</p> <p>The Primary changes found within the DRAFT Official Plan from the Existing Official Plan include enhanced policy frameworks related to Active Transportation and Complete Streets (Section 3.4 and Section 6.1.3) and Public Transit (Section 6.1.4). These new elements of the Official Plan, while high level, are considered crucial components for consideration and implementation going forward into the next 20 or 30 years.</p> <p>Section 3.4 of the DRAFT Official Plan includes policies for improving active transportation, including improved access to schools. Policy regarding the design of school sites is not included in the Official Plan under 5.1.8.13 Elementary Schools. School Boards are responsible for the design and layout of schools sites. While the Official Plan can recommend access and parking facilities, appropriate locations are required for pick-up/drop-off facilities for buses for those that cannot walk to school.</p> <p>The details of design for complete streets and active transportation are crucial but not appropriate for an Official Plan policy. The Transportation Master Plan will more fully consider all of these comments. Design issues will be dealt with through the Urban Design Manual and associated engineering standards.</p>
20	Justin Jones, MA.	<p>Section 2.1.b. In that Vision, The Plan purports to create a policy framework where:</p> <p>"The residents of Collingwood aspire to live in healthy and complete communities that are inclusive, accessible, compact and well connected for all modes of travel - and prioritizes active transportation such as pedestrians and cyclists" (emphasis mine). First, I applaud this statement. I feel it should be modified to include people who use mobility devices as well to be more inclusive, ...</p> <p>I would also encourage the Project Team to provide a degree of accountability to the feedback that has been provided through this Planning process...session hosted in January 2021 with Young Families. I feel that it would be valuable to show what was heard at that meeting, and provide an explanation of where that feedback is reflected in the Plan or, if it is not, an explanation of why it was not included. With that, I will get into my more detailed feedback.</p> <p>Value 11 (Page 6) - "...Pedestrian-first community design and enhanced and connected trail networks and bike lanes will provide mobility options and enhanced connectivity across the Town for people of all ages and abilities, making active transportation an attractive and practical travel option."</p> <p>First, remove the term "Bike Lanes" and replace with "All Ages and Abilities Cycling Infrastructure" everywhere in the document. Bike Lanes are, in large part, no longer being used since that term does not include curb separated cycle tracks nor does it include Neighbourhood Greenways - both of which are AAA facilities that are not "bike lanes" per se. Do not limit the type of cycling infrastructure in this long range plan to a term that is, even now, losing value in the transportation planning field.</p> <p>Secondly, and much more importantly, while the term "All Ages and Abilities" appears here in this Value Statement, it appears in no other place in the OP Beyond a brief mention when discussing the Downtown. To meet the OP's stated objectives of being one that "prioritizes active transportation" (Page 4, emphasis mine), it must be explicitly acknowledged that the types of walking and cycling facilities that should be prioritized by right in this document are those that meet All Ages and Abilities (AAA) design guidelines.</p> <p>The design guidance in 6.1.3.e. Could be amended to include recommendations for AAA facilities as well to encourage best practices in design. Number of references provided to American guidebooks, guidelines for bikeways, multimodal streets, etc.</p>	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan is specifically written to apply to everyone. Section 2.1 b) will be adjusted to be more inclusive.</p> <p>This matrix is intended to provide that accountability.</p> <p>Agree partly. "Bike lanes" to be replaced with "cycling facilities". The phrase "all ages and abilities will be removed. (Bike lanes to be removed throughout the document).</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan very deliberately does not identify specific people or groups of people in the articulation of planning policy - that approach implies that all policies apply to all people - including people of all ages and abilities equally. This sentiment will be articulated upfront in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan to ensure that the fundamental principle of inclusion is understood.</p> <p>See above, Re: TMP #1, #2, and #3</p>

	<p>In Value 9 (pg 6) the OP sets a goal of “The Town will be a healthy community that is accessible, connected, age-friendly and inclusive with a diversity of transportation options and a range and mix of housing, including attainable and affordable choices.” (pg 6, emphasis mine). This is literally the only mention of the term “Age Friendly” in the entire OP. While the 8 Dimensions of Age-Friendliness are embedded throughout the document, there should be at least a section mentioning the importance of tying those elements together to create an Age Friendly Community.</p> <p>Where are the considerations for Children in this plan? There was specific outreach to young families in the form of a Workshop in January 2021 - yet there is not a single mention of designing a community that serves the needs of Children and their caregivers in this document. They are completely absent from consideration.... What about being deliberate about designing public spaces with our most vulnerable populations in mind? What about creating child-friendly design around schools, near parks and in new developments? How about planning for youth so that there are places to gather and opportunities to exist in public without feeling criminalized? The Children of this community are the ones who are going to be seeing the implications of the policy language in this document for a long time to come. The consultant team made specific efforts to reach out to young families, so where is that feedback reflected in this document?</p> <p>Parking, Traffic Congestion and New Developments The current draft of the OP includes requirements for new developments (Section 5.1.8) not to “cause any traffic hazards or an unacceptable level of congestion on surrounding roads” - this includes land uses such as Day Cares and Small Scale Places of Worship, the exact type of land use that you would want to see in a dense, walkable urban environment. This provision is likely to be used to prevent (or, at the very least make it more challenging to seek approval for) these types of land uses in the Town’s most dense neighbourhoods, which are exactly the places you want to encourage this type of mixed-use development to reduce car dependency.</p> <p>Section 5.1.8.13.a.iv requires “Adequate parking and pick-up/drop-off facilities for automobiles and buses shall be provided on site” for Elementary School land uses. Once again, if the goal is to prioritize active transportation, then we must make decisions that meaningfully prioritize that mobility choice...5.1.8.13.a.v should be amended to read “Direct access shall be provided to elementary schools through a comprehensive All Ages and Abilities active transportation network” to emphasize the importance of creating high quality active transportation facilities to connect the most vulnerable residents to schools.”</p> <p>Section 6 Review First, I think that it is important to state the goal of prioritizing active transportation in Goal 6.1.1.a.i. The current language of “To maintain a multi-modal and integrated transportation system that permits the safe and efficient movement of people and goods within the Town” is, in essence, a description of what we have been doing with regards to transportation planning for the past 60 years. When you present investments based on the current model of mobility, we end up with the same type of infrastructure that we already have. There is a need to emphasize how prioritizing active transportation means that some corridors will necessarily deprioritize the movement of cars and trucks. Not all streets need this, but to keep the language of multi-modal and integrated transportation system in this goal does not speak to the overall value as expressed earlier in the OP to prioritize active mobility.</p> <p>Secondly, it is important to separate the goals contained in 6.1.1.a.iii to provide additional details about how transit can be supported versus how active transportation can be supported by this plan. My suggestion is: <i>iii. To enhance the Town’s transit system by ensuring that transit routes are connected to community facilities, major development areas and public uses and that service is frequent and reliable enough to serve the needs of Collingwood’s diverse population.</i> <i>iv. To create a connected network of active transportation facilities that serve people of all ages and abilities, creating connections to community destinations, schools, commercial areas and transit stops to foster a seamless, multi-modal community where daily travel does not require the use of a private automobile.</i></p> <p>In Section 6.1.2 General Policies, the OP references the Town’s Transportation Master Plan. Is this meant to refer to the 2019 Master Transportation Study? I just want to make sure we’re using consistent policy language.</p>	<p>Remove "age friendly". It is implied throughout the DRAFT Official Plan, and the real issue is "inclusiveness" which deals with societal differences beyond age.</p> <p>Children are considered people and this DRAFT Official Plan is deliberate in not identifying people specific to any age, class, sexual orientation, ethnicity, or religious affiliation.</p> <p>Design elements can be more focused on individual communities and that should be dealt with through design guidelines or engineering standards, and not land use planning policy. A families and youth workshop was held in 2021 and their input was considered and reflected in this document.</p> <p>All development is typically required to deal with impacts of traffic congestion. It is also true that where there is traffic congestion, more people will seek alternative modes, including active transportation and transit.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan does not discriminate against any person, or category of person. Active transportation facilities should be appropriate for everyone.</p> <p>Section 3.4 of the DRAFT Official Plan includes policies for improving active transportation, including improved access to schools. Policy regarding the design of school sites is not included in the Official Plan under 5.1.8.13 Elementary Schools. School Boards are responsible for the design and layout of schools sites. While the Official Plan can recommend access and parking facilities, appropriate locations are required for pick-up/drop-off facilities for buses for those that cannot walk to school.</p> <p>See above, Re: TMP #2 and #4</p> <p>Agree. Notwithstanding that much of Section 6 is from the EXISTING Official Plan, there is room to recognize that active transportation is fully part of the transportation system in Collingwood. Goals to be adjusted.</p> <p>Agree. Change to be made.</p> <p>Yes. However, a new TMP is to be carried out, as noted.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>In terms of Section 6.1.3, I think that there should be additional consideration to including stronger language around building not only Complete Streets, but All Ages and Abilities infrastructure for people walking, cycling and wheeling. Adding that language into section 6.1.3.d would encourage designers to look beyond the bare minimum when designing facilities and look to emerging best practices.</p> <p>With regard to Schedule 5, the Proposed Active Transportation Map, there are a few things I feel should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Peel Street North of Hume connects directly to Connaught School and the E3 center which often hosts young families. This should also be included as a cycling route to connect up to Ontario Street at the very least. ● Katherine Street is an important North-South connection from the Lockhart community up to Central Park, which also connects to Our Lady On The Bay Catholic High School. This should be added as a route. ● Spruce Street, which connects to Mountain View Elementary School and provides a signalized crossing at 1st Street / Highway 26 should also be included. Signalized crossings across Highway 26 are rare, and those corridors are important connections from the residential areas of Town to the Waterfront and Trails. ● Ste. Marie Street from Hume to Huron Street has substantial pavement widths, multiple popular destinations and relatively low parking utilization most of the day. There is little reason why this cannot be the alternate route north-south in the Downtown area, so it should be added as well. <p>In Section 6.1.3.e there are a few things that should be considered. First, please include language about All Ages and Abilities design in this section. It can be integrated into sections 6.1.3.e. i and ii easily. When talking about crossings in 6.1.3.e.iii, include reference to high-comfort intersection treatments such as protected intersections, and please reference the importance of designing for user experience at crossings.</p> <p>In 6.1.3.e.v, Include language about managing vehicle speeds and volumes. Speed is only one half of the equation when it comes to creating All Ages and Abilities infrastructure - reducing vehicular volumes on corridors is also important and should be referenced here.</p> <p>Parking, Transportation Demand Management and Roads</p> <p>5.3.1.3.I, where parking in the Downtown core is discussed, the Plan mentions that “On-street parking is important to the economic vitality of the Downtown and will be maintained to the extent practical.” Can the Project Team and the Town please provide solid data that shows that on-street parking is important to the economic vitality of a Downtown? ...Are there any studies that can be cited by the Consulting Team or the Town that shows that, in fact, on-street parking provides more value to the Downtown than the patios, than a wider sidewalk, than a protected bike lane or than an entirely pedestrianized Downtown (like Bear Street in Banff, for example) might bring? Otherwise please remove this statement and re-evaluate the policy directives that flow from it, and let our Downtown use more space for people rather than the storage of private property on our most valuable public lands.</p> <p>In Section 6.1.6.a, modify the language to The Town will implement a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management program.</p> <p>6.1.8.2 Road Classifications in section e - there is no need for a 6 lane cross section to be considered anywhere in Collingwood. A 6 lane road has the carrying capacity of well north of 50,000 vehicles per day - but that increase is marginal when compared to a 5-lane cross section with a centre turning lane. Remove any mention of 6 lane roads - we don't need a new highway running through our Town.</p> <p>6.1.8.2.g - restricting access to arterials is so important. These are corridors for movement of large numbers of people after all. There should be considerations for corridors like Huron Street / 1st Street that has frequent, tightly spaced driveways and accesses, so perhaps amend 6.1.8.2.i to identify that existing accesses should be considered for closure even without redevelopment?</p> <p>6.1.8.2.n Local Roads - I like this, but I worry how it connects to the objectives in Section 5.2.2.4.e.i where Future Neighbourhood roads are to be designed to “Maximize number of connections to surrounding Collector and Arterial Road network”. What is missing here in my mind is a recognition that not every road needs to be a through road for cars - designing streets that dead-end for drivers is a growing practice to create less cut-through traffic and safer streets for walking and cycling. This should be worked into the Plan somehow.</p>	<p>The opportunity for additional routes can be accommodated through Policy f) under Section 6.1.3 that states "The Town may adjust the location and/or alignment of existing and future Active Transportation facilities as identified on Schedule 5, to accommodate the actual on-ground route, and to respond to new opportunities and/or constraints that arise from time-to-time...."</p> <p>The Town has an Active Transportation Framework (2017) and a Cycling Plan, dated 2019, that provides a long-term vision, strategy and implementation plan to develop, strengthen and support a cycling culture in Collingwood. These documents identify policies, programs and facilities needed to make cycling an everyday mobility option for residents. The AT Framework and Cycling Plan include maps identifying a future cycling network. This was used in the preparation of Schedule 5. The TMP may consider further additions to cycling facilities, and these suggestions would be considered.</p> <p>Concept is covered in Section 6.1.3 e). More detail is appropriate for consideration in the Urban Design Manual.</p> <p>Acknowledged. Delete reference to the management of vehicle speeds. - Disagree with this change, managing vehicle speed is appropriate and responds to the many comments about traffic calming. Would instead add "and volumes, in consideration of the road or trail classification and function"</p> <p>Parking Strategy and Downtown Master Plan are both on the work plan for the Town for 2024-2025</p> <p>"May" is specifically used here to provide the Town the flexibility to establish priority for various and numerous studies that are required over time.</p> <p>The Official Plan identifies the existing road classifications within Collingwood that are the responsibility of the Province, County or the Town. Arterial Roads allow for up to 6 lanes. The need for new Arterial Roads and the number of lanes will be determined through the anticipated TMP. The Town is committed to carrying-out an update to the TMP (budget 2023) that will include analysis on traffic management based on current volumes and anticipated growth. The objective of the TMP is to ensure major goods movement facilities and corridors are protected for the long term and to ensure a safe, efficient, and integrated system for the movement of people and goods throughout the Town. Within this integrated system it remains a priority to develop strategies to effectively accommodate high seasonal traffic volumes while minimizing the impact of peak period and surge traffic on residents and residential neighbourhoods.</p> <p>That idea is a good one, however, it should be explored through the TMP.</p> <p>By providing connections to Collector Roads the road network allows for multiple route choices and a permeable network for walking or cycling, as well as for vehicles, including emergency vehicles such as fire trucks and ambulances. Many traditional suburban developments limited the connections to surrounding collectors, resulting in enclosed neighbourhoods with few options for entrance or exit. It is not the intention that every local street connect to collectors but to ensure that the neighbourhood has adequate and efficient entrance and exit routes.</p> <p>There needs to be a balance, and the design of the local street network and connections to surrounding collectors must consider all users and their safety. Disconnected neighbourhood pods are the least efficient design and promote longer vehicle trips and higher emissions.</p>
--	---	--

21	Richard Lex	<p>6.1.5 PARKING c) The Town may consider reductions to parking requirements for: i. Properties within an area or areas where the Town is satisfied that adequate alternative parking facilities are available, or where sufficient transit exists, or is to be provided along with adequate Transportation Demand Management measures; and/or, ii. Specific housing types including affordable/assisted housing and/or special needs housing where the Town is satisfied that adequate parking facilities can be provided on-site, or in proximity to the site, or where sufficient transit exists to serve the residents and/or employees and visitors of the development.</p> <p>Another exception to parking requirements should be Heritage Buildings, particularly in the Downtown Heritage Conservation District. Parking exemptions or reductions are addressed in the current by-laws but should also be noted in the official plan.</p> <p>Bike Lanes Second Street / Simcoe Street Bike Friendly Road I would propose that Second Street, beginning at Pine and travelling east across Hurontario St. and along Simcoe Street to St. Paul Street and perhaps to the museum should be considered for a future bike-friendly road. This is not a particularly heavily trafficked road and would link the main street to the rail trail at the museum grounds. This would connect the public library at Simcoe and Ste. Marie, the Simcoe Street Creative District and over to the museum. As a business owner in that area I can attest that there is already a lot of bike traffic in that area that could benefit from a bike friendly road.</p> <p>3.3 (d) Support Entrepreneurial, Creative, and Cultural Industries Consider wording around the potential of a Arts District or Hub as envisioned in the PRC Master Plan (#64) “Cultural Precinct (Hub): Establish and promote a ‘cultural zone’ in the community, having a critical mass of cultural facilities in one area, as the cultural precinct or ‘hub’ of the community”</p>	<p>Agree. Text to be amended to include the Heritage Conservation District.</p> <p>Acknowledged. The opportunity for additional routes can be accommodated through Policy f) under Section 6.1.3 that states "The Town may adjust the location and/or alignment of existing and future Active Transportation facilities as identified on Schedule 5, to accommodate the actual on-ground route, and to respond to new opportunities and/or constraints that arise from time-to-time,..." The TMP and updates to the Cycling Plan can also adjust active transportation priorities.</p> <p>Agree. Text to be amended to recognize the potential for a Cultural Precinct.</p>
22	Alicia Tone Virtanen, PhD	<p>The Draft O.P. lays out a vision for Collingwood's population to grow to over 40,000 residents by the year 2041. That will mean many more cars on our roads and increasing risk for pedestrians, cyclists and especially for our young and school-aged children. Our family is particularly interested in the Future Active Transportation Plan (Schedule 5 within the O.P.). Currently and in the past, the Town's Trails and Active Transportation Advisory Committee (TATAC) have built great recreational trails that link most, if not all, of the neighborhoods within the growing community of Collingwood. They are wonderful for our recreational walking/biking family experiences.</p> <p>In the Town's future planning, We are also looking for safe "School Streets" at all current and proposed new Schools. We are also looking for more safe biking routes on existing streets for trips to destinations such as Town recreation facilities, shopping, health and other appointments, personal grooming etc. including to the Hurontario, Pine & Ste. Marie St. area (downtown core).</p>	<p>The opportunity for additional routes can be accommodated through Policy f) under Section 6.1.3 that states "The Town may adjust the location and/or alignment of existing and future Active Transportation facilities as identified on Schedule 5, to accommodate the actual on-ground route, and to respond to new opportunities and/or constraints that arise from time-to-time,..." The TMP and updates to the Cycling Plan can also adjust active transportation priorities.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan supports a defined urban structure that promotes the use and viability of transit, as well as policies for Active Transportation and Complete Streets. The TMP will be a comprehensive review of vehicle and active transportation movements throughout the Town. This will include a review of potential future movement corridors. Opportunities for inclusion of active school travel to be discussed with Public Works/Engineering Division and Parks to determine if there are any policies that should be contained in the Official Plan or if this matter will be addressed by the TMP.</p>

		<p>We feel that the proposed bike friendly routes shown in Schedule 5 are not forward thinking enough for the next 20 years and don't reflect the dedication to the Active Transportation text within the O.P. The following are additional safe bicycling routes that are NOT included in Schedule 5 of the O.P. for your consideration. We realize that we are not the technical experts on designing these safe routes, but hope that they can be included within the final agreed upon O.P.</p> <p>1) Extend the proposed bike friendly route on Peel Street, to north of Hume St. past Connaught School to Ontario St., which already has bike lanes. This would provide a safer route to many students of Connaught School and - with some signage - to the controlled crossing at Huron and Niagara Streets and on to Sunset Point Park.</p> <p>2) Plan for a bike friendly route from Lockhart Rd. north on Katherine Street past Our Lady of the Bay School to Lorne Ave. Beyond safe travel to the school, this will also provide for safe access to the baseball fields, arena, curling rink and YMCA in the Central Park Area.</p> <p>3) Plan for a bike friendly route on Spruce St. from Underwood Creek trail to 1st St. This would provide another safe access route to the Mountain View School, Centennial Aquatic Centre, baseball diamond, skatepark and to the Street Lights on 1st St. (and further on to the Georgian Trail and quick and safe access to the commercial area on Balsam St.). This may be an option for a quieter, less polluted alternative than the heavily travelled High to Balsam planned route.</p> <p>4) Plan for a bike friendly route on Ste. Marie Street from Hume St. to 1st St. Since Pine St. is already slated to be a bike friendly route from 3rd to 1st, these two parallel streets to Hurontario St. would provide safer cycling access to downtown parking lots. The recent July 14th TATAC meeting had a discussion on pedestrian-first and lower speed limit concepts in our downtown core and we encourage the Town to come up with a feasible plan that can be implemented.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>The Town has an Active Transportation Framework (2017) and a Cycling Plan, dated 2019, that provides a long-term vision, strategy and implementation plan to develop, strengthen and support a cycling culture in Collingwood. These documents identify policies, programs and facilities needed to make cycling an everyday mobility option for residents. The AT Framework and Cycling Plan include maps identifying a future cycling network. This was used in the preparation of Schedule 5. The TMP may consider further additions to cycling facilities, and these suggestions would be considered.</p> <p>See above, Re: TMP #4</p>
23	Justin Jones	<p>I know that the comment period is closed, but I did want to draw your attention to this newly released report featuring policy recommendations for supporting active school travel. I feel that many of these recommendations are very valuable to include in our OP update, but are currently either not included in the update or have policies recommended in the update that run entirely counter to this widely researched best practices review for how to support active travel among those who do not have the choice to drive.</p> <p>The policy recommendations document is based on over 500 stakeholder interviews, reviews of 185 peer-reviewed academic studies and an Ontario-wide policy scan - in short, it is the most comprehensive and current evaluation of what truly works in policy documents to prioritize and support active travel. It can be found here: coverpage_quality_low_res2 (ontarioactiveschooltravel.ca) and I strongly encourage the OP update team to read it carefully and to consider where these recommendations are, and are not, being reflected in our planning documents.</p>	<p>Opportunities for inclusion of active school travel to be discussed with Public Works/Engineering Division and Parks to determine if there are any policies that should be contained in the Official Plan or if this matter will be addressed by the TMP.</p> <p>The Primary changes found within the DRAFT Official Plan from the EXISTING Official Plan include enhanced policy frameworks related to Active Transportation and Complete Streets (Section 3.4 and Section 6.1.3) and Public Transit (Section 6.1.4). These new elements of the DRAFT Official Plan, while high level, are considered crucial components for consideration and implementation going forward into the next 20 or 30 years.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan provides overarching policies that are intended to complement the more detailed requirements and guidelines identified in the Town plans such as the Transportation Update, Active Transportation Plan, Cycling Plan, Waterfront Master Plan, etc. If a Council-approved final Transportation Master Plan identifies changes in the transportation policies contained within the Official Plan, these can be incorporated through an OP amendment.</p>
24	Paul Frayne	<p>The following comments all center around the issue of excessive through traffic on the residential streets in the neighbourhood between 2nd & 6th & Maple & Spruce. Otherwise known as the "Tree Streets" neighbourhood of Collingwood.</p> <p>There is too much through traffic on these streets (in particular Cedar street) and the speed of traffic creates an unsafe environment in this community. The points below highlight how the goals of the draft plan 1 are not meeting the reality of the situation in this neighbourhood. My goals is to initiate positive discussions and sustainable solutions for all stakeholders with respect to this issue.</p> <p>#1. Draft Plan 1 page 11 section 3.4 - Supporting a Healthy Community The Draft Plan states " A fundamental element of a healthy community is the inclusion of active transportation - walking, cycling, using a wheelchair, scooters, inline skating, or skateboarding" *The amount of traffic and the traffic speeds in this neighbourhood prevent the healthy active transportation choices of citizens living in this area. Only a small % of citizens will walk or ride a bike in a high traffic zone with excessive speeds. To meet the needs of all citizens the traffic amount and road speeds must make community members from age 5 (my son's age) to 75+ feel safe enough to walk, bike, ride etc. That is currently not the case on Cedar Street and other streets in this neighbourhood.</p>	<p>The TMP is to provide strategies for addressing localized problem areas within the context of the larger transportation network, as well as crafting policies both for effective management of the network as a whole and for evaluating ongoing requests for traffic calming and controls.</p> <p>The Town has retained a consultant to conduct a Town Wide Speed Limit Reduction Study. Included in the study is research on what has been done in other municipalities, public engagement through online surveys, identify options to implement lower speed limits and how enforcement is to be carried out.</p>

	<p>#2. Page 12 section 3.4 - Pedestrian and Cycling Activity The Draft Plan states " Collingwood shall be planned around cycling and pedestrian activity with a substantial number of destinations, including parks, cultural and community facilities, shopping, and restaurant opportunities within walking distance to promote walking and cycling to encourage daily physical activity and a lessening of the dependence on automobiles. "</p> <p>*The best part of the neighbourhood in question is that it is within walking distance of many destinations in Collingwood including downtown, the waterfront, shopping etc. But, pedestrians and cyclists are not the priority on these streets. The car is the priority. There are no bike lanes to encourage cycling. There are no painted roads lanes. There are no features that calm traffic or discourage traffic. Many cars speed through these streets without limitation. The citizens of this neighbourhood are limited in their options of walking or cycling because of the amount and speed of the through traffic on these streets.</p> <p>#3 Page 20 section - Promoting Environmental Sustainability and Adapting to Climate Change The Draft Plan States " Air Quality and Carbon Mitigation g) To reduce the frequency and length of vehicle trips that contribute to poor air quality and greenhouse gas emissions,....."</p> <p>*With the grid pattern of streets that makes up this neighbourhood there are multiple ways that through traffic vehicles can try to "take a short cut" through this neighbourhood. People traveling through the neighbourhood think they can travel faster on these residential streets by avoiding the major collector roads of 1st street, Hurontario, High St, and 6th street. I doubt this short cut is actually faster. However, the point is there is no disincentive for them to try to speed through this residential area and "make up time". These streets are currently set up to encourage more travel, more greenhouse gases, more air pollution, and more noise pollution. This goes against the goals outlined in this section of the draft plan.</p> <p>#4. Page 102 section 6.1 - Multi-Modal Transportation System Draft Plan States " To maintain a multi-modal and integrated transportation system that permits the safe and efficient movement of people and goods within the Town; *Safety of all community members young and old should be priority #1. On residential streets with too much traffic (through traffic - not generated in the neighbourhood) this creates an unsafe environment for walking and cycling. The car should be limited in its speed and access to put the safety of people first. Again, there are no bike lanes, no traffic calming features, and no painted lines to narrow the road to limit traffic speed. The danger of cars travelling at 50-60km an hour on these streets is high and presents a real impediment to cycling and walking.</p> <p>#5. Page 103 section 6.1 - Active Transportation and Complete streets The Draft Plan States - " While Collingwood already has a well-established active transportation network, as shown on Schedule 5,..." * Yes, Collingwood already has many trails, parks, and is a excellent place to be active. The primary mode of transport for myself in Collingwood is by bicycle. I use the parks and trails everyday. But, the active transportation plan does not include residential streets in my neighbourhood. There are no features to slow traffic. There are no on street speed markers to help slow traffic and remind drivers that 40km is the maximum speed. Residential streets are where citizens will start their "active transport" activity - whether it is walking or biking. If citizens feel safe to walk or bike to the bike trail, park, or waterfront then they will do so. But, if the traffic volume and speed on their street discourages active transport then there is no way to access these trails and parks unless by car which is certainly not the goal of a healthy active community.</p> <p>#6. Page 107 section 6.1.8.2 - Road Classifications The Draft Plan States - "It is the intent of this Plan to promote and develop an appropriate hierarchy of roads that will ensure the desired movement of people and goods within and throughout the Town. This Plan, supported by the Transportation Master Plan, establishes a classification of roads according to their ultimate-desired function" *The residential neighbourhood in question - the "Tree Streets" is not designed, built, or promoted as a through traffic road. However, this is in deed what is happening in this neighbourhood. Vehicles are avoiding the collector or major roads and driving through these residential streets. The current use of these streets does not match the appropriate design and original function of these streets. The desired movement of people - walking or biking - is limited by the amount and speed of vehicles travelling through this area. These vehicles should be directed or incentivized to use the collector and major streets available to them.</p>	<p>The Town has an Active Transportation Framework (2017) and a Cycling Plan, dated 2019, that provides a long-term vision, strategy and implementation plan to develop, strengthen and support a cycling culture in Collingwood. These documents identify policies, programs and facilities needed to make cycling an everyday mobility option for residents. The AT Framework and Cycling Plan include maps identifying a future cycling network. This was used in the preparation of Schedule 5.</p> <p>The opportunity for additional routes can be accommodated through Policy f) under Section 6.1.3 that states "The Town may adjust the location and/or alignment of existing and future Active Transportation facilities as identified on Schedule 5, to accommodate the actual on-ground route, and to respond to new opportunities and/or constraints that arise from time-to-time,..."</p> <p>The Town has retained a consultant to conduct a Town Wide Speed Limit Reduction Study. Included in the study is research on what has been done in other municipalities, public engagement through online surveys, identify options to implement lower speed limits and how enforcement is to be carried out.</p> <p>Agree. To add safety in the goals in Section 6.1</p> <p>The Town has retained a consultant to conduct a Town Wide Speed Limit Reduction Study. Included in the study is research on what has been done in other municipalities, public engagement through online surveys, identify options to implement lower speed limits and how enforcement is to be carried out.</p> <p>See above, Re: TMP #1 and #2</p>
--	---	--

	<p>#7. Page 108 section 6.1.8.2 - Road Classifications The Draft Plan states - " 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>*This is the most important statement from the draft plan with regards to this issue. Local residential roads are intended to provide access to people's homes. The local roads are not for through traffic. However, there is no design features on this area to discourage through-traffic.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my comments and the highlighted Draft Plan points. I welcome the chance to contribute to the community solutions to solve this problem. I am passionate about Collingwood and I believe Collingwood can become a Provincial leader with respect to health active living and sustainable modes of transportation. I hope we can all work together to make sure the Official Town Plan is working and helping to solve important problems in our community.</p>	<p>See above, Re: TMP #1 and #2</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------

Third Street		
Respondents:		
Name	Comment	Response
<p>> John Housser > Linda Housser > Catherine M Barlow > Meg Anderson > Luke Anderson > Jill Bates > Leslie Bolt > Alison Boyack > Julie Brown > Helen Bull > Michelle and Albert > Darlene Craig > David Craig > Patti Daly > Sandy Dickson > Diane Doyle > Jacqueline Eger</p> <p>> Alan & Jane Metheral > Susan Morton and Tom Trenholme > Brian Neely > Diane Neely > Janet Nielsen > Rob Peacock > Margaret and Norbert Pirk > Robert Powadiuk > Jennifer Radecki > Paul Richards > Paul Rogers and Leslie Bolt > Robbie and Judy Ross > Dennis and Kathleen Roth > Jeanette Beck > Michael McArthur > Laura Salter > Sandra Hager > Sally Ann Slevin > John Genest > Randy Gillies > Mary Gurr > M. Hahne > Wendy & Brian Hickey > Jack and Sue Marley</p> <p>> Samuel Holwell > Monica Jensen > Bob and Anne Luton > Norah MacLean > Jennifer Marley > Molly McArthur > Esther McIntyre > Jennifer McKay > Andrew McKay > Rosemarie McKay > Sandra & Gordon McLean > Luke McNabb > David Slevin > Kenneth Swain > Rob and Margaret Thorburn > Abbey Westlake > Jim Worts > Christopher Baines > Kari Payne > Elise Craig > Michael Craig</p>	<p>There is tremendous concern about the future role of 3rd Street within the Town of Collingwood. In recognition of this concern, the Town held a special public meeting to better understand the issues and concerns of residents.</p> <p>Many questions were raised at the special public meeting, and which are highlighted through the individual correspondence that has been received to date.</p> <p>The intent of this part of the matrix is to provide a host of answers to the questions, although the answers are not specifically linked to any individuals or individual questions in order to provide appropriate and important information, but to avoid duplication.</p>	<p>THE EXISTING OFFICIAL PLAN</p> <p>1. The EXISTING Official Plan, approved by Council in 2004, was subject to a public process that included public meetings to solicit comments. At that time, 3rd Street and Ontario Street were identified as collector roads, as shown on Schedule 6 in the DRAFT Official Plan. 3rd Street has been identified as a collector road in the Official Plan since at least 1985.</p> <p>2. The EXISTING Official Plan states that "Collector Roads are existing and proposed roads of 2 to 4 traffic lanes which are designed to collect and carry local traffic to arterial roads and/or to distribute traffic to local roads. Collector roads shall have a minimum right-of-way width of 20 to 26 metres (66 to 85 feet). Access to collector roads from abutting properties will be permitted but shall be kept to a minimum. No access will be permitted where a traffic hazard would be created. "</p> <p>3. 3rd Street, and its currently defined role, are part of a broader transportation system where traffic flow is expected to be accommodated in the long-term. Changes to the existing planned system require adjustments to other parts of the system elsewhere within the Town, and those changes need to be fully understood.</p> <p>THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN</p> <p>4. This is the first version of the DRAFT Official Plan circulated for comment. There will be other opportunities for consultation and review of future versions of the DRAFT Official Plan.</p> <p>5. A new Transportation Master Plan (TMP) has not been developed for the Town. The DRAFT Official Plan relies upon the EXISTING Official Plan as well as transportation studies carried out in 2012 and 2019 which focused on improvements required to the road network in order to accommodate increased growth in traffic.</p> <p>6. The Transportation Section (Section 6.1) of the DRAFT Official Plan is a carry-forward of the principles, policies and categorizations that are included within the EXISTING Official Plan. Third Street has been identified as a Collector road in the Town's Official Plan's since 1985 and is contemplated to provide linkage further west through the approval of the draft plan of subdivision for the Regional Commercial District in 2016 and extended in 2021. However, that westerly linkage has been omitted from the Official Plan Schedules until it can be further substantiated through a new TMP.</p> <p>6. The Primary changes found within the DRAFT Official Plan from the EXISTING Official Plan include enhanced policy frameworks related to Active Transportation and Complete Streets (Section 3.4 and Section 6.1.3) and Public Transit (Section 6.1.4). These new elements of the DRAFT Official Plan , while high level, are considered crucial components for consideration and implementation going forward into the next 20 or 30 years.</p> <p>7. The DRAFT Official Plan provides overarching policies that are intended to complement the more detailed requirements and guidelines identified in the Town plans such as the Transportation Update, Active Transportation Plan, Cycling Plan, Waterfront Master Plan, etc. If a Council-approved final Transportation Master Plan identifies changes in the transportation policies contained within the DRAFT Official Plan, these can be incorporated through modifications prior to County/Provincial approval, or through a subsequent Official Plan Amendment. Further, the DRAFT Official Plan contains policies requiring all development applications to have regard for or be consistent with endorsed master plans, strategies, studies, guidelines or standards of the Town as these are prepared, approved and/or amended.</p> <p>A NEW TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN</p> <p>The Town is committed to preparing a new TMP (budget 2023) that will include analysis on traffic management based on current volumes and anticipated growth. The objective of the TMP is to ensure major goods movement facilities and corridors are protected for the long term and to ensure a safe, efficient, and integrated system for the movement of people and goods throughout the Town, including all modes of transport and active transportation. Within this integrated system it remains a priority to develop strategies to effectively accommodate high seasonal traffic volumes while minimizing the impact of peak period and surge traffic on residents and residential neighbourhoods.</p> <p>9. The TMP will be a comprehensive review of vehicle and active transportation movements throughout the Town. This will include a review of potential future movement corridors to be protected. The TMP also intends to develop a Complete Streets Policy to further implement policies identified in the Town Official Plan update. A key goal of this policy will be to balance the needs of all transportation modes and users. Further, The TMP is to provide strategies for addressing localized problem areas within the context of the larger transportation network, as well as crafting policies both for effective management of the network as a whole and for evaluating ongoing requests for traffic calming and controls.</p> <p>10. The TMP process will provide more detailed responses to all of the relevant comments on transportation issues received to date on the DRAFT Official Plan - both general comments, as well as comments that are specific to 3rd Street. It is expected that the TMP, when complete, may result in an Amendment to the Official Plan.</p>

<p>> Peter and Patti Daly > Andre M Dempsey > Kenneth Swain > Jeanette Beck > David Black</p>		<p>11. Public consultation throughout the development of the TMP is essential to its success. Participation by residents will be key to ensure that all issues and opportunities have been identified so that appropriate policies can be developed. In order to ensure meaningful consultation. Town staff are considering the following as the minimum requirements for the TMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > 2 rounds for formal public consultation including preparation of the presentation materials; > workshops with community stakeholder groups; > public survey/questionnaire (web, social media, mobile, etc.); > Ongoing communication through the Town's "Engage Collingwood" portal; and, > Council presentations. <p>COMMENTS SPECIFIC TO 3rd STREET</p> <p>12. The anticipated traffic of 3rd Street in a future condition falls within the range of typical collector roads, outlined in the Town's Transportation Update Study (TUS-2019). The existing and future right of way width for 3rd Street and Ontario Street is 20 metres. The TUS-2019 did not identify the need to widen 3rd Street or Ontario Street beyond 2 lanes. The TUS-2019 predicted 5,720 vehicles per day (vpd) as vehicle traffic in 2031 and 6,320 vpd in 2041. 8,000 vpd is a technical guideline and not an absolute number. The TUS did not anticipate a rise in volume to 8,000 vpd. First Street is another available option to reach the east end of Collingwood. In addition, the Turning Movement Counts for TUS-2019 were collected in December 2018, the data was compared with historic summer and winter traffic counts from various sources to determine what overall seasonal adjustment factor should be applied. The results of the comparisons indicated that the application of a 5.0% adjustment factor would be most reasonable, therefore the turning movement volumes were increased by 5.0% to represent existing summer weekday conditions.</p> <p>13. The Town did carry out speed studies on 3rd Street in 2017 and 2019 with 85 percent of the vehicles travelling at or below 49 km/h for both years. On average 96.6% of the vehicles are travelling at a speed of 55 km/h or under. This was reported to Council on September 30, 2019.</p> <p>14. The 2023 Capital Budget does include funds for the future design of the 3rd Street bridge located between Oak Street and Birch Street to carry out needed rehabilitation work. The Town's capital plan also has the reconstruction of 3rd Street from High Street to Birch Street scheduled in 2028. Specific traffic features to address particular issues related to 3rd Street would be considered during the pre-design for road reconstruction. Any proposed changes to the 3rd Street road design (i.e., addition of sidewalks on both sides of the street, addition of cycling lanes, on street parking, etc.) would include public consultation. The information provided to the public would include any planned facilities identified through Council approved plans (i.e., Active Transportation Plan, Cycling Plan, the new Transportation Master Plan) as the starting point for discussion and concept design.</p> <p>15. There are various traffic calming measures that can be implemented and will be considered when 3rd Street is reconstructed in the future. Sidewalks on both sides of the street is a desire that has been brought forth by residents located on or near Third St. Cycling facilities were identified in the Town Cycling Plan. Further, the use of physical measures to alter driver behaviour through traffic calming can improve safety on residential streets. The resulting reduction in travel speeds and, potentially, traffic volumes can create a safer environment for all road users, including active transportation users and area residents. There are various physical measures that could include speed cushions, speed tables, textured crosswalks, raised intersections, traffic circles (not a roundabout), chicanes, chokers, curb radius reduction, neckdowns and centre islands.</p> <p>16. The TMP may rely upon updated traffic counts. The collection of traffic counts for the purpose of establishing long term transportation movement includes a review of regular conditions. Transportation needs are not determined from unique or irregular conditions as then road features would not function well under the frequent regular conditions. To meet certain levels of service under irregular conditions, this could also result in identifying additional vehicle accommodations (like additional paved area) that take away valued assets within the street boulevard. All of this is taken into consideration when collecting traffic data, as necessary.</p> <p>COMMENTS SPECIFIC TO THE REGIONAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT</p> <p>17. The original draft plan approval for the Regional Commercial District was given on March 25, 2013. The 'Street A' road corridor was sized to accommodate a future collector road at 26 metres wide, and Block 197 is identified as a service corridor to be dedicated to the Town for a potential future road and servicing corridor to provide linkages in the community</p> <p>18. As part of the draft plan approval a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was undertaken by an engineering consultant on behalf of the developer in 2012. The TIS did recognize that there would be a collector road within the proposed subdivision and that it would connect to High Street. A qualitative assessment was done, and it indicated that the collector connection would provide an alternative and more convenient route to retail, employment, service, and residential destinations in the Town. As a result, the existing access may be closed completely or converted to a right-in/right-out access at some point in the future. Further, the removal of the existing signals at the Home Depot access would coincide with the relocation of the access to the Cambridge Street extension. The EXISTING Official Plan contains policies that speak to these upgrades and those have been carried forward.</p> <p>19. The distance between the existing Home Depot access and the intersection of High and Third St. is approximately 150 metres. Signalized intersections should be located at least 215 metres apart in order to allow a driver adequate time to react to a signal.</p> <p>20. As some time has lapsed since the original impact study was done, Town staff may require an update to the report. In Appendix C of the report P2022-09 under the heading 'File' it indicates that "Service Corridor Block which could accommodate a potential road connection to the lands to the east (crossing Black Ash Creek) and linking potentially to Third St. and/or Cambridge St.</p> <p>21. For the analysis of the future total traffic conditions, there are certain development related network and intersection improvements that have been assumed to be in place, including the extension of Cambridge Street to the High Street and Third Street intersection. In conjunction with this improvement, the existing traffic signals at the Home Depot Access on High Street will be moved to the new Cambridge Street/Third Street/High Street intersection (prior to 2031).</p>
--	--	--

OTHER RELATED TOWN ACTIVITIES

22. The Town has retained a consultant to conduct a Town Wide Speed Limit Reduction Study. Included in the study is research on what has been done in other municipalities, public engagement through online surveys, identify options to implement lower speed limits and how enforcement is to be carried out.

23. The Town has an approved Stop Sign Policy, and it can be found on the Town's website.

24. The Town has tree canopy preservation tools that include a Tree Preservation By-law, and the Simcoe County Tree By-law. Tree preservation is being addressed through a multi-pronged project outside of the Official Plan Review including a review of the tree cutting by-law, Town forestry practices and resources, engineering/urban design standards, and site alteration.

25. Town is currently in the process of updating its road design standards. The update to the standards will incorporate the Town's traffic calming policies as well as incorporating the needs of all users and modes of transportation. These standards will need to be reviewed following the completion of the Transportation Master Plan and the recommendations that come from it.

26. Climate Change is top of mind with the residents of Collingwood. The Town is committed to the preparation of a comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan in the coming months. From the perspective of transportation, enhancing mobility options for residents is a key component of any comprehensive response to climate change.

27. Collingwood is, for the most part, already a 15-Minute Community. Further, the concept of a 15-Minute Community is already included in Section 3.4, subsection d) in the DRAFT Official Plan.

28. The existing Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is currently operating at approximately 70% capacity. Review and management of the remaining capacity is included in the Town's recently adopted Servicing Capacity Allocation Policy. The initiation of a Class Environmental Assessment for the expansion of the WWTP has been included in the capital plan for 2024. Funding has been included in the 2022 Town Budget and is proposed for 2023 and 2024 to carry out an inflow/infiltration study to determine the sources of stormwater that is entering the sanitary sewer system.

Area Specific Requests

Respondents:			
#	Name	Comment	Response
1	Denis Martinek 247 Osler Bluff Rd.	<p>Subject: Official Plan Update Submission 247 Osler Bluff Rd. Collingwood Please accept the attached letter and natural heritage report as my submission for the Town of Collingwood Official Plan Update. I am formally objecting to the current classification of my property at 247 Osler Bluff Rd. Collingwood.</p> <p>The subject premises is located on the east side of Osler Bluff Road, to the south of the former Thomson Tennis School property and approximately opposite Grand Cypress Lane (The Blue Mountains). I have had an opportunity to review the draft policies and mapping schedules associated with the Draft Official Plan released for comment last week and provide the following comments as they relate to the subject premises.</p> <p>The subject premises is proposed to be located/placed in the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delineated Built-up Area Boundary, Residential Communities and Greenlands System – Schedule 1; • Rural and Environmental Protection Land Use Designations – Schedule 2; and, • Natural Heritage System and Adjacent Lands Overlay – Schedule 3 <p>Regarding the foregoing, please be advised that a Natural Heritage Report (NHR) was completed for the subject lands by Hensel Design Group Inc. in 2017, copy attached, which concluded: <i>Based on the information gathered from both the second source data search and the site visit on October 18, 2017, it is our conclusion that the subject lands do not contain any significant natural heritage features or functions and as a result should not be included in the revised Environmental Protection mapping exercise by the Town of Collingwood.</i></p> <p>As you will note, the NHR was inclusive of a second source data review of existing natural heritage data (NHIC, SAR) as well as a reconnaissance level site visit to confirm existing natural heritage features. Given the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject premises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should NOT be placed in the Greenlands System; • Should NOT be designated Environmental Protection but rather Rural in its entirety; and, • Should NOT form or be part of the Natural Heritage System. 	<p>Staff have followed up to determine if the Natural Heritage information has been accepted by the Conservation Authority, or if it should be peer reviewed by the Town at this time at this time.</p>
2	George Powell, Vice-Chair of our Watershed Action Committee	<p>11. The Committee of Adjustment needs to be involved in Minor Variance and not issues that impact the environment i.e. 70 Madeline.</p> <p>12. Legal non- conforming uses should not be allowed to construct new homes in EP lands. 69, 70 and 80 Madeline, Oliver</p>	<p>The Committee of Adjustment should not be creating new development lots within the Environmental Protection Designation. All Committee of Adjustment decisions must conform to the policies of the Official Plan.</p> <p>New homes are not permitted on EP lands.</p>
3	Colin Travis Travis and Associates PO Box 323 Thornbury, Ontario N0H 2P0 on behalf of Bridgewater/Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc. North side of Highway 26 west of Princeton Shores Boulevard	<p>The Draft 1 OP presents a dramatic, significant shift in land use approaches. It is appreciated that many of these shifts reflect more contemporary policy approaches directed through the Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan. The substantial nature of changes requires more than 11 working days post public meeting to thoroughly address all implications on lands affected prior to being put to council for a decision. Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc. (Consulate) owns approximately 312 acres on the north side of Highway 26 west of Princeton Shores Boulevard. About 92 acres are situated immediately south of Bartlett Boulevard and west of Princeton Shores Boulevard and are zoned and draft Plan Approved for, among other uses, 328 dwelling units (under the file name "Bridgewater"). Both the West and East lands are currently subject to appeals before the Tribunal.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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 1 despite our requests to Town staff. It does not appear that our submission made in the above letter was taken into consideration. We maintain the request for the designations on the West lands referenced in that letter. 2. The proposed designations in Schedules 1 and 2 on the East lands have boundaries that appear to respect boundaries in the in force OP. At this stage of our review, the boundaries and the range and type of uses proposed in Draft 1 do not appear to be problematic as they could enable implementation of proposed approved development plans. 3. The proposed designations in Schedules 1 and 2 on the West lands are not consistent with the in force OP as they ignore the designated "Rural" land use areas. We request that this be corrected. We note that similar "Rural" areas found in the in force OP in other parts of the Town are followed through in this Draft 1. We are not aware of the rationale for this proposed change but it is our opinion that these lands remain appropriate for development as part of the "Rural" land use area. 4. We are concerned over the imposition of the "Adjacent Lands Overlay" on the East lands. The existing approved zoning and Draft Plan are based on approved Environmental Impact Studies and the application of the overlay fails to recognize this status. We request that it be removed. 5. We have reviewed general land use designations. We continue to review the Draft 1 OP document for the purposes of cross-checking related land use policies and assessing implementation matters. We anticipate a subsequent commentary on Draft 1. 	<p>This request is subject to an ongoing OLT process. No further response is appropriate at this time.</p>
4	Colin Travis Travis and Associates PO Box 323 thornbury ontario N0H 2P0 on behalf of Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc. Part Lots 48, 49, 50, Concession 11	<p>By way of additional background, the following points have been made in discussions with Planning Staff relating to the Consulate West lands:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consulate was willing to revisit the Minutes of Settlement process initiated with the Town and its municipal lawyer. 2. The land identified as "Rural" within the No. 7 area remain proposed as residential. 3. That the boundaries of the "EP" lands have been refined through further study. 4. That the logical residential land use designation is "Medium Density Residential" as this affords a wider variety of residential dwelling types. 5. That the "Medium Density Residential" designation would assist the Town in meeting growth allocation targets established through the County Official Plan. 	<p>This matter is subject to ongoing litigation. No further response is appropriate at this time.</p>

5	<p>J. David Bunston President, Georgian Communities</p> <p>Area South of Sixth Street, West of Black Ash Creek</p>	<p>The purpose of this submission is to request that the ongoing Official Plan Update consider including the subject area in an urban development area having at least the same land use development intent and process (or equivalent) as lands currently referred to as the westerly "Secondary Plan Boundary" in Schedule A to the current Official Plan. In addition, this submission requests that the subject lands be recognized as a Service Area 2 development area, or equivalent, in the Official Plan Update.</p> <p>Integral to the subject request is that from an engineering basis the subject area can be readily developed from a servicing and constraint perspective and thus assist the Town in moving forward in a logical fashion to accommodate future growth.</p> <p>...been advised that the Provincial Policy Statement requires that municipalities must ensure that sufficient land is made available to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of land uses to meet projected needs for a time horizon of up to 25 years. Given this, the ongoing Official Plan Update exercise must account for substantial growth to at least 2046.</p> <p>Primarily as a result of the passage of time, we, along with our consultants, note the following major deficiencies to the existing Official Plan land use management approach with respect to the subject area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject area comprises lands that are designated "Rural" and "Environmental Protection", the same designations as for the majority of lands to the north—west. 2. Similarly, designated lands to the north—west lie within a defined "Secondary Plan Boundary". However, the subject lands lie outside of such a boundary. 3. The subject lands lie within Service Area 3, similar to the western sector of lands within the "Secondary Plan Boundary". However, the subject lands are contiguous to existing Service Areas 1 and 3 and can be readily serviced. 4. The subject lands front onto 2 major arterial roads (Sixth Street and County Road 34) with these 2 roads being the southerly limit of existing large fully serviced residential subdivisions. 5. The subject area abuts (via Black Ash Creek) large existing fully serviced residential subdivisions to the east. 6. The subject area is capable of being fully serviced with existing sewer and water services in the immediate area that have been sized to accommodate future development. 	<p>Redesignation request considered by Council, and considered major, and requiring an Official Plan Amendment (OPA). Any redesignation should require an OPA, with the requisite studies and justification. Existing policy is clear on expectations and need for additional urban lands would be required to be demonstrated to support an OPA.</p>
6	<p>J. David Bunston President, Georgian Communities</p> <p>Area South of Sixth Street, West of Black Ash Creek</p>	<p>We are concerned that Draft OP Release number 1 does not designate these lands as we had requested. Schedule 1 places the subject lands as "Rural" and "Greenlands System", similar to the undeveloped situated north-west. Schedule 2 designates the subject lands as "Rural" and "Environmental Protection", again similar to the undeveloped lands situated north-west. However, the subject lands remain outside of the westerly "Secondary Plan Area", unlike lands situated north-west.</p> <p>Our position remains that the subject lands are a logical component of the Secondary Plan Area. It is inexplicable why these lands are the only lands within the Town that are not included in a Secondary Plan Area. The lands abut existing development, they abut a Secondary Plan Area boundary and, they can be readily serviced more so than most lands in the Secondary Plan Area.</p>	<p>Redesignation request considered by Council, and considered major, and requiring an Official Plan Amendment (OPA). Any redesignation should require an OPA, with the requisite studies and justification. Existing policy is clear on expectations and need for additional urban lands would be required to be demonstrated to support an OPA.</p>
7	<p>Michael Lacroix President and CEO Collingwood General and Marine Hospital</p>	<p>CGMH is presently undertaking an in-depth review to evaluate these lands to accommodate an expansion or redevelopment of the lands for new medical facilities (Stage 2 planning). We are presently midway through this review and anticipate it will be finished by March 2023.</p> <p>The draft Official Plan depicts the hospital lands to be redesignated to the new Major Institutional land use designation...</p> <p>The Hospital's understanding is that the Major Institutional land use designation basically permits,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. All large-scale public service facilities, including secondary schools, post-secondary educational facilities, and hospitals; ii. Large-Scale Special Needs Housing; and, iii. Large-Scale Places of Worship. <p>Until we finish our Stage 2 review and obtain direction from the Ministry on next steps, we would formally request that the Town place us in a Non-Decision Area thereby leaving the existing land use designations intact until we hear from the Ministry and receive direction how we may proceed with our new development plans.</p>	<p>Major Institutional is the most appropriate designation in the new Plan. Premature to predetermine the outcome of any future use of this property until a decision to move away from this site by the hospital. Town will carry forward the Special Policy Area Health overlay for the existing hospital location and surroundings. If the hospital relocated to a greenfield site, a comprehensive process (e.g. block plan), including public consultation, should be undertaken to determine the appropriate re-use of the existing site.</p>
8	<p>Colin Travis Travis and Associates PO Box 323 Thornbury, Ontario N0H 2P0</p> <p>On behalf of Owner: L. Law Cranberry Golf Course</p>	<p>Two written submissions and requests were provided to the Town identifying lands that will be surplus as a result of a rationalized golf course re-design. Those requests asked the Town to address surplus lands during the Official Plan review process. Draft 1 does not address the land use planning points made in the two submissions. Mr. Law can provide an innovative housing and accommodations program on his surplus lands. Such surplus lands are already in proximity to municipal services. Surplus golf course lands represent an opportunity for the Town to realize innovative housing approaches on lands with full municipal services and within the "Delineated Built Up Area Boundary"</p> <p>On December 4, 2020 we submitted a follow up letter in response to discussions held November 4, 2020 with Mr. Bryan and Mr. Farr. Those discussions centered on further descriptions of the results of the golf course analysis and concluded with a request from Mr. Farr for additional rational on how existing Official Plan policy addresses "land use conversion". Our second letter concluded that existing Official Plan policy provides a policy context for "intensification" that includes redevelopment of vacant or under-utilized lots, infill development and conversion of certain uses. We noted that existing Official Plan policy did not specifically address conversion of private open space and recreational facilities (such as a golf course).</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><i>"That conversion of surplus lands to an existing golf course will be considered by the Town if the surplus lands result from golf course re-design and the surplus lands front onto municipal services. The conversion of such lands shall require an amendment to the Zoning By-law and must comply with development policies provided under the "Future Neighbourhood" policy section to this Plan."</i></p>	<p>Redesignation request considered by Council, and considered major, and requiring an Official Plan Amendment (OPA). Any redesignation should require an OPA, with the requisite studies and justification. Existing policy is clear on expectations and need for additional urban lands would be required to be demonstrated to support an OPA.</p>

9	<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>EXISTING OFFICIAL PLAN Schedule 'A', Land Use Plan designates the eastern portion of the subject lands "Residential". The Black Ash Creek is a discrete feature and is designated "Environmental Protection". The westerly portion of the subject lands is designated "Rural". Schedule 'B', recognizes the Black Ash Creek as part of the Town's Natural Heritage Resources Areas. Schedule 'C' designates the easterly portion of the subject lands as "Medium Density" residential.</p> <p>DRAFT 1 OFFICIAL PLAN Schedule '1', Growth Management Plan: The eastern portion of the subject lands are shown as being within the "Greenlands System". The western portion (west of Black Ash Creek) is shown as being within the "Greenlands System" and "Rural/Agricultural".</p> <p>Schedule '2', Land Use Plan: The eastern portion of the subject lands are designated "Environmental Protection" and "Parks and Open Space". The western portion is designated "Environmental Protection" and "Rural".</p> <p>COMMENT 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>We request that Schedules 1, 2 and 3 be corrected to reflect the land use designation intents of the existing Official Plan. In that regard, the east lands would be designated "Future Neighbourhood" with a "Environmental Protection" designation along the existing well defined Black Ash Creek corridor.</p>	<p>Environmental Impact Study must be prepared to support any application for development.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Study should be completed by the proponent and peer reviewed by the Town to demonstrate lands are not Natural Heritage System. Please see Discussion Paper 5</p>
10	<p>Shelley Wells MES, MCIP, RPP Plan Wells Associates</p> <p>On behalf of Lorablue Holdings Inc. Harbour Centre, 20 Balsam Street</p>	<p>Attached comments on behalf of Lorablue Holdings Inc. regarding Harbour Centre for Draft # 1 Official Plan July 2022</p> <p>Harbour Centre retail shopping plaza centrally located at 20 Balsam Street in the Town of Collingwood. The subject lands front onto Balsam Street near the intersection of First Street and Mountain Road. Harbour Centre is located adjacent to the Regional Commercial District within the "built boundary" of the Town of Collingwood.</p> <p>The Official Plan of the Town of Collingwood designates these lands Highway Commercial Exception Five (HC-5), permitting a wide range of personal services and retail commercial establishments, which generally require larger floor plates or orientation to vehicular traffic. Exception Five prohibits motor vehicle dealerships and gas stations. A small portion of the subject lands is designated Environmental Protection. The site is Zoned Highway Commercial Exception 6 and Environmental Protection in Bylaw 2010-040.</p> <p>Based on our review of the draft Official Plan July 2022, we note that the following are of interest in relation to the future development of Harbour Centre: 1. Schedule 3 Natural Heritage System outlines at a conceptual level the limit of the portion of the site currently designated Environmental Protection. Schedule 3 proposes to re-designate a portion of the lands as Natural Heritage System and Adjacent Land Overlay. The portion of the site currently designated and zoned Environmental Protection was determined via Minutes of Settlement between Lorablue Holding Inc., and the Town of Collingwood dated March 4, 2014, copy attached. The Minutes of Settlement were set out in a Board Order (OMB Case# PL 100526 copy attached) dated March 12, 2014. The limit of the land designated and zoned Environmental Protection was staked in consultation with the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority and surveyed by Rudy Mak Surveying Inc. A copy of this survey prepared by Rudy Mak in 2013 is attached. We note that Section 2 of the Minutes of Settlement and the OMB Board Order confirm the minimum required yard to the EP zone is 3.0 metres. Subsequently Mr. D Speller, Tarandus Associates Limited met with Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority in 2019. I am advised a revised limit to the Environmental Protection designation was agreed between the parties at that time. This revised limit has been staked and surveyed. A copy of the 2019 staked limit together with a revised survey prepared by Rudy Mak in 2019 is attached. Please accept this written correspondence as a formal request that the Schedule 3 Natural Heritage System mapping reflect the Environmental Protection boundary as set out above. We note the minimum required yard established in the OMB Order noted above has not been altered.</p>	<p>OMB decision (2014) has been reviewed, and confirmation of NVCA acceptance of 2019 environmental information should be provided. Alternatively, environmental information should be peer reviewed by Town's Environmental consultant.</p> <p>Adjacent Lands Overlay to be retained to require an Environmental Impact Study should additional development approvals be requested. No change to policy required.</p>
		<p>2. 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. A submission for pre-consultation for the redevelopment of Harbour Centre was tabled with the Town in December 2019. Proposed were two 10 storey buildings consisting of residential and commercial uses, with parking provided at grade and also integrated into the built structures. Attached are the pre-consult notes (Town file D002219). The proponent, although delayed considerably by COVID protocols, has continued to refine this concept plan and submission materials. For this reason, we request that the draft Official Plan confirm that the Harbour Centre be developed as an individual site and not be subject to a Secondary Plan.</p> <p>We support the proposed designation of this site as Mixed-Use Corridor 1. We note the permissions in this designation closely reflect the proposed re-development of the site as proposed in the 2019 pre-consult submission.</p>	<p>Will review Section 5.3.2.3 to provide flexibility to the Town to waive Secondary Plan requirements, where appropriate.</p>
11	<p>Shelley Wells MES, MCIP, RPP Plan Wells Associates</p> <p>On behalf of LMair Mills Village Inc. Panorama Subdivision 260 Mountain Road.</p>	<p>Attached comments on behalf of Mair Mills Village Inc., regarding Panorama for Draft # 1 Official Plan July 2022</p> <p>Panorama is a designated greenfield subdivision. The subject lands are currently draft plan approved and zoned for three hundred and nineteen (319) dwellings consisting of one hundred and twenty-seven (127) single detached dwellings, and approximately one hundred ninety-two (192) multiple residential dwellings, a combination of freehold townhouses, condominium townhouses, stacked townhouses and /or apartment dwellings. A .364 park block, 1.989 combined park and stormwater management block and a .567 neighborhood commercial block complete this subdivision. Zoning Bylaw 2018-052 implements the draft plan.</p> <p>Based on our review of the draft Official Plan July 2022, we note that Section 7.1.5.1 (i) and U)are of concern in relation to the future development of Panorama. We note the current draft plan approval for Panorama will lapse on June 29, 2024. We seek, on behalf of Mair Mills Village Inc., a specific exemption in the proposed new Official Plan to confirm that the draft plan approval for Panorama will not be allowed to lapse until after the Water Treatment Plan Expansion is completed, the above noted Stewart Road and 10th Line water infrastructure is commissioned and a reasonable period of time has passed to allow for such registration to occur.</p> <p>We support the proposed designation of the subject lands as Designated Greenfield Area: Future Neighbourhood.</p>	<p>The DRAFT Official Plan is not the vehicle to deal with site specific lapsing provisions or water allocation, for specific properties. It is understood that extensions to external services are required prior to development.</p>

12	<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>The Draft OP through a series of policies and the identification of lands on Schedule 7, identifies lands within the Town that are subject to Area Specific Policies wherein a site-specific policy framework directs the development of said lands. It is noted that the site-specific policy framework applicable to the Subject Lands which was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in 2014 and included in the Current Town OP</p> <p>The Subject Lands are currently designated "Residential" and "Environmental Protection" on Schedule "A2" to the Town of Collingwood Official Plan, 2019 (Current Town OPA). More specifically, the Subject Lands include two residentially designated areas on either side of the "Environmental Protection" designation. The lands to the west of the "Environmental Protection" designation within the Subject Lands are designated "Low Density Residential" and the lands to the east side of the "Environmental Protection" designation within the Subject Lands are designated "Medium Density Residential" on Schedule "C" to the Current Town OP. We note that the Subject Lands are proposed to be designated as "Greenlands System" and "DGA " Residential Communities on Schedule "1" Growth Management Plan and "Environmental Protection" and "Future Neighbourhood" on Schedule "2" Land Use Plan to the Draft OP.</p> <p>The Draft OP through a series of policies and the identification of lands on Schedule 7, identifies lands within the Town that are subject to Area Specific Policies wherein a site-specific policy framework directs the development of said lands. It is noted that the site-specific policy framework applicable to the Subject Lands which was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in 2014 and included in the Current Town OP as Sections 4.3.2.5.3.3 and 4.3.2.6.3.5 has not been carried forward into the Draft OP as an Area Specific Policy.</p> <p>In order to ensure the development of our client's lands in accordance with previous approvals, we request that Sections 4.3.2.5.3.3 and 4.3.2.6.3.5 from the Current Town OP be introduced as Area Specific Policies in a new subsection within proposed Section 5.2.2- The Future Neighbourhoods Designation and that Schedule-7 be amended to identify the Subject Lands as subject to Area Specific Policies. In addition, based on our review of other new proposed policies, there are exceptions that we would also be seeking within the Area Specific Policies to ensure that development contemplated under our existing approvals can be realized.</p>	<p>The next DRAFT of the Official Plan will incorporate site specific mapping designations and policies for this site.</p> <p>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>
13	<p>Christopher S. Assaff, B.COMM Vice-President</p> <p>Charis Developments Ltd.</p> <p>869 Hurontario Street and 7564 Poplar Sideroad</p> <p>49 Huron Street</p>	<p>Charis generally supports the direction of the Draft and believe it provides direction for the growth dictated by the Growth Plan and the related County of Simcoe Municipal Comprehensive Review Official Plan Amendment No. 7, albeit for a truncated period, in a strategic fashion. With the foregoing being said, we believe certain improvements to the Draft can and should be made, both site specific and in general.</p> <p>869 Hurontario Street and 7564 Poplar Sideroad are proposed to be designated Mixed Use Corridor I, which is found under the heading of Strategic Growth Areas on Schedule '2' but are not identified as a Strategic Growth Area on Schedule '1'. Further to this, we note that the lands on the west side of Hurontario Street and directly opposite to our site are proposed to be placed in the Strategic Growth Area on Schedule '1', with the only difference being that the lands on the west side are within the built boundary. We submit that if this is the reason for the difference that it is insufficient and is not supported by "good planning" policy.</p> <p>49 Huron Street</p> <p>The subject lands are currently and proposed to be placed in the Downtown Core land use designation. We submit that the continuation of this land use designation is inappropriate as this site is an anachronistic outlier to the remainder of the properties located within the Downtown Core as it is not within the Heritage District or the Business Improvement Area and not contiguous to the remainder of the Downtown Core and that it would better align with the Town's vision/direction, as well as Provincial policies regarding growth and intensification, by placing the subject lands in the Mixed Use Corridor I land use designation.</p> <p>Regarding the Downtown Core land use designation and the related policies, there appear to be several inconsistent or contradictory policies proposed that should be further explored/reviewed and clarified. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downtown Core height and density (FSI) policies appear to be inconsistent/contradictory – 5.3.1.1. to 5.3.1.3 • The majority of the Downtown Core policies appear to be focused on the Heritage District (see 5.3.1.3.1.3. e) and 5.3.1.4. i) and ii)) versus the entire proposed Downtown Core land use designation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 869 Hurontario Street and 7564 Poplar Sideroad be included within the Strategic Growth Area identified on Schedule '1'. 2. Retail outlets for the sale of alcoholic beverages be permitted at 869 Hurontario Street and 7564 Poplar Sideroad. 3. 49 Huron Street be placed in the Mixed Use Corridor I land use designation. 4. Policies related to the Downtown Core land use designation be reviewed from a policy consistency and clarity perspective (height and density); that the lands proposed to be included in the Downtown Core land use designation be reviewed in terms of appropriateness, underlying similarities, proximity, surrounding land use and desired built form perspective and the ability for the Town to achieve the required intensification and growth targets given the amount of land proposed to be placed in the Downtown Core land use designation 	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>869 Hurontario Street and 7564 Poplar Sideroad - Schedule 1 to be amended to include as Strategic Growth Area as a mapping correction. This is deemed to be a 'minor request' as it is aligned with the mixed use corridor approach.</p> <p>49 Huron Street - This is deemed to be a 'major request' which would require an Official Plan Amendment. This property already has policy support for residential and mixed use development.</p> <p>Policies will be reviewed for clarification.</p> <p>See staff report outlining how these requests fall within the major or minor categories determined by Council. Deletion of protectionist policies in the Official Plan related to banks, grocery stores, sale of alcoholic beverages, etc requires further study, which can be part of a site specific Official Plan Amendment or a comprehensive process led by the Town.</p>
14	<p>Christopher S. Assaff, B.COMM Vice-President</p> <p>Charis Developments Ltd. 49 Huron Street</p>	<p>The subject lands are located on the north side of Huron Street, east of Heritage Drive, and located in the Downtown Commercial Core land use designation and within the Waterfront Master Plan Study Area.</p> <p>The current Downtown Commercial Core land use designation permits residential uses with "higher density" in accordance with Section 4.3.2.7 (High Density), which permits a maximum density of 120 units per gross hectare. Further, this land use designation allows for the "fullest and most diverse range of commercial activities (Section 4.4.4.1), which we continue to support. The Waterfront Master Plan identifies the subject lands ("D") as a key mixed-use opportunity (Page 11) and recommends that priority be given to views over the Fens.</p> <p>The Downtown and Waterfront Discussion Paper indicates that: "there is an opportunity to encourage higher density residential development within and in proximity to the downtown, increasing the downtown population. Providing more opportunities for residents to live within or near the downtown provides stronger support for local businesses, makes more efficient use of existing and future infrastructure, supports the use of active transportation, creates opportunities for shared investment in the public realm and contributes to the creation of more dynamic main streets. Higher density residential development may be accommodated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouraging mixed use development and redevelopment with upper storey residential and office uses; and, • Continuing to support the development of freestanding residential buildings in the downtown." 	<p>49 Huron Street - This property already has policy support for residential and mixed use development in the existing and proposed Downtown Core land use designation. Request for further changes is considered to be 'major', requiring an Official Plan Amendment, supported by appropriate justification.</p>

		<p>As significant portions of the waterfront are pre-planned (Shipyards), and most of the downtown is located within or adjacent to the Heritage Conservation District ("HCD"), it is submitted that the Town's ability to achieve a strategic objective of providing additional density downtown or within the waterfront is somewhat challenged. It should be noted that the subject lands are located outside of the HCD.</p> <p>The Town's Waterfront Master Plan identified development opportunities and noted: "There is a significant amount of land in the central waterfront area that is privately owned and designated for a range of uses. As part of the Waterfront Master Plan, the opportunity exists to ensure that future waterfront development is in keeping with the overall waterfront vision, including a focus on increasing vibrancy on the waterfront through mixed-use development."</p> <p>Given the subject lands are distant to the HCD and are an ideal location to contemplate a higher density, it is submitted that the subject lands should, as a minimum, be placed in a land use designation that provides for a density of up to 200 units per gross hectare and/or a floor space index of up to 4.0. By doing this, the Town will be providing for intensification that is easily serviceable by infrastructure and public transit, is within walking distance of numerous Town services and amenities and provides for additional commercial uses as well as provide for a critical mass of population to contribute to Collingwood as a complete community.</p> <p>It is submitted that our request to enhance the Official Plan Commercial Core policies as they relate to 49 Huron Street to facilitate a mixed-use development with an increased density of up to 200 units per gross hectare and/or a floor space index of up to 4.0 would align policies and approaches related to sustainability and intensification found in many Town documents.</p>	
15	<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>Please be advised that Charis Developments Ltd. is the owner of the subject lands and that the purpose of this submission is to request that the Official Plan Update consider eliminating the prohibited uses within the Highway Commercial land use designation at Section 4.4.8.1 of the Town's Official Plan that apply to a portion of 839 Hurontario Street and to 869 Hurontario Street. We further request that 7564 Poplar Sideroad, being the abutting 2.0 acre vacant parcel to the east, currently designated Residential, be redesignated Highway Commercial.</p> <p>The subject lands are located at the north-east corner of Hurontario Street and Poplar Sideroad and are in Highway Commercial (portion of 839 Hurontario Street and 869 Hurontario Street) and Residential (7564 Poplar Sideroad) land use designations.</p> <p>This 8.75 acre site, which is situated at the intersection of two major roads, is well positioned to serve not only the travelling public but also serve the new residential neighbourhoods that have and will be developed adjacent to and near the site. It is noted that this is the only site large enough to develop a "Neighbourhood Shopping Centre" in the south end of Collingwood.</p> <p>With a direct connection to the Hamilton Drain Trail, and to the remainder of the Town's trail system, The Gateway Shopping Centre would significantly enhance the "Active Transportation and Sustainability" efforts of the community and would address the shopping needs of the residents of the south end of Town and those within the broader trade area. These residents currently must drive to the north or west end of Town, or to other communities, for their daily shopping needs and thereby adding traffic congestion and parking challenges to these areas.</p> <p>Prohibited Uses in the Highway Commercial Land Use Designation Currently, the Highway Commercial land use designation provides for highway commercial uses, which generally require larger floor areas and land areas which cannot be provided in the Downtown Core, and orientation and accommodation for vehicular traffic. Our request to eliminate the prohibited uses found at Section 4.4.8.1 is consistent with the summary findings contained within the Official Plan Update Options and Recommendations Report Fall 2020: "In order to support residential growth and ensure that neighbourhoods develop as complete communities, commercial uses should be more broadly allowed." (Page 3)</p> <p>Section 4.4.8.1 identifies prohibited uses in the Highway Commercial land use designation, uses that people typically desire in their local neighbourhoods and preferably within a few minutes' walk. It is our opinion that the Town's policies restricting the location of these uses is a disservice to the local and trade area residents, especially with the projected growth for the Town. Allowances for these uses in the ever growing south-end of Town should be provided for, specifically on the subject lands. As noted above, this is consistent with the findings contained within the Official Plan Update Options and Recommendations Report Fall 2020.</p> <p>It is submitted that the Official Plan policies for the site should provide for a diverse range of commercial uses to facilitate the development of a neighbourhood shopping centre.</p> <p>Residentially Designated Lands The 2.0 acre residentially designated portion of the subject lands is inappropriate for residential use as it is an awkward configuration for development. It is submitted that it would be better utilized as part of the abutting commercial development and, as such, a commercial designation is requested for the parcel.</p>	<p>The Highway Commercial designation has been replaced with a mixed-use designation which provides for an appropriate mix of residential and retail and service commercial land uses.</p> <p>It is expected that an appropriate transition to existing low-rise residential uses will be established.</p>
16	<p>Krystin Rennie, MAES MCIP RPP Georgian Planning Solutions</p> <p>32 Oak Street</p>	<p>The current owners purchased the property to develop a Mixed use commercial and residential development. A Site Plan Approval application has been submitted and has been through the first submission review.</p> <p>The subject lands are currently designated, in the existing Official Plan, Mixed Use Commercial. We would like clarification that the DRAFT Official Plan Schedule 1 has included this property with the Strategic Growth Areas and that on Schedule 2 the property is designated Mixed Use Corridor II.</p> <p>We would request that for greater certainty, that a transition policy be inserted into the Updated Official Plan, which clearly states this transition provision in order to avoid any interpretation discrepancy in the future. An example of such a policy was recently approved in the New City of Barrie Official Plan which included such a transition policy which can be used as an example, it reads as follows:</p> <p>City of Barrie Official Plan 2051 – Council Adopted Version February 15, 2022 2.5.7 Existing Applications a) Applications deemed complete prior to the approval of this Plan by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing may continue towards final approval under the policy framework in place at the time the Notice of Complete Application was issued. This would include any subsequent implementing approvals.</p>	<p>The next DRAFT Official Plan has adjusted the limits of the Strategic Growth Area and Mixed Use Corridor designation to generally be consistent with the current Official Plan Mixed Use Commercial designation.</p> <p>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>

17	<p>Krystin Rennie, MAES MCIP RPP Georgian Planning Solutions</p> <p>103 & 123 Eleventh Line.</p>	<p>The subject lands are currently designated, in the existing Official Plan, as Residential and Mountain Road Corridor Secondary Plan. The DRAFT Official Plan Schedule 1 – Growth Management- is proposing to designate the majority of the property to Greenlands Systems and a portion of the property Residential Communities. Schedule 2 - Land Use Plan - designates the property as mostly Environmental Protection with a small portion of Future Neighbourhood. This is a significant change from the current Official Plan designation.</p> <p>These new Environmental Protection Areas that have been identified on Schedules 1, 2 & 3 of the DRAFT Updated OP that are not identified today. Can the Town and the Project Team clarify what background work and methodology lead to these additional areas being identified as Environmental Protection Areas.</p>	<p>In accordance with Provincial policy, it is a requirement that the Town identify and protect from the impacts of development all significant natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions. To this end, the Town retained a fully qualified environmental scientist who utilized the most up-to-date information to establish the Environmental Protection Designation and the Adjacent Lands Overlay that are identified on various schedules included in the DRAFT Official Plan. That work is provided in Discussion Paper 5 and relevant mapping will be added as an Appendix to the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Importantly, the policy framework included within the Environmental Protection Designation Section of the DRAFT Official Plan (see Section 5.6.1) does provide the opportunity to adjust the boundaries of that designation (through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study), and deals specifically with circumstances related to existing uses and structures, as well as existing development approvals.</p> <p>The next DRAFT of the Official Plan will consider providing an additional specific policy that deals with existing lots of record. That policy may identify the permission for the development of the property, subject to a number of criteria that may include a requirement for frontage on a public road, the ability to accommodate, or connect to appropriate sewer and water facilities and a requirement to conform with the regulations of the implementing Zoning By-law. If a rezoning is required, it would need to be supported by an Environmental Impact Statement.</p>
18	<p>Krystin Rennie, MAES MCIP RPP Georgian Planning Solutions</p> <p>11555 Highway 26</p>	<p>The subject lands are located at 11555 Highway 26 and are referred as the Greentree property. Recently an Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment application was submitted to support the proposed Draft Plan of Condominium for a mixed-use development containing both commercial and residential units.</p> <p>The subject lands are currently designated in the existing Official Plan as Highway Commercial, Recreation and Environmental Protection. The proposed amendment to the Official Plan is to designate a portion of the property from Recreation to Medium Density Residential and to refine the boundaries of the Environmental Protection area based on the conclusions of the Environmental Impact Study that was prepared in support of the proposed amendments. We would suggest that for greater certainty, that a transition policy be included in the Updated Official Plan,</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan Schedule 1 – Growth Management is proposing to designate the majority of the property to Greenlands Systems. Based on the current submission to the town and discussions with Town Staff through the pre-consultation process we think that the property should be designated as Strategic Growth Area. This would be consistent with the surrounding lands uses.</p> <p>Schedule 2 designates the property as Mixed Use Corridor II and Parks and Open Spaces. Based on the current proposal we suggest that the entire property be redesignated to the Mixed Use Corridor II designation. The fine tuning of the development area can be determined through our Official Plan Amendment approval process.</p> <p>It is understood that active planning applications that were deemed complete by the Town prior to the date the Updated Official Plan eventually comes into force and effect would continue to be considered and assessed under the policies of the then previous Official Plan which were in effect at the time the application(s) were deemed complete.</p> <p>A question related to draft plan extensions and not permitting an extension of a Draft Plan Approval for more than a cumulative or single 3 year period. (Policy 7.1.5.1 i) ii. Many instances occur that can delay the registration of a subdivision that are completely beyond the Owner’s control and they should not be penalized for that, a recent example being the water capacity-related interim control by-law.</p> <p>Policy 5.1.2 a) i) identifies – 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. Clarification is requested to better understand what is meant by providing opportunities to enhance a feature.</p>	<p>This site is subject to an ongoing official plan amendment application that propose to update the existing site specific land use designations on the site. The first DRAFT Official Plan proposed the Mixed Use Corridor II designation for those lands subject to the site specific exception. The next DRAFT Official Plan mapping could be refined to reflect the ongoing amendment application, if approved.</p> <p>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>Draft Plan approval extensions are not being offered for more than 3 years, which is consistent with the Town's Servicing Capacity Allocation policy (SCAP). Policy to remain, flexibility for extenuating circumstances exists.</p> <p>It is a requirement to "protect" features and functions. The DRAFT Official Plan is looking for opportunities to "enhance" the feature/system to improve environmental health and stewardship throughout the Town. Enhance means to increase or further improve the good quality of the feature/system.</p>
19	<p>Krystin Rennie, MAES MCIP RPP Georgian Planning Solutions</p> <p>560, 580 & 590 Sixth Street</p>	<p>Recently an Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment application was submitted to support the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision for a mixed-use development containing townhouse dwellings and two multi-unit residential buildings.</p> <p>The subject lands are currently designated in the existing Official Plan as Residential Medium and High Density. The proposed amendment to the Official Plan is to designate a portion of the property from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential.</p> <p>The DRAFT Official Plan Schedule 1 – Growth Management is proposing to designate the property Residential Communities.</p> <p>It is understood that active planning applications that were deemed complete by the Town prior to the date the Updated Official Plan eventually comes into force and effect would continue to be considered and assessed under the policies of the then previous Official Plan which were in effect at the time the application(s) were deemed complete. We would suggest that for greater certainty, that a transition policy be included in the Updated Official Plan,</p> <p>A question related to draft plan extensions and not permitting an extension of a Draft Plan Approval for more than a cumulative or single 3 year period. (Policy 7.1.5.1 i) ii. Many instances occur that can delay the registration of a subdivision that are completely beyond the Owner’s control and they should not be penalized for that, a recent example being the water capacity-related interim control by-law.</p>	<p>This site is subject to an ongoing official plan amendment application.</p> <p>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>Draft Plan approval extensions are not being offered for more than 3 years, which is consistent with the Town's Servicing Capacity Allocation policy (SCAP). Policy to remain, flexibility for extenuating circumstances exists.</p>

20	<p>MacNaughton Hermesen Britton Clarkson (MHBC)</p> <p>on behalf of Crestpoint Real Estate (Blue Mountain) Inc. ("Owners")</p> <p>2 and 6 Old Mountain Road, and 5, 7 and 15 Balsam Street in the Town of Collingwood - Blue Mountains Centre</p>	<p>d) There is typographical error in policy 5.3.4.5.b wherein the policy has been transcribed from the in effect Official Plan and continues to identify Area "F" as Area "A". This highlights the perpetuation of policies that were developed two decades ago and that do not reflect today's market conditions.</p> <p>Recommendation 5: s.5.3.4.3.e.ii Land Use/Built-Form Specific Policies: Building Heights Regarding the requirement to have two storeys as a minimum building height is supported for new development on vacant lands, a policy should be added that allows for additions/expansions to existing buildings, and redevelopment of additional commercial buildings of one (1) storey where feasible.</p> <p>Recommendation 6: s. 5.3.4.5.b and Schedule 7 – Area Specific Policies Request the removal of the Subject Lands from Area "F" on Schedule 7 as the lands are within a Strategic Growth Area. These policies were developed over two decades ago and in an era of on-line shopping, maintaining minimum unit sizes and maximum gross leasable areas are not relevant in today's retail market. The intent of this area, according to policy 4.3 Intensification in the Designated Built-Up Area, envisions annual intensification where 50% of residential growth is to occur within a mixed use area. The list of permitted uses within 5.3.4.2 should suffice to provide the range of commercial uses that are required to meet local and regional demand.</p> <p>Recommendation 7: Development Review Section 5.1.2 Development Review represents implementation and operational matters of the Town rather than land use designations. The section should be moved to Section 7 Implementation and Interpretation.</p>	<p>Typographical error to be changed in next DRAFT Official Plan.</p> <p>Agree. Wording change to be implemented.</p> <p>Most of this policy framework is a carry-forward from the EXISTING Official Plan and is proposed to remain in place. The opportunity for a subsequent Official Plan Amendment (either site specific or comprehensively led by the Town), supported by a retail/commercial study will be added to the policy.</p> <p>This will be considered in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p>
21	<p>Mark Eplett</p> <p>Bluerock Developments</p>	<p>Further to review of the latest proposed new Official Plan the following are our comments regarding the designation proposed for the 40 Acre Gateway property fronting Highway 26, Poplar Side Road and Sixth Line. We still feel the Best Use for this Gateway Property is Mixed Use. This area could very well help the Municipality bring Sustainable Affordable Development with employment uses and needs being met as well.</p> <p>Most. Industrial growth is going to Bradford, Innisfil and Barrie Highway 400 corridor. As we communicated to Staff and the Official Plan Team at the beginning of the OP review process a designation of Mixed Use would be best for this property. We look forward to working together to develop this Gateway Property into a useable and beneficial development for Collingwood and the Region.</p>	<p>This is one of few remaining vacant employment areas in the Town, and these lands were not identified for conversion for any other use in the County's Municipal Comprehensive Review. As such, no change proposed at this time.</p>
22	<p>David Finbow</p> <p>Land Development & Building Code Consulting</p> <p>on behalf of Richard Thomson Tennis School</p> <p>255 Osler Bluff Road</p>	<p>CURRENT OFFICIAL PLAN The current OP designates the subject lands as Recreation</p> <p>ZONING BY-LAW NO. 2010-40 The current Zoning By-law places the subject lands in a REC-1 Zone with same permitting: A private tennis teaching facility and four (4) temporary accommodation units for the facility's staff shall also be permitted. All development shall be serviced with a municipal water supply system. This permission permits a private indoor and/or outdoor tennis facility along with four (4) accommodation units for the facility's staff provided development is serviced by a municipal water supply system.</p> <p>FIRST DRAFT OF THE OP UPDATE The first draft of the OP Update proposes to redesignate the subject lands to the Parks and Open Space land use designation with this land use designation proposing to substantially change the permitted uses for the subject lands with the removal of public and private indoor recreational uses. Further, the first draft further restricts accessory buildings and structures and uses: <i>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.</i></p> <p>In short, the proposed land use designation would remove the currently permitted indoor recreational uses, be they permanent or seasonal, and remove and/or restrict currently permitted accessory building, structures and uses permissions. Further, we note that a site specific policy is not proposed to support the long-standing use of the subject lands and the current REC-1 permissions contained in the Town's Zoning By-law.</p>	<p>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>It is not appropriate to tailor the Official Plan to accommodate a site specific Zoning permission. However, Parks and Open Space designation should permit private recreation facilities as well. Policies to be clarified in next DRAFT Official Plan.</p>
		<p>The removal of the current indoor/outdoor recreational uses and activities would eliminate the possibility of a year round recreational facility on the subject lands, which we submit would not be consistent with the broader vision and needs of the Town and its residents. Further, the current policy direction could be extremely problematic in terms of continuing the owner's long term vision for the lands, which are entrenched in the current Zoning By-law, with an expected Zoning By-law update exercise.</p> <p>Given the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A land use designation be created for private recreational lands that would continue the current permissions in the OP for private outdoor and indoor recreational uses, buildings, and structures, and uses accessory thereto, with the inclusion of a site specific exception for the subject lands that would entrench the historic use of the subject lands as well as those permissions contained in the REC-1 Zone under the Zoning By-law. <p>Or,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site specific exception to the Parks and Open Space land use designation be developed for the subject lands that would permit private outdoor and indoor recreational uses, buildings, and structures, and uses accessory thereto, with the inclusion of a site specific exception that would entrench the historic use of the subject lands as well as those permissions contained in the REC-1 Zone under the Zoning By-law. 	
23	<p>Owen Gray</p> <p>Trails of Collingwood</p>	<p>After reviewing the Draft, I was wondering about a property in particular that looks from Schedules 1 and 2 to be slated for a future neighbourhood. I'm referring to the property at the West end of Cameron Street. Will that natural area be developed into housing eventually as part of this plan? Will the existing trail network be preserved? Will the existing stormwater pond be preserved? Is there plans to extend Cameron Street itself all the way to High Street in the transportation plan? I teach elementary school at the nearby Cameron Street Public School and often bring students to this area to learn about nature and teach students about the value of forests for our health and the health of our local community and global community. I would be very sad to see this property turned into housing, and I know many students to come would miss out too as this is the only 'nearby nature' that is walking distance from our school grounds. Is there any way this property could instead become part of the "Greenlands System" or be protected going forward as a natural area? It already adjoins nicely to the existing Greenlands on the West side of High Street I see on the map.</p>	<p>This property is subject to a draft approved plan of subdivision, known as the Trails of Collingwood. Some active transportation infrastructure will be maintained, with Cameron Street being extended to High Street.</p>

<p>24</p>	<p>Justin Sharp IBI Group</p> <p>on behalf of Sanjaykumar Patel 11493 Highway 26</p>	<p>Current Official Plan Policy Framework Under the current Town of Collingwood Official Plan (OP), the subject site is designated as Residential on Schedule A.</p> <p>Draft 1 of the New Official Plan – Proposed Framework IBI Group understands that Town of Collingwood Draft OP proposes to re-designate the subject site from Residential to Major Institutional, as shown on Schedule '2' Land Use Plan. The subject site will also be located within a Strategic Growth Area as per Schedule '1' Growth Management Plan.</p> <p>Growth Management Plan The client is content that the Town of Collingwood has designated the subject site as being within a Strategic Growth Area. As per Section 5.3, Strategic Growth Area, these areas are expected to intensify over time and include an appropriate mixture of residential, retail, service commercial, and office uses.</p> <p>The permitted uses for lands designated Major Institutional are limited to large-scale public service facilities that include secondary schools, post-secondary education, hospitals, large-scale special needs housing, and large-scale places of worship – with accessory residential uses being permitted. While the client appreciates the intent of the Major Institutional land use designation, clarification is being requested as to why the subject site is being re-designated to this land use. Additionally, given that the site is located within a Strategic Growth Area, it is IBI Group's opinion that the existing Residential land use designation is appropriate and would help achieve the goals of the Draft OP.</p> <p>Based on our preliminary review of the Draft OP, IBI Group on behalf of the client is supportive of the subject site being within a Strategic Growth Area, as it would allow for the future intensification of land and help support a complete community in proximity to transit. In our opinion, however, the of Institutional Designation doesn't align with proper general intent of a Strategic Growth Area. The client has concerns with the proposed re-designation of the subject site to Major Institutional as this would remove existing residential use permissions currently afforded to the subject site under the in-effect OP and does not appear to be in keeping with the objectives of the Draft OP or provincial direction. Major Institutional uses are often singular in nature and can become quite land intensive. A more appropriate fit for a Strategic Growth Area would be residential of an appropriate typology and density in order to support the growth and intensification objective.</p> <p>Clarification is also requested as to the impetus of this proposed change. As such, IBI Group on behalf of the client politely requests that the existing Residential land use designation for the subject site under the in-effect OP is carried forward and reflected in future Drafts of the New Official Plan.</p>	<p>Mapping discrepancy to be dealt with such that Schedule 1 is to be revised to be in conformity with Schedule 2. The subject property is to be designated Environmental Protection and Existing Neighbourhood.</p>
<p>25</p>	<p>Innovative Planning Solutions Greg Barker, B.A.A. Partner</p> <p>2204604 Ontario Inc Regional Commercial District lands 20 High Street</p>	<p>20 High Street, also known as the Regional Commercial District (RCD) lands. It is noted that the subject lands currently possess draft plan approval for future commercial and industrial development; original approval was granted in 2016 and an extension to draft plan approval was granted on June 3, 2021 with a revised lapsing date of June 29th, 2024. The lands are currently draft plan approved to create a series of blocks which would be subject to individual site plan control applications.</p> <p>Understanding the ongoing County of Simcoe Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) process, it is unclear why the DOP does not plan for a 2051 horizon in conformity with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Further, it is understood that the population targets established are minimums, however the Town will have to amend the DOP once the MCR process is finalized which can be challenging, unless the DOP is approved following the MCR.</p> <p>The Town of Collingwood DOP designates the RCD lands as being within the Strategic Growth Area and part Employment Area per Schedule 1. The lands are further identified as being within the Regional Commercial District (lands within the Strategic Growth Area) and Prestige Employment (lands within the Employment Area) per Schedule 2. Portions of the lands contain the Adjacent Lands overlay, per Schedule 3.</p> <p>Value 2 Support a Flexible Approach to Economic Development - In our opinion the policies relating to the RCD lands do not reflect this Value of a flexible approach to economic development, specifically, but not limited to the following policies which prohibit certain commercial uses (Section 5.3.4.5 (j) and (o).</p> <p>Value 6 Provide a Full Range and Mix of Land Uses and Value 7 Provide a Full Range and Mix of Housing Opportunities - In our opinion the policies relating to the RCD lands do not reflect these values to the extent possible. The RCD policies permit Residential Apartments (5.3.4.2), however they prohibit stand alone residential buildings (5.3.4.3 f). These policies do not permit a full range or mix of residential uses, despite being within a strategic growth area, nor do the policies permit a range and mix of housing types to households across the income spectrum. It is our opinion that a wider range of residential uses, including stand alone residential uses be permitted on the RCD lands...</p> <p>Section 3 Policy 3.1 (b) provides: A Successful Community recognizes existing historic land use patterns and development trends and builds upon these patterns and trends... 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 in the area. In our opinion the maintenance of these restrictive policies conflict with Section 3.1 (b) which is intended to build upon historic patterns to promote land use changes that will stimulate economic growth.</p>	<p>Will be planning to 2051 horizon in Draft #2.</p> <p>Value 2 - Noted and disagree.</p> <p>Value 6 - Noted and disagree. This area is primarily commercial, and residential uses have been added to provide for mixed use opportunities, but not stand-alone residential. Proposed mixed use opportunities are intended to stimulate growth here by introducing higher-density residential permissions.</p> <p>As noted, much of the policy framework for the RCD is maintained from the EXISTING Official Plan, with the very notable exception of the introduction of residential permissions in a mixed-use format. The retail restrictions will be maintained. The opportunity for a subsequent Official Plan Amendment, supported by a retail/commercial study will be identified in the policies.</p>

	<p>Section 3.2 (a) provides that the Town shall encourage a mix and range of market-based housing types, styles, tenures and affordability characteristics to meet the needs of a growing and diverse population. The RCD lands which are located in a strategic growth area are limited to only mixed use apartments; in our opinion there is an opportunity for the RCD lands to accommodate a much wider range of housing types, styles, tenures and affordability characteristics while minimizing potential impact on surrounding lands and relieving development pressures within established neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Section 3.3 (b) relates to the diversification of commercial uses, including identifying that the lands designated for commercial and mixed use development will provide a sufficient supply of land to accommodate a complete range of commercial goods and services to foster competition and choice for residents and visitors to the Town and surrounding communities. While the RCD lands permit a range of commercial type uses, it is our opinion that the various restrictions maintained in terms of prohibited uses, unit sizes etc conflicts with Section 3.3 (b).</p> <p>Section 4.1 (a) provides residential population growth for the DOP. Clarification is requested relating to the population projections and where they were derived from. The County of Simcoe MCR process indicates a population forecast of 42,690 by 2051 (per May 31, 2022 Hemson Memo). Section 4.3 (c) (i) provides that Residential intensification opportunities, as well as opportunities for new population related employment opportunities (retail and service commercial uses, institutional uses and office uses) will be primarily accommodated within the Strategic Growth Areas. In our opinion 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. Collectively the many policies/restrictions applying to the RCD lands, in our opinion has the effect of preventing residential uses from occurring, thus increasing development pressures throughout the Town.</p> <p>Section 5.3.4 provides the policy framework for the Regional Commercial District Designation, noting the intent of the plan is that the area further evolves as a mixed-use centre that includes residential uses. In our opinion the following RCD policies should be revised to facilitate and implement this intent for a mixed use centre more directly, and specifically allow for stand alone residential uses which would still have the effect of creating a mixed-use centre when considering the entirety of the RCD designated lands...Further, it is our opinion that a broader range of residential uses be permitted on the RCD lands and would appreciate the opportunity to meet with the Town to discuss this in greater detail.</p>	<p>The RCD sites are not considered appropriate for stand-alone and lower density residential uses - the DRAFT Official Plan provides for ample opportunity for those uses elsewhere in the community (i.e. Existing and Future Neighbourhoods).</p> <p>The policies do allow for a broad range of commercial uses.</p> <p>Population forecasts were for Discussion Paper 1, prepared by The Planning Partnership and UrbanMetrics. 2051 will be used in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan in accordance with the County of Simcoe's Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p> <p>The RCD is not considered appropriate for stand-alone high-density residential. This is the last remaining area in the community to host larger floor plate commercial uses, which are anticipated to be required in the long-term. It should not be eroded by standalone residential which is permitted in other areas of the community.</p> <p>See comments above.</p>
	<p>Section 5.3.4.3 (a) provides that new development in the RCD will be planned in a comprehensive manner and continues to state that larger sites may be required to prepare a Secondary Plan... It is unclear where there is any further reference to which "Larger Sites may be required to prepare a Secondary Plan as identified in this Plan". Clarification is requested as to where the larger sites are referenced.</p> <p>Section 5.3.4.3 Subsection (d) provides policies relating to minimum retail unit sizes and notes that the Town shall implement minimum unit sizes for retail commercial establishments in the Regional Commercial District Designation within the Zoning Bylaw, which is an appropriate approach, however the DOP continues to provide for minimum retail unit sizes – 5.3.4.5 (c) (i, ii, iii), (g), (i)(i,ii) (n)(i, ii). In our opinion these minimum retail unit sizes are better captured in a Zoning bylaw and not in the Official Plan, as per Section 5.3.4.3 (d).</p> <p>Section 5.3.4.3 Subsection (e) the following building height policies apply within the Regional Commercial District Designation: i. All development shall incorporate a minimum floor to ceiling height of the ground floor of 4.25 metres; and, ii. The minimum building height shall be 2 storeys, or 8.0 metres, whichever is greater. Based on the above, clarification is requested relating to permitted minimum building height as mid rise buildings require 3 storeys (5.1.8.2). Further, the RCD designation permits many uses which may not require more than one storey of height, such as a day care, or restaurant. It is recommended that this policy be removed; alternatively should be captured in the Town's zoning bylaw.</p> <p>Section 5.3.4.3 Subsection (f) relates to a mix of uses. It is our opinion that the prohibition of stand alone residential uses effectively will prevent the implementation of any residential uses within the RCD lands.</p> <p>Clarification is requested relative to subsection (h), specifically what would be considered "major new development".</p> <p>Section 5.3.4.4 provides Design Policies for lands designated RCD including subsection (a) which provides that development within the Regional Commercial District Designation is intended to be transit supportive, as well as to incorporate the Active Transportation Network. It is our opinion that the allowing a range and mix of stand alone residential uses within this designation will have the effect of creating a more transit supportive area, particularly active transportation given the proximity to commercial amenities and employment lands in the area. We would request further discussion with the Town on this in greater detail.</p> <p>Section 5.3.4.5 Area Specific Policies. The Subject lands generally comprise Area H and Area I. Subsection (d) makes reference to Area A – should be Area F. Subsection (h) makes reference to Area B – should be Area G. Clarification is requested on subsection (i) that the uses listed are in addition to the uses listed in Section 5.3.4.2. There is a reference to Area C, should be Area H.</p>	<p>This is a carry-over policy and will be reviewed.</p> <p>These are carry-over policies and the retail protections are to be maintained. The opportunity for a subsequent Official Plan Amendment, supported by a retail/commercial study will be identified in the policies.</p> <p>Flexibility to be included in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Understood. See comments above.</p> <p>The determination of what is major vs. what is minor is to be determined by staff at the time of an application.</p> <p>Understood. See comments above.</p> <p>Typographic error rectified. Remembering to watch new Schedule.</p>

		<p>Subsection (i), (i) & (ii) provide, in our opinion overly restrictive policies which in our opinion should be zoning provisions. There is a reference to Area C which should be Area H.</p> <p>Subsection (j) lists a number of prohibited uses which in our opinion are not justified, particularly in light of Value 2 and Section 3.3 (b). Further clarification is requested relative to the policy which permits smaller retailers may be permitted subject to specific conditions – no further specific conditions are identified. Would an OPA be required to permit a smaller retailer? Subsection (k) makes reference to Area C – should be Area H</p> <p>Clarification is requested for subsection (m) which provides All of the other permitted land uses and associated policies including within this Section the this Plan shall be applicable to lands within the Regional Commercial District Designation that are delineated as Area C (*should be area H) South Expansion Lands. It is unclear what is meant by this policy and what "Section" is being referred to. Within Section 5.3.4.5? Area H Section, or Section 5.3.4?</p> <p>Clarification is requested on subsection (n) that the uses listed are in addition to the uses listed in Section 5.3.4.2. There is a reference to Area D, should be Area I.</p> <p>Subsection (n), (i) & (ii) provide, in our opinion overly restrictive policies which in our opinion should be zoning provisions. There is a reference to Area D which should be Area I.</p> <p>Subsection (o) lists a number of prohibited uses which in our opinion are not justified, particularly in light of Value 2 and Section 3.3 (b). We question the justification for maintaining these prohibited uses.</p> <p>Subsection (p) makes reference to Areas D and C – we would request the Town update/clarify these references.</p> <p>Subsection (q) makes reference to Area D – should be Area I. Further, this subsection indicates that Area D (I) shall not be zoned to a commercial category until Council has considered and approved studies prepared and submitted in accordance with the policies of this Plan. It is noted that these lands (Area I) are already zoned in a commercial category. Clarification is requested on the purpose and intent of this policy.</p> <p>Clarification is requested for subsection (r) which provides All of the other permitted land uses and associated policies including within this Section the this Plan shall be applicable to lands within the Regional Commercial District Designation that are delineated as Area D (*should be area H) Third Street Extension. It is unclear what is meant by this policy and what "Section" is being referred to. Within Section 5.3.4.5? Area H Section, or Section 5.3.4?</p>	<p>Yes, an Official Plan Amendment, supported by a retail/commercial study, among other studies to be required.</p>
		<p>Section 5.4 Employment Areas – a portion of the subject lands are within the Employment Area designation (Prestige Employment) as per Schedule 2. We would request the consideration of including these lands within the RCD designation in light of the functional considerations, specifically that they are functionally disconnected from the existing adjacent employment areas (ie no road connection) and are connected with the RCD designation. Their inclusion would round out the RCD lands and eliminate any potential conflicting land uses.</p> <p>Section 5.6 Natural Heritage System. It is important to note that the subject lands have existing draft plan approval. In our opinion the DOP should include policies which recognize existing development approvals moving forward and could establish site specific policies to recognize such approvals.</p> <p>Section 5.6.2.3 General Development Policies - Adjacent Lands Overlay extends onto the westerly portions of the subject lands. Subsection (a) indicates that the Town SHALL require that an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) be prepared for development, redevelopment and/or site alteration is proposed within the Adjacent Lands Overlay. In our opinion the word SHALL should be replaced with MAY, which is consistent with Section 5.6.2.2 (a) which allows for certain development subject to the results of an EIS when required by the Town. In our opinion the term MAY rather than SHALL will provide the Town flexibility on a site specific basis to require an EIS.</p> <p>Clarification is requested relating to Section 5.6.3.4 (a)(i) which indicates that a Functional Servicing Plan (FSP) shall be required in conjunction with all future development applications within Black Ash Creek sub-watershed as delineated on Schedule 3. We are unable to identify the delineation of Black Ash Creek sub-watershed on Schedule 3.</p> <p>Section 6 - Transportation, Municipal Service Infrastructure, and Utilities. Section 6.1.2 (b) indicates the Transportation System is delineated on Schedule 5 and 6. Upon review of these schedules, two separate transportation systems are identified, one for Future Trail/Trail Improvements (Schedule 5) the other for future collector (Schedule 6). In our opinion it may be appropriate to align these transportation corridors to allow for a more efficient movement of both people and vehicles.</p> <p>Section 4.1 (d) makes reference to the ongoing County of Simcoe Official Plan update and that the Town will amend their Official Plan to conform to the County Plan once the County Plan is finalized. Accordingly, it is our opinion that Section 7.1.2.1 should include a policy that reflects this requirement to update the Town Official Plan upon final approval of the County of Simcoe Official Plan update.</p>	<p>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>The flexibility is provided through the opportunity for the Town to scope the EIS.</p> <p>Schedule 3 has been updated in teh next DRAFT Official Plan to identify watershed boundaries in accordance with Discussion Paper 5.</p> <p>Future transportation infrastructure improvements will updated based on the upcoming Transportation Master Plan. Schedules have been updated to reflect infrastructure approved in the Town's Cycling Plan, Active Transportation Framework, and Transportation Study Update.</p> <p>Will consider, however, the current County Official Plan Amendment 7 is fundamentally linked to growth management and has been adopted. The future role of the County Official Plan is not understood at this time.</p>
<p>26</p>	<p>Davies Howe Mark R. Flowers on behalf of Blake and Rita Wallace 60 Mariners Haven</p>	<p>Our clients have a particular concern with the proposed identification of a north-south "Future Trail/Trail Improvements" on Schedule 5 – Active Transportation Plan of the Draft OP that is located in the area of the western boundary of the Mariners Haven lands, extending roughly from Black Ash Creek to just north of Harbour Street East (the "Proposed Trail").</p> <p>By way of context, Schedule D1 – Collingwood Trail System of the current, in-force Town Official Plan (the "Current OP") identifies a "Pedestrian Trail (Future)" in this area running east-west along Black Ash Creek and north-south immediately east of Balsam Street between Black Ash Creek and Harbour Street East (the "Future Trail").</p> <p>It is unclear what has prompted the Town to propose to shift the location of the Future Trail eastward from Balsam Street, as reflected in the Current OP, to what appears to be roughly the western boundary of the Mariners Haven lands, as shown in the Draft OP. Consequently, we hereby request that the Town provide us with copies of all documents supporting the proposed relocation of the Future Trail to the location of the Proposed Trail.</p> <p>Among other things, our clients have identified potential privacy and safety concerns, as well as potential interference with existing property interests and/or a heavily treed area that exists near the western boundary of the Mariners Haven lands. We also note that the Proposed Trail does not connect to any other identified existing or future trail at its northern terminus.</p> <p>As a result, we request that Schedule 5 of the Draft OP be amended to remove the Proposed Trail.</p>	<p>The expected update to the Transportation Master Plan is to provide strategies for addressing localized problem areas within the context of the larger transportation network, as well as crafting policies both for effective management of the network as a whole - including future trail improvements.</p> <p>The Waterfront Master Plan indicates a proposed trail crossing the Black Ash Creek to meet with Harbour Street East in this location.</p>

27	<p>Kristine A. Loft BES BAA MCIP RPP Principal Loft Planning</p> <p>On behalf of Primont (Collingwood 100) Inc. 207 Osler Bluff Road</p>	<p>The subject lands are located on the east side of Osler Bluff Road south of Highway 26. The lands are flanked by Osler Bluff Road to the west, rural land to the north, Georgian Trail and Cranberry golf course development to the east and rural lands to the south.</p> <p>Primont (Collingwood 100) Inc., retained Neil Morris, Consulting Ecologist to assess the proposed Official Plan changes. Mr. Morris reviewed the proposed Official Plan changes and completed ground level surveillance in order to prepare an Ecological Land Classification map of the site. Mr. Morris has also provided an opinion on the differences between the proposed mapping and policy changes compared to the ground level surveillance ELC mapping.</p> <p>The lands are currently designated Rural and Environment Protection on Schedule A of the Official Plan. Schedule B to the Plan also identifies Category 2 Woodland, Category 1 Valleylands and is within the Schedule B Line. Schedule B1 identifies a tributary of the Silver Creek that traverses the lands in a north south direction.</p> <p>The mapping presented by Plan B Natural Heritage within the Discussion Paper: Greenland, the lands are more extensively mapped by the identified Natural Heritage Systems by nature of the single tiering. The Neil Morris, Consulting Ecologist has completed an on-site evaluation and as concluded that, "As currently proposed for the OP update, ~22 ha of woodland and ~9 ha of Cultural Thicket would be newly designated as Category 1 features within the Osler Bluff Property. The rationale and justification for the proposed changes in categorization is not known at this time.</p> <p>On behalf of Primont (Collingwood 100) Inc., we would ask that Mr. Morris's correspondence dated August 6 2021 (attached for your reference), be forwarded to Plan B Natural Heritage for incorporation/updating into the Greenland mapping for the site based on the ground truth data. In our opinion, the shifting from a Two-Tiered Approach to a Natural Heritage System (NHS) has a significant impact on the extent of the environmental constraints on the lands in conjunction with adjacent lands and included buffers.</p> <p>We would note that at the Town's Public Workshop regarding Greenlands, it was noted by the consultants that if landowners submitted Environmental Reports (subject to being up to date), there would be an opportunity to update the draft mapping with ground surveillance data, subject to review.</p>	<p>The environmental work needs to be appropriately peer reviewed by the Town prior to considering any mapping changes. The Town will need to accept the environmental work, in consultation with any other agency having jurisdiction.</p>
28	<p>Kristine A. Loft BES BAA MCIP RPP Principal Loft Planning</p> <p>On behalf of VMK Capital Inc. (Developer: Integricon Group) 11476 Highway 26</p>	<p>The site is located on the north side of Highway 26 in the westerly gateway to the Town of Collingwood. The lands have a lot area of 2.8 ha and a lot frontage of 160 metres. The lands are vacant and are located adjacent to Lighthouse Point. The lands are designated Residential in the Official Plan and are zoned Commercial (C3) in Town of Collingwood Zoning By-law. The Official Plan Residential Density Schedule further identifies the lands as Medium Density.</p> <p>Integricon is currently within the planning approvals stage of developing 11476 Highway 26. Integricon Group is proposing a residential development on site in the form of multi-floor condominium buildings. The site will have direct access from Highway 26. The development will be known as Glow Condominiums.</p> <p>...as part of the formal pre-consultation, the NVCA provided wetland mapping that was not previously included in the Official Plan policies/schedules. We are currently consulting with the NVCA to refine the mapping and establish the building envelope. LGL Environmental has been retained and has completed extensive field study and mapping which has now been provided to NVCA. NVCA is currently reviewing the LGL updated mapping and we should be received comments following an NVCA site visit earlier this week.</p> <p>We would ask that as this site-specific mapping becomes established/accepted by the NVCA, and in conjunction with the timing of the Official Plan – that this site-specific mapping be included within the Official Plan policies. It would be a considerable setback to Integricon, after working with the NVCA staff now since late 2020 – to have the new Official Plan mapping be a high-level mapping exercise rather than using the most current site-specific data.</p>	<p>The environmental work needs to be appropriately peer reviewed by the Town prior to considering any mapping changes. The Town will need to accept the environmental work, in consultation with any other agency having jurisdiction.</p>
29	<p>Vincent Maffei 85 Toner Street</p>	<p>Please accept this E-Mail as our Re-Submission to our OPPOSITION to have our Property, namely 85 Toner Street, (85), (Approx. 30 Acres in area situate in the Town of Collingwood), included in the Land Use Designation "NATURAL HERITAGE SYSTEM", in the current Update to the Town of Collingwood's (Town) Official Plan.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was conducted and prepared for on (85) circa 2019, by our Consultant Ecologist, Mr. Neil Morris, in conjunction with the express requirements to include therein, established by the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority, (NVCA) and the Town. On completion, the EIS was submitted to the NVCA, the Town and by the Town to the Town's consultants, for their review.</p> <p>It was and still is our position that our property (85) based on the "Ground Truth findings" as stated in the EIS, does not "FIT" the criteria requirements as enumerated in the various Documents that the NVCA, the TOWN and the Town's COLSULTANTS have relied upon to assert their inclusion of 85 in the Natural Heritage System Designation.</p> <p>It was our written request submitted to the Town, that based on the findings of the EIS ,that 85 continue to be classified in the "RURAL" designation in the Update to the Official Plan and do so as part and during the current review of the Update of the Official Plan.</p> <p>For your information, a Natural hazard Study of 85 was conducted by Natham Engineering (Collingwood) in 2021, whose findings indicate that 85 is suitable for development and is available for submission and your review upon request.</p>	<p>The environmental work needs to be appropriately peer reviewed by the Town prior to considering any mapping changes. The Town will need to accept the environmental work, in consultation with any other agency having jurisdiction.</p>

		<p>Environmental Protection (EP) lands are indicated as including a variety of specific natural heritage features, including Provincially Significant Woodlands. The Draft OP does not explicitly mention any mapping of such woodlands or the process and criteria that have been applied in any woodland mapping for the Town. Are there supporting materials available which identify Significant Woodlands and document the process through which they were delineated?</p> <p>Previous iterations of the Collingwood OP have identified some specific criteria for Category 1 and Category 2 lands. For example, Category 1 and 2 woodlands were previously identified and delineated in part on the basis of size and age. Do these various criteria still have any relevance to the "Environmental Protection" designation, or are woodlands no considered strictly in context of PPS criteria?</p> <p>The OP notes that EP designation also reflects "Other natural heritage features", including woodlands that are less than 4 hectares. Is this reflective of the size-related criteria outlined in the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (NHRM)? Are there other criteria from the NHRM or other sources that are relevant in this context?</p> <p>The Draft OP also notes that "locally significant" wetlands are among the "other natural heritage features" which may confer an EP designation. Are there supporting materials available which identify locally significant wetlands and document the process through which they were delineated?</p>	<p>Please refer to Discussion Paper 5. In addition, the DRAFT of the Official Plan will include all the relevant feature mapping used to establish the Environmental Protection designation in an Appendix.</p> <p>The intent of the DRAFT Official Plan is to simplify the policy framework by identifying all significant natural heritage features and their ecological functions into one category and apply a 30 metre buffer. This takes away the interpretive issue of Type 1 versus Type 2 and defers all of that investigation to an EIS, should development be proposed.</p> <p>Please refer to Discussion Paper 5</p> <p>Please refer to Discussion Paper 5</p>
30	<p>MHBC Dave Aston, MSc, MCIP, RPP Vice-President</p> <p>on behalf of Millennium Holdings Inc. 200 Balsam Street</p>	<p>The site is located to the southeast of Balsam Street and Harbour Street East and has an area of approximately 4.4 hectares. The site is the location of the former Kaufman furniture factory and is presently vacant. A pre-consultation request related to a potential residential redevelopment of the site was filed in November 2019 with a pre-consultation meeting in January 2020. Comments on the Official Plan update process were initially filed on March 2, 2021.</p> <p>We support the identification of the subject lands identified as being within a Strategic Growth Area on Schedule 1, Growth Management Plan and also support the designation of the subject lands as Mixed Use Corridor I on Schedule 2. Further, we support the policies for the Mixed-use Corridor that permit a range of uses, including residential uses.</p> <p>Our comments on the draft Official Plan primarily relate to the general development policies for the Mixed- Use Area designation, specifically Section 5.3.2.3 e) which states "stand alone residential buildings are prohibited. Where residential development is proposed, all buildings will include a minimum of 75 percent of the at-grade GFA for active, non residential land use."</p> <p>We request that this policy be reconsidered such that stand-alone residential buildings in the Mixed-Use Area designation be permitted on the subject lands.</p> <p>In the case of the subject lands the site is large and has unique considerations that provide an opportunity to comprehensively plan the redevelopment in support of the strategic growth area objectives. There are also challenges to the design that will make it difficult and not particularly feasible for all buildings to be mixed use. The depth of the site and lack of visibility to the majority of traffic on Balsam Street, the limited frontage on Balsam Street, restrictions on access locations to Highway 26 and the separation of the site from the main commercial areas to the east of Black Ash Creek. The access, size and configuration of the subject lands result in challenges for commercial development on the western portion of the site.</p> <p>We request that consideration be given to the policy to require a mix-of uses on the site, rather than requiring that each building be a mixed-use building. This would maintain the policy intent that the site be redeveloped with a mix of uses, but allow for more flexibility for the comprehensive redevelopment of the subject lands...</p>	<p>The Town supports comprehensive planning on the subject site. The adjusted DRAFT of the Official Plan will include further explanation of the term non-residential, however, it is the Town's intent to require mixed use development on lands so designated. Further, the Town would support a Mixed Use Corridor II designation on the lands abutting existing low density residential uses (Mariner's Haven) to permit less density/height, stand-alone residential uses, and a more appropriate transition between building typology. Mixed Use Corridor I should still apply to the lands fronting Balsam Street in accordance with the urban structure that directs the highest intensification along arterial/major roads.</p>
31	<p>MHBC Oz Kemal, BES, MCIP, RPP Partner</p> <p>on behalf of Crestpoint Real Estate (Blue Mountain) Inc.</p> <p>2 and 6 Old Mountain Road, and 5, 7 and 15 Balsam Street commonly identified as the Blue Mountains Centre</p>	<p>Blue Mountain Centre, civic address 2 Old Mountain Road, Collingwood, is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of two arterial roads, Highway 26 (High Street) and First Street. The lands are developed and contain a retail plaza with four separate buildings which accommodate over 6,000 square metres of commercial uses. Current tenants (pre-Covid) include: Galaxy Cinemas, Little Ed's Ski & Bike Shop, Staples, Georgian Audio Video, and Sleep Country.</p> <p>Recommendation 1: Accommodating Projected Growth</p> <p>The Subject Lands are identified as being within a Strategic Growth Area (s.5.3). Strategic Growth Areas are identified as the target areas within the Town that are to accommodate 50% of annual residential intensification. Given that this is the projected and allocated growth by the Town, the purpose of the Official Plan Review process is to estimate and plan for the capacity and allocation of servicing to Strategic Growth Areas.</p> <p>Policy 6.2.2.g also states that before approval of any development application, the Town must be satisfied that there is adequate municipal servicing infrastructure. It is unclear how the Official Plan determined Strategic Growth Areas in absence of ensuring that servicing infrastructure is available.</p> <p>As stated in section 1.2 Purpose, the Plan, "Provides a strategy for phasing and the assignment of municipal infrastructure capacity over time."</p> <p>Recommendation 2: s.4.3(f) to (j) Service Capacity Allocation</p> <p>The Service Capacity Allocation policies 4.3(f)-(j) have the effect of elevating the Town's Water and Wastewater Capacity Allocation policy document to the level of Official Plan policy. The Allocation policy represents an operational matter of the Town, as stated, "to add... predictability to the process of capacity estimation and allocation." Yet, policy s.4.3 (h) delegates allocation authority to the Allocation policy and states that the Water and Wastewater Capacity Allocation, "will identify what growth and development in the Town is subject" to the Allocation policy. The outcome of policy 4.3(h) indicates that if a development application does not meet the requirements of the Official Plan, then an applicant would require an Official Plan Amendment for a site-specific exemption to proceed with a development. Under legislation, growth and development is subject to the Official Plan rather than a procedural allocation policy document.</p> <p>Recommendation 3: s. 5.1.8 Land Use/Built-Form Specific Policies: Building Heights</p> <p>While supportive of residential development within the Regional Commercial District and the intensification of the Strategic Growth Area through a mid-rise and high-rise built height form, it is recommended that more standard application of built height be applied. For example, establishing the mid-height built height at being up to 11 storeys, high-rise buildings should be identified as buildings above 11 storeys without the height being indicated in policy. This allows the Town to identify building heights within the Zoning By-law, and thereby achieving the goal of reducing applications to amend the Town's Official Plan.</p>	<p>Subject to OLT appeal and legal advice.</p> <p>Anticipated that the Town will undertake/update a Master Servicing Study to ensure servicing is available a the appropriate time.</p> <p>The next DRAFT of the Official Plan will match the recently approved and updated SCAP, recognizing that the Official Plan will contain less detail than the operative policy document.</p> <p>The height required in the DRAFT Official Plan is considered appropriate in the Collingwood context, especially in recognition of the housing and climate changes crises. More refined building height limitations will be included in the Zoning By-law.</p>

32	<p>MHBC Oz Kemal, BES, MCIP, RPP Partner</p> <p>on behalf of Crestpoint Real Estate (Blue Mountain) Inc.</p> <p>3 and 6 Old Mountain Road, and 5, 7 and 15 Balsam Street commonly identified as the Blue Mountains Centre</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: 5.3.4 Regional Commercial District</p> <p>a) Given the proposed Urban Structure, wherein the Subject Lands are Strategic Growth Areas and proposed for intensification, continuing to identify the Area as under a two decade old concept of limiting retail unit sizes should no longer be valid in today's economy. The Area should only be identified as a Strategic Growth Area to support the 'simplification' of the Official Plan to be more of a 'strategic plan' (to quote the Town's planning consultant's Community Information presentation) and to reduce applications to amend the Official Plan.</p> <p>b) In proposed 5.3.4.2.d, the policy identifies several "specifically" prohibited uses including the retail outlets for sale of alcohol. Official Plan policies should generally be permissive in nature rather than prohibitive. Irrespective, the policy describes that any retail outlets for the sale of alcohol are not permitted and we would recommend removal of the policy. It is unclear regarding the rationale for the prohibition as this was not captured in background studies for the Official Plan and likely represents dated political decision. Further, it should be noted that the phrasing lacks clarity. For example, "regarding restaurant facilities where alcoholic beverages are made, or partially made within one building." Does 'making a beverage' mean the mixing of cocktails, or does this mean the use of lands as a micro-distillery/brewery with a retail/restaurant service component?</p> <p>c) Policy 5.3.4.3.f.i Mixed Uses should be deleted. The policy states that where in a mixed use building, such as at-grade commercial use with residential above, the policy states that 75 percent of at-grade Gross Floor Area must include "active, non-residential land uses." This phrase lacks clarity as 'active' land uses generally implies physical activity. We seek clarity in what the Town identifies as active, non-residential land uses.</p> <p>d) There is typographical error in policy 5.3.4.5.b wherein the policy has been transcribed from the in effect Official Plan and continues to identify Area "F" as Area "A". This highlights the perpetuation of policies that were developed two decades ago and that do not reflect today's market conditions.</p>	<p>The opportunity for a subsequent Official Plan Amendment, supported by a retail/commercial study will be added to the policy framework.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Issue reviewed. No changes implemented.</p> <p>Typographical errors to be fixed in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p>
33	<p>MHBC Oz Kemal, BES, MCIP, RPP Partner</p> <p>on behalf of Crestpoint Real Estate (Blue Mountain) Inc.</p> <p>4 and 6 Old Mountain Road, and 5, 7 and 15 Balsam Street commonly identified as the Blue Mountains Centre</p>	<p>Recommendation 5: s. 5.3.4.3.e.ii Land Use/Built-Form Specific Policies: Building Heights</p> <p>Regarding the requirement to have two storeys as a minimum building height is supported for new development on vacant lands, a policy should be added that allows for additions/expansions to existing buildings, and redevelopment of additional commercial buildings of one (1) storey where feasible.</p> <p>Recommendation 6: s. 5.3.4.5.b and Schedule 7 – Area Specific Policies</p> <p>Request the removal of the Subject Lands from Area "F" on Schedule 7 as the lands are within a Strategic Growth Area. These policies were developed over two decades ago and in an era of on-line shopping, maintaining minimum unit sizes and maximum gross leasable areas are not relevant in today's retail market. The intent of this area, according to policy 4.3 Intensification in the Designated Built-Up Area, envisions annual intensification where 50% of residential growth is to occur within a mixed use area. The list of permitted uses within 5.3.4.2 should suffice to provide the range of commercial uses that are required to meet local and regional demand.</p> <p>Recommendation 7: Development Review</p> <p>Section 5.1.2 Development Review represents implementation and operational matters of the Town rather than land use designations. The section should be moved to Section 7 Implementation and Interpretation.</p>	<p>The next DRAFT of the Official Plan will include some flexibility to address this concern.</p> <p>See response above.</p> <p>This will be considered in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p>
34	<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 Linksview Subdivision as well as the adjacent landholding to the west comprised of contiguous parcels comprising over 130 hectares (320 acres) of land in the Mountain Road West Corridor Secondary Plan</p>	<p>New Environmental Protection Areas have been identified on our Client's landholdings on Schedules 1, 2 & 3 of the DRAFT Updated OP. Can the Town Project Team clarify what background work and methodology lead to these additional areas being identified as Environmental Protection Areas?</p> <p>Further to past discussions with Town Staff and the presentation made to Town Council on March 14th, 2022 that the Wyview Group / FLATO Developments Inc. landholdings be identified in an Area Specific Policy on Schedule 7, identifying that these lands due to their geographic location, and large area under contiguous ownership represent a logical Future Development area of the Town of Collingwood and preliminary work to begin the master planning process on these lands can be initiated prior to them being designated for development in the Town of Collingwood Official Plan.</p>	<p>Most of these lands are already part of a Secondary Plan area.</p> <p>A redesignation request was made, and Council agreed that it was a major redesignation request, and would require a site specific Official Plan Amendment supported by an appropriate justification, and other studies deemed appropriate by the Town.</p> <p>The property has received draft plan approval for a plan of subdivision. 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>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 is an important piece of background information incorporated into the DRAFT Official Plan.</p>
35	<p>PLAN WELLS ASSOCIATES Miriam Vasni, MCIP, RPP</p> <p>on behalf of Ted North (295 Mountain Road) Ltd., applicant for the Panorama North subdivision (owner Todco Investments Inc.) and Mair Mills Village Inc., owner of the Panorama subdivision.</p>	<p>We support the proposed designations of these two sites as Designated Greenfield Area: Future Neighbourhood.</p> <p>While we also support structured parking and underground parking in Designated Greenfield Areas, Section 6.1.5(b) in the Draft Official Plan is cause for concern. In part, this section states: "Parking standards and regulations for all types of land uses will be provided in the Zoning By-law."</p> <p>The current Zoning By-law 2010-040 is twelve years old and does not reflect demographic and lifestyle changes that have occurred in the Town over the past decade. The current By-law does not take into account the many retirees and single persons that have moved to Collingwood who have different needs/requirements than a family of four may have. Many of the retirees have down scaled to one car and single persons generally only have one vehicle – they do not have two cars.</p> <p>The current By-law requires 1.25 parking spaces per each apartment unit (1 per unit & .25 visitor). It does not differentiate between a one-bedroom or a three-bedroom unit. In Panorama North, for example, we are proposing 'stacked' townhouses which are basically the same as apartment units, save for an except all units are entered from the ground level as opposed to a common hallway and elevator.</p> <p>In order to reach the density target of Section 5.2.2.3(c), parking requirements should reflect current needs of the population today – not twelve years ago. The parking requirement for stacked townhouses should be the same as for apartment units – 1.25 spaces per unit.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Not applicable to the Official Plan.</p> <p>Comments relate to Zoning By-law parking standards.</p>

36	<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>It is proposed by Planning staff that these lands which are divided into many separate residential building lots, be re-designated from the Residential land use designation to the Environmental Protection land use designation, a designation which is inappropriate for development purposes and a land use designation which is supposed to indicate the existence of natural heritage features, natural heritage areas, and/or ecological functions of these lands or possibly the existence of hazard lands.</p> <p>As you can see from the attached Excerpt from Schedule 'A', Land Use Plan, the majority of these lots are now designated Residential and Schedule 'C' designates those lots now designated Residential to be Medium Density.</p> <p>In accordance with Schedules A and B of the Town's Official Plan only a small portion these previously sub-divided lots are identified as designated Environmental Protection situated adjacent Black Ash Creek. Schedule B identifies that some of these westerly lots may be within an area possibly consisting of Category 1 Valleylands and Category 2 Woodlands. Other than those identified environmental features, there are no known habitat of endangered species, threatened species, significant wetlands, any type of coastal wetlands, significant wildlife habitat, significant areas of natural and scientific interest (ANSIs), fish habitat, or natural linkage areas on any other lots with this residential plan.</p>	Subject to ongoing legal advice. No further response is appropriate at this time.
37	<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>Within Plan 51R-741, of the forty-two (42) lots, the above number companies have amalgamated and remain the Owner of a total of 37 lots. Of the remaining five (5) lots, the ownership of four (4) lots (Lots 15, 30, 33 & 39) are registered to the Town of Collingwood and the fifth lot (Lot 21) remains in the ownership of a third party. Each of the forty-two (42) lots within this plan are recognized as stand-alone lots.</p> <p>Block 43 represents the 'road allowance lands' and constituting the future municipal road allowance. Block 31 represents a future road stub.</p> <p>Current Town of Collingwood Official Plan: Schedule A Land Use Plan – most of the subject lands are designated "Residential" and a small portion of the lands are designated Environmental Protection. Schedule C – Residential Density: the "Residential" lands have a "Medium Density" designation, Schedule E – the subject land is within Municipal Service Area 2, Schedule F – most of the subject lands are depicted as "Green Fields (Lands for Urban Uses)" Most Schedules depict Plan 51R-741 and its stand-alone lots and future road-way parcels as part of the existing underlying property fabric.</p> <p>Current Zoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Subject Lands are zoned : Holding No. 12 (H12) Second Density R (H12) R2 & Environmental Protection EP. • Holding Zone (H12): Confirmation of adequate and functional municipal services. <p>Comments, Schedules Schedule 1 – the subject lands are designated "Greenlands System", Schedule 2 - the subject lands are designated "Environmental Protection", Schedule 3 - the subject lands are designated "Natural Heritage System", None of the draft Schedules depict Residential Plan 51R-741 nor its lots and future road allowances as part of the existing underlying property fabric.</p>	Subject to ongoing legal advice. No further response is appropriate at this time.
		<p>Section 5.2 Residential Communities, Schedule 1 identifies Residential Communities and DGA - Residential Communities that incorporate the elements of the Town that are focused on primarily residential land uses, but also include community facilities, parks, institutional uses and small-scale retail and service commercial uses that support local residents. These Residential Communities in Collingwood are diverse, ranging from stable historic districts to recently constructed subdivisions, to new neighbourhoods that are still in the planning approvals stage.</p> <p>The subject lands are presently divided into forty-two (42) separate residential building lots and a road allowance owned by the Town. The road allowance lands are awaiting 'adequate and functional' infrastructure inclusive of municipal water, sanitary sewer, and stormwater services as well as an improved local roadway.</p> <p>Additionally, as the number of lots (42) has been established and the Town's Zoning By-law zones most of these lots Residential Second Density R2, it would be appropriate that Draft Schedules 1, 2 and 3 be revised to reflect this existing plan of Residential Second Density R2 lots and butting road allowance as a Residential Community with the 'Existing Neighbourhood Designation'.</p> <p>Landowners' "Requests": Draft Official Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise OP Schedule 1 to designate most of the subject lands as "Residential Communities" or "DGA-Residential Communities", and • Revise OP Schedule 2 to designate most of the subject lands with the "Existing Neighbourhoods Designation". 	

38	<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>The Smycorp property is adjacent to the proposed Poplar Regional Health and Wellness Village on 130 acres under consideration for a Minister's Zoning Order (MZO). We understand the MZO has been studied by the Town and its consultants (The Planning Partnership and urbanMetrics) and recommendations were presented to the Standing Committee of Council on August 11th, but Council has not yet approved any of the recommendation options.</p> <p>We appreciate the Town's careful and cautious consideration of the proposed MZO, and we do not have an opinion on whether the MZO and the land use concept behind it are appropriate.</p> <p>Nevertheless, we do agree with Ron Palmer of The Planning Partnership, as stated in his memo of August 4th, that the proposed Health and Wellness Village "represents a fundamental change to the Town's urban structure" and "will have a dramatic impact on the Town's growth management strategy." The Village, if approved and if it includes a new hospital, will transform lands currently intended for low-density employment uses into a major mixed-use centre within the region, complementing Downtown. As such, the Village's impacts on surrounding land uses, both existing and planned, should be carefully reviewed. Specifically, regarding the Smycorp property, what are the implications for surrounding designated industrial lands and for the Town's overall supply and structure of employment lands?</p> <p>Given the significant impact the Village would have on the Town's urban structure and its immediate surroundings, in our opinion the Updated Official Plan should not be finalized and approved until a decision has been made on the proposed MZO by Council and subsequently the Province. If and when an MZO converting the lands to mixed-use is approved, it would be appropriate to reconsider the Town's overall supply and pattern of employment lands and the types of uses appropriate on remaining employment lands adjacent to the Village. It also might be appropriate to review the structure of residential and commercial lands. To simply align the Official Plan to the MZO through a future amendment would be contrary to the intent of a Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p>	<p>MZO decision has been made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Notwithstanding the anticipated impacts on growth management in the Town from the MZO, the County's Municipal Comprehensive Review does not support the conversion of any lands out of the Employment Area to the year 2051.</p> <p>The request requires an Official Plan Amendment, including appropriate justification, and any other studies deemed appropriate by the Town.</p>
39	<p>Colin Travis MCIP RPP Travis & Associates</p> <p>11344 & 11352 Hwy 26, and 12 Gun Club Rd</p>	<p>The lands are situated on the east side of Hwy 26 and south of Gun Club Rd. In total, they comprise approximately 0.8ha of potential developable lands. Land use wise, the lands are used for as a real estate sales centre (corner of Hwy 26 and Gun Club Road) and as operational centre (along with a small arms shooting range) for the Collingwood Rod and Gun Club. In many respects, the referenced lands are under-utilized and offer an appropriate opportunity for a comprehensive redevelopment plan.</p> <p>The lands are designated "Environmental Protection" and "Medium Density Residential" in Schedules 'A' and 'C' to the current Official Plan. Over the past few years EDEV (Mark Cairns) has investigated the redevelopment potential of these lands.</p> <p>We note that in Schedule 1 to OP Draft 1 the referenced lands are shown as part of the "Strategic Growth Areas" and "Greenlands System" within the "Delineated Built Boundary". Of interest is that OP Draft 1 introduces the principle of Strategic Growth Areas as being a focus for development intensification (S.4.3 and S.5.3). An important locational attribute is that such areas are along the Town's collector and arterial road system and can support an efficient and integrated transit system. These policy attributes are an example of local land use policy directions implementing Provincial Policy Statement policies addressing among other matters, mixed uses, broadening housing options, efficient use of land and transit supportive development.</p> <p>Schedule 2 to OP Draft 1 proposes to designate the referenced lands as "Existing Neighbourhood" and "Environmental Protection". The "Existing Neighbourhood" anticipates a range of uses. However, the policy does indicate an intention for "primarily low-rise residential forms" (S.5.2.1.1 b)). Such a policy direction appears suited to many of the older, existing residentially developed areas where moderate intensification may occur. Such intensification is to understandably respect the character of the given established residential neighbourhood. For the most part such lands are accessed off a local road network.</p> <p>As noted previously, the referenced lands, when taken as a whole, represent a redevelopment opportunity more in line with what is anticipated in Schedule 1 and it's "Strategic Growth Area" direction. In this case, the referenced lands are not part of an existing low density residential neighbourhood but are located along a major arterial road and have potential for a mixed use intensification approach. Similar to area properties along Hwy 26 within the same urban structure category, we believe that the referenced lands are more appropriately reflected as a "Mixed Use Category II" in Schedule 2.</p> <p>In conclusion, the identification of "Strategic Growth Areas" in Schedule 1 leverages the importance of existing and future collector and arterial road systems. The referenced lands are oriented to an arterial road, and in the context of the OP Draft 1 approach, are underutilized and provide an opportunity to implement the policy direction more appropriately reflected in the "Mixed Use Category II" land use designation. We therefore request that the referenced lands be designated "Mixed Use Category II" in the next draft iteration of the proposed Official Plan.</p>	<p>Mapping discrepancy to be dealt with such that Schedule 1 is to be revised to be in conformity with Schedule 2. The subject property is to be designated Environmental Protection and Existing Neighbourhood.</p> <p>The Existing Neighbourhood designation recognizes context, size of the site, and extent of the Environmental Protection designation. Importantly, the DRAFT Official Plan, as noted, does permit mid-rise, stand-alone residential development, subject to a number of tests. A mixed use designation would require non-residential uses at-grade.</p>

40	<p>Colin Travis MCIP RPP Travis & Associates</p> <p>on behalf of Lotco II Limited, Al Allendorf</p> <p>Lotco II Limited 50 Saunders Street</p>	<p>The subject lands comprise approximately 4.2ha and are located at the north-west corner of Poplar Side Road and Saunders Street. The property municipal address is 50 Saunders Street, Collingwood. Applications for a Draft Plan of Subdivision and the related implementing Zoning By-law Amendment were submitted in January 2020.</p> <p>Draft 1 of the Official Plan review document proposes significant policy “shifts” with the aim to align the Town’s land use policy regime with the Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan. The breadth and extent of all changes is beyond the scope of this review. This review will focus on the essential land use designation proposals. Overall, it appears Draft 1 treats the subject lands as follows:</p> <p>Schedule ‘1’, Growth Management Plan: Shows the subject lands as a “Designated Greenland Area – Residential Communities” (DGA) situated immediately adjacent to lands within the “Delineated Built-up Boundary”. DGA’s are “expected to accommodate significant growth over the horizon of this Plan” (Section 4.3 e)). We note that the subject lands are a logical extension and infill housing form to the existing residential neighbourhood to the north, east and west.</p> <p>Schedule ‘2’, Land Use Plan: Designates the subject lands “Future Neighbourhood”. Low-rise, mid-rise and high-rise residential housing forms are anticipated (Section 5.2.2.2). We note that the Draft Plan that is at it’s final review stage provides for “low-rise” residential uses.</p> <p>Schedule ‘6’, Transportation Plan: The southern boundary of the subject lands flanks Poplar Side Road. Poplar Side Road is identified as an Arterial Road under County jurisdiction. We note that the proposed Draft Plan has made allowances for conveyance of lands to add to the road right of way and improve the existing trail network running parallel to Poplar Side Road.</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p>1. The proposed land use designation of “Future Neighbourhood” in Schedule ‘2’ allows for a range of dwelling types. Proposed zoning and the approved Draft Plan provide for single detached dwelling types. The applications in process and nearing completion appear to conform to the policy direction proposed in Draft 1. We ask for confirmation that this interpretation is correct.</p> <p>2. As noted previously, Draft 1 is a significant departure from existing Official Plan policy. We continue to review Draft 1 and may have additional commentary.</p>	<p>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>
41	<p>Colin Travis MCIP RPP Travis & Associates</p> <p>on behalf of Red Maple, Town File No. D1202218 725 Tenth Line</p>	<p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>The subject lands comprise approximately 17.6ha and are located on the east side of Tenth Line. South of Mountain Road. Legally, the lands as Part of the South Half of Lot 44, Concession 10. The lands have a 251m frontage along Tenth Line and depth of about 640m. Draft Plan approval was granted initially in 2013 for 230 dwelling units. A redline revision that increased the number of units to 278 dwelling units was approved in 2014. Subsequent Draft Plan approvals were granted in 2016, and 2019. The dwelling unit yield breakdown per Draft Approval is:</p> <p>131 Single Detached 56 (Freehold) Street Townhomes 91 Townhomes (Condominium)</p> <p>EXISTING OFFICIAL PLAN</p> <p>The subject lands are designated low and medium density residential in Official Plan Schedules ‘A’ and ‘C’. Schedule ‘A’ also designates a portion of the north and north-east sectors of the site as “Environmental Protection”. Zoning By-law 2010-40 zones the subject lands for residential uses. The “Environmental Protection” lands are zoned “EP”.</p> <p>DRAFT 1 OFFICIAL PLAN</p> <p>Schedule ‘1’, Growth Management Plan: The subject lands are shown as “DGA-Residential Communities” with portions of the north and north-east as “Greenlands System”.</p> <p>Schedule ‘2’, Land Use Plan: The subject lands are designated as “Future Neighbourhood” with the north and north-east portions “Environmental Protection”.</p> <p>Schedule ‘3’, Natural Heritage System: The subject lands are designated “Natural Heritage System” and “Adjacent Lands Overlay”.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>Draft 1 to the Official Plan review is significant departure from the current, in-force Official Plan. This review is limited to the major land use designation directions.</p> <p>Within the development policy context of Draft 1 it appears that the existing zoning and Draft Plan on the subject lands is respected. However, Schedule ‘3’ proposes to impose an “Adjacent Lands Overlay” on the zoned and residential component of the approved Draft Plan. The intent of the “Adjacent Lands Overlay” is to show an area 90m from the boundary of the “Natural Heritage System” designation and to trigger the requirements for an EIS (Section 5.6.2.1). We note that the approved zoning and Draft Plan clearly establish development areas and environmental protection areas. The “Natural Heritage System” boundaries are specifically set.</p> <p>We request that the “Adjacent Lands Overlay” be removed as it’s intent is already established through approved zoning and the approved Draft Plan.</p>	<p>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>Adjacent Lands Overlay is a standard distance from the natural heritage system to trigger an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) through development applications. This application has already received draft approval and presumably clearance from the NVCA for the plan of subdivision. No requirement for a new EIS at this time.</p>

<p>42</p>	<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>The subject lands comprise approximately 7.6 hectares and are located on the east side of High Street, south of Telfer Road. Existing zoning and Draft Plan Approval allow for a residential subdivision comprising apartments, townhouses, semi-detached and single detached dwelling types. In 2021, a three-year extension to Draft Approval was granted by the Town...</p> <p>A minor amendment to the Zoning By-law was recently assessed by Staff with a report recommending approval scheduled for Council on August 18, 2022.</p> <p>DRAFT 1 OFFICIAL PLAN</p> <p>Draft 1 of the Official Plan review document represents a substantial change in the nature and type of policy over the existing Official Plan. The breadth and extent of all changes is beyond the scope of this review. This review will focus on the essential land use designation proposals. Overall, it appears Draft 1 treats the subject lands as follows:</p> <p>Schedule '1', Growth Management Plan: Shows the subject lands as a "Designated Greenland Area – Residential Communities" (DGA) situated immediately adjacent to lands within the "Delineated Built-up Boundary". DGA's are "expected to accommodate significant growth over the horizon of this Plan" (Section 4.3 e)).</p> <p>Schedule '2', Land Use Plan: Designates the subject lands "Future Neighbourhood". Low-rise, mid-rise and high-rise residential housing forms are anticipated (Section 5.2.2.2). More specifically, Section 5.2.2.3 directs that the Town "shall permit the development of a range and mix of housing types". We note that approved zoning and the Draft Plan provide for a range of housing types.</p> <p>Schedule '3', Natural Heritage System: Shows a westerly portion of the subject lands as being within the "Adjacent Lands Overlay". This overlay runs parallel to east side of High Street along the entire frontage of the subject lands. The intent of the "Adjacent Lands Overlay" is to show an area 90m from the boundary of the "Natural Heritage System" designation and to trigger the requirements for an EIS (Section 5.6.2.1). We note that the approved zoning and Draft Plan clearly establish development areas and no environmental constraints in the context of "Natural Heritage System" are identified.</p> <p>Schedule '6', Transportation Plan: Shows the westerly extension of Cameron Street as a "Future Collector" type road connecting to High Street and through the subject lands. We note that the approved Draft Plan supports the Cameron Street extension.</p>	<p>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>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The proposed land use designation of "Future Neighbourhood" in Schedule '2' allows for a range of dwelling types. Existing zoning and the approved Draft Plan (and the amendments currently being considered) provide for a range of dwelling types. In this case, existing approvals appear to conform to the proposed Draft 1 land use designation. We ask for confirmation that this interpretation is correct. 2.The imposition of the "Adjacent Lands Overlay" status (Schedule '3') is inappropriate for at least two reasons: first, a major arterial road lies between the "Natural Heritage System" that has High Street as a boundary, thus providing a substantial developed (and to be enlarged) urban use barrier between the subject lands and; the acceptability and desirability of development land use is clearly established through existing approvals – the imposition of an EIS at this stage is unwarranted and inappropriate. We ask that this overlay be removed from the subject lands. 3. As noted previously, Draft 1 is a significant departure from existing Official Plan policy. We continue to review Draft 1 and may have additional commentary. 	
<p>43</p>	<p>Wayne Wood</p>	<p>I became aware of the review of the official Plan by way of a July 15 article in a local newspaper. Not long after beginning to read the document, the maps were accessed to determine what was proposed for the properties in my area. This revealed of change of designation to "Environmental Protection" on a portion of my property, the respective adjacent unopened road allowance and a relatively small portion of the adjacent property on to the east. On Schedule 1 dated 2019 in the existing Official Plan, the designation is "Residential". The Zoning By-law shows R3-33 which is essentially a mix of residential occupancies from low to higher densities.</p> <p>After review of various documents, literature and inspection of the property, my view is, there does not appear to be sufficient documentation showing compliance with recognized criteria to justify the designation.</p> <p>A recent email sent to the Nottawasaga Conservation Authority is included in this document. Up to the time of submitting this document, other than an electronic response acknowledging receipt of the email, there has not been further communication with the NVCA. On further review of the Draft Official Plan, the absence of an immediate response might be explained.</p> <p>It is presumed that readers of this document are aware of relevance of the sources the referenced text.</p> <p>From the Natural Heritage Reference Manual, <i>"While some significant resources may already be identified and inventoried by official sources, the significance of others can only be determined after evaluation."</i> This is understood to mean that a designation should not be applied unless there is sufficient data in the file to show compliance with a recognized standard procedure.</p> <p>From the Draft OP <i>5.1.5 Natural Heritage and Hazard Lands</i> <i>a) While every effort has been made to capture significant natural heritage features and functions within the Environmental Protection Designation or Adjacent Lands Overlay,</i> This might lead many to believe there has been an extensive detail analysis of diligently collected, relevant data.</p>	<p>In accordance with Provincial policy, it is a requirement that the Town identify and protect from the impacts of development all significant natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions. To this end, the Town retained a fully qualified environmental scientist who utilized the most up-to-date information to establish the Environmental Protection Designation and the Adjacent Lands Overlay that are identified on various schedules included in the DRAFT Official Plan. That work is provided in Discussion Paper 5 and relevant mapping will be added as an Appendix to the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Importantly, the policy framework included within the Environmental Protection Designation Section of the DRAFT Official Plan (see Section 5.6.1) does provide the opportunity to adjust the boundaries of that designation (through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study), and deals specifically with circumstances related to existing uses and structures, as well as existing development approvals.</p> <p>The Town may also consider, in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan, providing an additional specific policy that deals with existing lots of record. That policy may identify the permission for the development of the property, subject to a number of criteria that may include a requirement for frontage on a public road, the ability to accommodate, or connect to appropriate sewer and water facilities and a requirement to conform with the regulations of the implementing Zoning By-law. If a rezoning is required, it would need to be supported by an Environmental Impact Study.</p> <p>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>5.6.1.4 General Development Policies Boundaries a) The boundaries of the Environmental Protection Area shown on Schedule 2 have been conceptually delineated. It is the intent of this Plan that their precise locations be determined in consultation with the Conservation Authority at the time of the consideration of specific development applications.</p> <p>Finding "conceptually" to be defined as "in terms of a concept or abstract idea", the statement "every effort has been made" looks to be undermined.</p> <p>Where a <u>minor</u> adjustment to the boundary of the Environmental Protection Designation is approved by the Town, in consultation with the Conservation Authority and any other agency having jurisdiction, the abutting land use designation as identified on Schedule 2, shall apply.</p> <p>Without a specific numerical limit of "minor" the perception of "minor" for the same actual area on a property can in one situation be far different than another. For example, the Environmental Protection Designation represents in the order of 50% of the total area of land in the property of 11475 Highway 26. If, in the future, the property was sold to the owner of a development such as has been proposed the adjacent property to the east of 11475 Highway 26, to be incorporated into a development, the area of Environmental Protect would be more in the order of 5% of the development. Then there is the concept of "minor on a community scale". From GIS, the area of the Town is approximately 3344 ha. Now the 0.25 ha represents more like 0.007%.</p> <p>The combination of what I see on the properties and what is written in various documents, and what does not seem to exist or made available, my hypothesis is, there is insufficient reason to apply the Environmental Protection Designation. The area should be included in the "Strategic Growth Area" in Schedule 1, "Existing Neighborhood" in Schedule 2 and be subject to the conditions for "Adjacent Lands Overlay" in Schedule 3 with no change in Schedules 4 and 5.</p>	
44	<p>Shelley Wells Jim Hood</p> <p>40 Connor Avenue Lot 24, Plan 51 M-809</p>	<p>Based on our review of the draft Official Plan July 2022, we note that Schedule 3 Natural Heritage System indicates that the land behind our home is included in the Natural Heritage system.</p> <p>Please confirm that Natural Heritage system extends to the area noted on the attached Simcoe County GIS mapping.</p>	<p>Red Maple Subdivision is draft approved and zoned for the proposed uses, and the Environmental Impact Study (2012) would be used to determine how this area would be developed. Further, a mapping change will be implemented based on the draft approved plan.</p>
45	<p>Shelley Wells MES, MCIP, RPP Plan Wells Associates</p> <p>on behalf of Black Ash Enterprises Inc., Mr. Thomas Vincent Balmoral Village, Block 3, Registered Plan 51 M-1049</p>	<p>The subject lands are located within the Balmoral Village community on the south side of Harbour Street West near the intersection of Dawson Drive. Balmoral Village, is located on a 9.4-hectare site comprised of the following blocks: Block 1: vacant land condominium (4.27 hectares) built out in 2 phases for a total of 96 semidetached and townhouse dwellings. Block 2; a five storey condominium apartment building located on .86 hectares presently under construction. Block 4; a four storey Retirement Residence consisting of 127 units including an 8,000 square foot internal "Recreation Club" for all residents of Balmoral, plus a four storey purpose built seniors apartment building consisting of 49 units on 1.82 hectares Blocks 5, 6 and 7; comprised of 2.07 hectares, dedicated to a storm water management facility, environmentally protected lands and a road widening Block 3; the subject lands .47 hectares, currently designated Residential- Mixed Use.</p> <p>Balmoral Village is a progressive "Age in Place" community that fulfills the needs of residents at various stages of retirement living. A range of living options designed to fit most budgets, lifestyles, needs and desires is offered within this unique concept.</p> <p>The proposed designation for Block 3 in the draft Official Plan is Strategic Growth Area -Existing Neighbourhood Area. The Existing Neighbourhood designation permits both Low rise and Mid Rise buildings. However the focus of intensification within the Existing Neighbourhood designation is to "focus primarily on modest residential infill, small scale redevelopment "</p> <p>Based on our review of the draft Official Plan we note Schedule 2 Land Use Plan proposes that the golf course maintenance site adjacent to Balmoral Village be designated Mixed Use Corridor 11. The adjacent lands between Balmoral Village and Highway 26 are proposed to be designated Mixed Use Corridor 1. These designations are intended to be a focus for residential intensification. Balmoral Village is a mater planned community with specific permissions embedded in the existing Official Plan designation. Block 3 is not proposed to be developed as modest residential infill, or a small scale redevelopment. As noted above Block 3 is currently designated Residential Mixed Use, with existing approvals including site specific zoning for 2 floors of Medical/Commercial and 3 floors of Residential.</p>	<p>Agreed. Mapping change to Mixed Use Corridor II will be implemented, and site specific policies also apply.</p>
		<p>Accordingly, the more appropriate designation for Block 3 is Mixed Use Corridor 1 or 11 similar to the vacant land on either side of Balmoral Village. We note, "the new hierarchy of mixed-use nodes and corridors focuses on the scale of development, rather than on the land use mix and the type of retail and service commercial uses permitted ... " Block 3 fits here not in the Existing Neighbourhood designation.</p> <p>The Existing Neighbourhood designation is too limiting, does not consider the current permissions embedded in the operative Official Plan and does not reflect the proposed designation in the draft Official Plan for adjacent lands.</p> <p>The current Residential -Mixed Use designation specifically permits local convenience commercial uses including a pharmacy, office space, medical, and health care related offices and clinics. These permissions are integral to the master plan for Balmoral Village which is in a Registered Plan of Subdivision as noted above, and must be retained for Block 3 in the new Official Plan.</p> <p>Block 3 is the final block to be developed in this master planned community. A major feature of this adult life style community are the proposed medical services to be included in Block 3. These services are critically important to complete the community and long contemplated for the existing residents of Blocks 1, 2 and 4.</p>	

46	<p>Shelley Wells MES, MCIP, RPP Plan Wells Associates</p> <p>on behalf of Ted North (295 Mountain Road) Ltd. Tadeo Investments Inc.</p>	<p>In November 2018 applications for Draft Plan approval for a Plan of Subdivision and Zoning Bylaw Amendment were submitted. These applications were declared complete in December 2018 but have not yet gone to Council for approval. The Town of Collingwood Official Plan was approved in 2004 and consolidated as amended in 2019. Schedule B Environmental Protection Natural Heritage Resource Areas identifies no Natural Heritage Resource Areas on the subject lands.</p> <p>Based on our review of the draft Official Plan July 2022, we note that Schedule 3 Natural Heritage System indicates that a portion of the subject lands, which approaches the west boundary, is proposed to have potential Natural Heritage attributes.</p> <p>Please advise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How was the limit of the proposed Natural Heritage System determined as regard to the subject lands? • What specific natural heritage attributes are proposed to be located on the subject lands? 	<p>In accordance with Provincial policy, it is a requirement that the Town identify and protect from the impacts of development all significant natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions. To this end, the Town retained a fully qualified environmental scientist who utilized the most up-to-date information to establish the Environmental Protection Designation and the Adjacent Lands Overlay that are identified on various schedules included in the DRAFT Official Plan. That work is provided in Discussion Paper 5 and relevant mapping will be added as an Appendix to the next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Importantly, the policy framework included within the Environmental Protection Designation Section of the DRAFT Official Plan (see Section 5.6.1) does provide the opportunity to adjust the boundaries of that designation (through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study), and deals specifically with circumstances related to existing uses and structures, as well as existing development approvals.</p> <p>The Town may also consider, in the next DRAFT of the Official Plan, providing an additional specific policy that deals with existing lots of record. That policy may identify the permission for the development of the property, subject to a number of criteria that may include a requirement for frontage on a public road, the ability to accommodate, or connect to appropriate sewer and water facilities and a requirement to conform with the regulations of the implementing Zoning By-law. If a rezoning is required, it would need to be supported by an Environmental Impact Study.</p> <p>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>
47	<p>Celeste Phillips</p> <p>70 High Street</p>	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of the owner of 70 High Street to express concerns about a proposed change in land use designation for the property at 70 High Street. Could you kindly provide me with information about the basis for the changes, the uses that would no longer be permitted and what new uses would be allowed.</p>	<p>The proposed designation for this property is Prestige Employment. Unclear about the specific concerns with this land use designation.</p>
48	<p>David Finbow</p> <p>on behalf of Charis Developments Limited (Charis)</p> <p>Liberty Plan of Subdivision and Blocks 169 & 170, Plan 51M-945 7564 Poplar SR</p>	<p>First, I confirm that I continue to be the authorized agent for Charis Developments Limited (Charis) with Charis having an interest in the subject matter as the prospective purchaser of Blocks 169 and 170.</p> <p>As you may be aware, Brattys LLP, on behalf of Liberty, has been communicating with the Town regarding Blocks 169, 170 & 179, Plan 51M-945. While I will not get into the legal aspects of this matter, I do want to ensure that the Town is aware that Charis is the prospective purchaser of Blocks 169 and 170, that Charis is desirous of incorporating these 2 Blocks into its future development plans for the lands that they own immediately to the south, being 7564 Poplar SR, and that it is Charis' understanding that one of the lot owners to the east has expressed a disinterest in acquiring one of the subject Blocks and that Liberty has exhausted its efforts in terms of selling the other Block to the other adjacent lot owner.</p> <p>By way of background, 7564 Poplar SR encompasses 2 acres of land and as noted above Blocks 169 and 170 are located immediately to the north of 7564 Poplar SR. All of these lands are immediately to the east of 869 Hurontario Street, also owned by Charis and for which Charis has an active Site Plan Application (Town File No. D11722).</p> <p>7564 Polar SR and Blocks 169 and 170 are currently designated Low Density Residential under the Town's Official Plan with the Town's 1st Draft of the New Official Plan proposing to place these lands in the Strategic Growth Area Mixed Use Corridor I (DGA - Residential Communities) land use designation. We note that the Mixed Use Corridor I land use designation is also proposed for 869 Hurontario Street. Charis has commented on the 1st Draft and has advised that we are generally supportive of the direction proposed.</p> <p>Regarding Charis' future development plans for 7564 Poplar SR, you are likely aware these lands are narrow in width, approximately 39 metres at the northerly extent, and therefore are not able to accommodate a n/s public road, be it from Block 179 or from Poplar SR, along with uses permitted in the low density land use designation (i.e. single detached, semi-detached, duplex and boarding homes). Further, we note that there would be other transportation challenges in terms of a proposed access from Poplar SR or for that matter, Hughes Street.</p> <p>In short, Charis believes that 7564 Poplar SR cannot be developed alone in accordance with the Town's current OP policy direction respecting built-form and that development therefore would have to occur by way of access from Charis' lands to the west and encompass types of built-form outside of the current OP land use designation.</p> <p>As to the Town's 1st Draft of the OP, should it be approved substantially in accordance with the direction proposed, specifically all of the above noted lands are placed in the Mixed Use Corridor I land use designation, Charis believes that it would afford substantial options and opportunity for 7564 Poplar SR and Blocks 169 and 170 to be developed comprehensively with access from 869 Hurontario Street.</p>	<p>This matter is subject to ongoing litigation. No further response is appropriate at this time.</p>
49	<p>Matthew Hodgson</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 counsel to 12123045 Canada Inc., and Adventurous Holdings Ltd., the registered owners of lands legally described as 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 (the "subject lands"). The subject lands are comprised of eight properties - lots 59, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 70 and 72 - located on an unopened road allowance extending from Braeside Street.</p> <p>Our clients purchased the subject lands in May of 2021 with the intent to develop them, and have made several attempts to clarify the nature of the proposed development with Town Planning staff. The subject lands are designated as Rural within both the Town's current Official Plan and Zoning By-law. A single detached dwelling is a permitted use within the Rural zone. Therefore, when the subject lands were purchased, the applicable zoning contemplated future residential development.</p> <p>The Town's new Draft Official Plan ("Draft OP"), dated June 2022, and, in particular, Schedules 2 and 3 of the Draft OP, propose to redesignate the subject lands as Environmental Protection ("EP") and Natural Heritage System (the "proposed redesignation"). The proposed redesignation effectively eliminates all residential development potential from the subject lands, as single-detached dwellings are not a permitted use within the EP zone. Our clients thus strongly object to the proposed redesignation.</p>	<p>Subject to ongoing legal advice. No further response is appropriate at this time.</p>

		<p>Should the proposed redesignation ultimately be approved, our clients would be deprived of all reasonable and economic uses of their land, resulting in a constructive taking without compensation. In other words, through the exercise of its regulatory powers in redesignating the subject lands, the Town would be appropriating private property. At common law, taking of property by a governmental authority must be authorized by law, and triggers a presumptive right to compensation.</p> <p>In the recent case of Annapolis Group Inc. v. Halifax Regional Municipality, 2022 SCC 36, the Supreme Court of Canada affirmed that the line between a valid regulation and a constructive taking is crossed where the effect of the regulatory activity deprives a claimant of the use and enjoyment of its property in a substantial and unreasonable way. Confining all reasonable uses of the subject lands to the Town's preferred use – preserving the lands as EP in the public interest – does exactly that. In Annapolis, the Court emphasized that the public authority need not actually acquire a proprietary interest to establish a constructive taking; the focus is instead on the effect on the landowner of the advantage gained by the land use regulation. The Court also held that regulations that leave a rights holder with only notional use of the land, deprived of all economic value, would satisfy the test for a constructive taking.</p> <p>We therefore request that the Town reconsider the proposed redesignation of the subject lands under the Draft OP and acknowledge our clients existing development rights. Placing such an undue restriction on the subject lands does not constitute proper land use planning and risks sterilizing the lands.</p>	
50	<p>Shawn Legere, MCIP, RPP, Senior Planner / Project Manager RFA Planning Consultant Inc.</p> <p>Adventurous Holdings Ltd Braeside Street (Parts 50 to 56 on R. Plan 729)</p>	<p>We are the project planner and agent for the Adventurous Holdings Ltd. development at the terminus of Braeside Street (Parts 50 to 56 on R. Plan 729) – and we are writing on their behalf to object to the proposed changes to the Draft Official Plan (Draft OP) dated June, 2022, particularly as it impacts development of existing lots of record currently within the Rural designation and the Rural (RU) Zone with as-of-right uses. The proposed changes are significant since S.5.6.1.2 does not permit single-detached dwellings on existing lots of record within Environmental Protection designation of the Plan, to which my client's land is being designated from Rural to Environmental Protection. It is important to note that S.5.5.1.2 permits single-detached dwellings on existing lots of record within the Rural designation to which currently applies to my client's land under the current Official Plan. In essence, existing development potential of my client's land is being removed.</p> <p>1. Inclusion of smaller existing lots of record: This appears to create a "tooth-like" boundary in the vicinity of Glenlake Boulevard, Broadview Street and Braeside Street. Many lots have frontage on open road allowances. This approach does not appear to have been utilized in the other areas of Collingwood. Furthermore, there appears to be a discrepancy with the vegetation communities outlined on Figure 9, prepared by Plan B Natural Heritage in the Greenlands (Natural Areas & Park) Discussion Paper (dated July, 2020) for the Glenlake-Broadview-Braeside area and the built up area outlined on Figure 3, which do not coincide with the Proposed Environmental Protection designation. Urban sized parcels have been included with the proposed Environmental Protection designation, but it is not clear this has been factored into the natural heritage system approach of the 2020 Greenlands Discussion Paper.</p> <p>2. Status of registered lots in the RU Zone: It is a general planning practice to recognize the status of existing zoning and not remove development potential in order to avoid unnecessary hardship to existing property owners. Registered lots with no present environmental protection (i.e., Rural land use designation and zoning) have been included with the proposed Environmental Protection designation, but it is not clear sterilizing lots of record that have not been deemed has been factored into the natural heritage system approach of the 2020 Greenlands Discussion Paper, which may become a legal matter.</p> <p>3. Area M: A golf course is permitted in Area M of the draft Official Plan. It is my understanding that golf courses have a high land use impact due to vegetation clearing and maintenance requirements. Golf courses require a large land base more readily found outside of settlement areas and is not considered a compact land use pattern encouraged within Growth Plan urban serviced areas. Further, that this area consists of significant groundwater recharge area, wetlands, fish spawning habitat and a Category 1 Valleyland identified within the 2020 Greenlands Discussion Paper, and, under the current Official Plan, appears to have been previously identified as having higher environmental value than the subject lands. In essence, a nearby high-impact development on more environmentally sensitive property is permitted, but not minor rounding out of lower impact residential development. The subject lands do not appear to have the above-noted characteristics and appear to have a much lower environmental value. It is unclear why special policies were not created to facilitate infill and minor rounding out of existing development on existing lots of record within an urban serviced settlement area versus a golf course, which is typically found in a rural area.</p>	
		<p>4. Woodlands coverage: Woodland coverage within the study area is approximately 19% (i.e. 669 ha), which is well below the minimum guideline of 30% coverage for healthy, sustainable watersheds (Greenlands Discussion Paper 2020; Environment Canada 2013). The subject property is located at the fringe of the woodland and amounts to 1.2 hectares (0.2 %) of the overall system. Subject to site-specific surveys, it is understood that due to the uneven and level of disturbance of the Glenlake-Broadview-Braeside area, that the objection to the designation of the site from Rural to Environmental Protection may not affect the overall ecological and hydrologic function of the woodland, as it appears to represent minor rounding out of existing development of existing lots of record that already permit single-detached dwellings on individual on-site services as-of-right.</p> <p>5. Bill 23: The More Homes Built Faster Act received Royal Assent on November 28, 2022, which includes changes to the Conservations Authorities Act and the Planning Act, amongst other legislation and changes to various provincial regulations. Bill 23 is part of a long-term strategy to increase housing supply and provide housing options with a goal of building 1.5 million homes in the next 10 years. It is unclear how sterilizing existing lots of record with as-of-right uses within an urban serviced settlement area is consistent with Bill 23. It is presumed that the Collingwood Official Plan update will be delayed pending release of new provincial regulations and Draft Official Plan implementing policies are developed / revised.</p> <p>6. Interim Control By-law: In review of Staff Report #CAO2022-13, there appears to be ten (10) approvals for a total of 54.5 SDU for water allocation for minor residential development units for 48 new dwellings on existing lots of record. These range from single-detached units on vacant lots, some specified are not planned to be constructed within a three-year timeframe. Most of the units approved are for Phase 3B of the Summit View Subdivision. This appears to be significant as this would be new construction of roads and servicing not yet assumed by the municipality on vacant lots (which may or may not yet be registered). The subject lands are registered on an unopened road allowance, and a Development Agreement would should suffice to satisfy frontage requirements within the Zoning By-law.</p>	<p>Subject to ongoing legal advice. No further response is appropriate at this time.</p>

51	<p>Shawn Legere, MCIP, RPP, Senior Planner / Project Manager RFA Planning Consultant Inc.</p> <p>12123045 Canada Inc. d Braeside Street (Parts 57 to 71 on R. Plan 729)</p>	<p>We are the project planner and agent for the 12123045 Canada Inc. development at the terminus of Braeside Street (Parts 57 to 71 on R. Plan 729) – and we are writing on their behalf to object to the proposed changes to the Draft Official Plan (Draft OP) dated June, 2022, particularly as it impacts development of an existing lot of record currently within Rural designation and the Rural (RU) Zone with as-of-right uses. The proposed changes are significant since S.5.6.1.2 does not permit single-detached dwellings on existing lots of record within Environmental Protection designation of the Plan, to which my client's land is being designated from Rural to Environmental Protection. It is important to note that S.5.5.1.2 permits single-detached dwellings on existing lots of record within the Rural designation to which currently applies to my client's land under the current Official Plan. In essence, existing development potential of my client's land is being removed.</p> <p>1. Inclusion of smaller existing lots of record: This appears to create a "tooth-like" boundary in the vicinity of Glenlake Boulevard, Broadview Street and Braeside Street. Many lots have frontage on open road allowances. This approach does not appear to have been utilized in the other areas of Collingwood. Furthermore, there appears to be a discrepancy with the vegetation communities outlined on Figure 9, prepared by Plan B Natural Heritage in the Greenlands (Natural Areas & Park) Discussion Paper (dated July, 2020) for the Glenlake-Broadview-Braeside area and the built up area outlined on Figure 3, which do not coincide with the Proposed Environmental Protection designation. Urban sized parcels have been included with the proposed Environmental Protection designation, but it is not clear this has been factored into the natural heritage system approach of the 2020 Greenlands Discussion Paper.</p> <p>2. Status of registered lots in the RU Zone: It is a general planning practice to recognize the status of existing zoning and not remove development potential in order to avoid unnecessary hardship to existing property owners. Registered lots with no present environmental protection (i.e., Rural land use designation and zoning) have been included with the proposed Environmental Protection designation, but it is not clear sterilizing lots of record that have not been deemed has been factored into the natural heritage system approach of the 2020 Greenlands Discussion Paper, which may become a legal matter.</p> <p>3. Area M: A golf course is permitted in Area M of the draft Official Plan. It is my understanding that golf courses have a high land use impact due to vegetation clearing and maintenance requirements. Golf courses require a large land base more readily found outside of settlement areas and is not considered a compact land use pattern encouraged within Growth Plan urban serviced areas. Further, that this area consists of significant groundwater recharge area, wetlands, fish spawning habitat and a Category 1 Valleyland identified within the 2020 Greenlands Discussion Paper, and, under the current Official Plan, appears to have been previously identified as having higher environmental value than the subject property. In essence, a nearby high-impact development on more environmentally sensitive property is permitted, but not minor rounding out of lower impact residential development. The subject property does not appear to have the above-noted characteristics and appears to have a much lower environmental value. It is unclear why special policies were not created to facilitate infill and minor rounding out of existing development on existing lots of record within an urban serviced settlement area versus a golf course, which is typically found in a rural area.</p>	<p>Subject to ongoing legal advice. No further response is appropriate at this time.</p>
		<p>4. Woodlands coverage: Woodland coverage within the study area is approximately 19% (i.e. 669 ha), which is well below the minimum guideline of 30% coverage for healthy, sustainable watersheds (Greenlands Discussion Paper 2020; Environment Canada 2013). The subject property is located at the fringe of the woodland and amounts to 2.4 hectares (0.4 %) of the overall system. Subject to site-specific surveys, it is understood that due to the uneven and level of disturbance of the Glenlake-Broadview-Braeside area, that the objection to the designation of the site from Rural to Environmental Protection may not affect the overall ecological and hydrologic function of the woodland, as it appears to represent minor rounding out of existing development of existing lots of record that already permit single-detached dwellings on individual on-site services as-of-right.</p> <p>5. Bill 23: The More Homes Built Faster Act received Royal Assent on November 28, 2022, which includes changes to the Conservations Authorities Act and the Planning Act, amongst other legislation and changes to various provincial regulations. Bill 23 is part of a long-term strategy to increase housing supply and provide housing options with a goal of building 1.5 million homes in the next 10 years. It is unclear how sterilizing existing lots of record with as-of-right uses within an urban serviced settlement area is consistent with Bill 23. It is presumed that the Collingwood Official Plan update will be delayed pending release of new provincial regulations and Draft Official Plan implementing policies are developed / revised.</p> <p>6. Interim Control By-law: In review of Staff Report #CAO2022-13, there appears to be ten (10) approvals for a total of 54.5 SDU for water allocation for minor residential development units for 48 new dwellings on existing lots of record. These range from single-detached units on vacant lots, some specified are not planned to be constructed within a three-year timeframe. Most of the units approved are for Phase 3B of the Summit View Subdivision. This appears to be significant as this would be new construction of roads and servicing not yet assumed by the municipality on vacant lots (which may or may not yet be registered). The subject property is registered on an unopened road allowance, and a Development Agreement would should suffice to satisfy frontage requirements within the Zoning By-law.</p>	
52	<p>MHBC Kris Menzies, BES, BEd, MCIP, RPP Partner</p> <p>58 Saint Paul Street</p>	<p>It is requested that a policy be included which recognizes the existing low-rise residential uses within the Downtown Core (or along the Downtown Core fringe areas, and specifically including the subject site) and permits them to continue and be redeveloped for similar low-rise residential uses (as well as the other permitted Downtown Core uses).</p> <p>Perhaps an expansion on policy 5.3.1.2 d) to read (track changes by us): <i>Where residential uses in Low-Rise Buildings exist within the Downtown Core Designation, additional residential units, home occupations, and bed and breakfast establishments are also permitted within any Low-Rise Residential Building. Redevelopment to the same or similar Low-Rise building use and/or expansions and additions are permitted.</i></p> <p>It is suggested that the built form and use context along Saint Paul between Simcoe and First Streets is unique and forms a good transition to the Downtown and will not adversely affect the planned function of the Downtown Core.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.1.2 e) – Building Height – it is requested that any existing residential uses in Low-Rise buildings be exempt from the minimum 4.25 ground floor height.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.1.2 f) i) – Pedestrian Environment & 5.3.1.2 g) vi)– similar to above an exemption is requested to these policies which requires commercial like building façade treatments.</p> <p>Policy 3.5 d) provides a definition for Compatible Development which clearly states compatible does not mean the same as. This is supported.</p>	<p>Will consider adjustment in next DRAFT of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Agree, for existing uses.</p> <p>Agree, where there is existing low rise uses.</p>

		<p>It is understood that the Town has verbally advised that active planning applications that were deemed complete by the Town prior to the date the Updated Official Plan eventually comes into force and effect would continue to be considered and assessed under the policies of the then previous Official Plan which were in effect at the time the application(s) were deemed complete. As you are aware, an application is in process for these lands.</p> <p>In order for greater certainty we request that a transition policy be inserted into the Updated Official Plan, potentially in Section 7.2 – Interpretation – which clearly states this transition provision in order to avoid any interpretation discrepancy in the future. It is requested that the following form of wording be considered:</p> <p>Applications deemed complete prior to the approval of this Plan by the County of Simcoe may continue towards final approval under the policy framework in place at the time the Notice of Complete Application was issued. This would include any subsequent implementing approvals.</p> <p>The site is designated “Downtown Core” in the draft OP. In various instances, the draft OP speaks to residential built form, other than low-rise residential, being permitted and proposed. Policy 5.3.1.2 (e) (iii) specifically prohibits various forms of low-rise residential dwellings. As you are aware, there are several low-rise residential developments along the fringe of the Downtown including on Saint Paul Street where the site is located. Putting these existing dwelling units in a non-complying/non-conforming status has the potential to cause hardship to the land owners including but not limited to expansion/redevelopment issues and financing issues.</p>	<p>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>This project has the same issue under the EXISTING Official Plan. Legal non-conforming can continue to exist but should be replaced over the long term. Policy to be reviewed to ensure the concept is clear.</p>
53	<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>The subject lands are currently developed as the Collingwood Centre, a regional commercial shopping centre for the Town and surrounding area, which includes a Canadian Tire store and associated gas bar that form a part of the broader shopping centre. Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited is proposing an expansion of the existing Canadian Tire store on the subject lands, which were subject to pre-consultation discussions with Staff on October 27, 2021. Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan Approval applications are expected to be submitted in the coming weeks in order to permit the store expansion.</p> <p>Preliminary comments for the Draft Official Plan are as follows: Policy 5.1.2(a)i. states “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.” We request clarification as what is intended by “opportunities to enhance,” and suggest “where appropriate” be added to the beginning of the Policy as enhancements may not be appropriate in all circumstances, such as for minor additions and expansions to existing structures.</p> <p>Policy 5.1.2(a)ii. states that the Environmental Protection Designation has been conceptually delineated and that it is to be refined by the NVCA during the development review process. For the subject lands, we request that areas which have been subject to this process be reflected on Schedule 2 – Land Use Plan to provide certainty regarding the approved development limit.</p> <p>Policy 5.1.8.1(a)v. states that beyond residential and mixed uses, a Low-Rise Building is “Any other use that is accommodated in a building that is 3 storeys, or 11 metres in height, whichever is less.” We suggest that “a maximum of” be added before “3 storeys” for clarity.</p> <p>Policy 5.1.8.1(c) states “Low-Rise Buildings shall have a minimum density of 15 dwelling units per gross hectare and a maximum density not exceeding 20 dwelling units per gross hectare.” We suggest adding “Residential” before “Low-Rise Buildings” for clarity.</p>	<p>Transition policies are to be added to the next DRAFT Official Plan to clarify the Town's approach to in progress applications, existing approvals and existing lots of record.</p> <p>It is expected that opportunities to enhance the integrity of the natural heritage features will be explored through the require Environmental Impact Study. Enhance means to further improve the quality, value, or extent of the natural heritage features and/or its ecological functions.</p> <p>The policy does not say that the designation will be refined by the NVCA. Any adjustments are to be supported by an Environmental Impact Study prepared by the proponent, to the satisfaction of the Town and will be peer reviewed by a third party. Policy will be clarified.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p>
		<p>Policy 5.3(a) states “Strategic Growth Areas include the areas of the Town that are expected to intensify over time and include mixture of residential, retail and service commercial uses, as well as offices. The Strategic Growth Areas are to be the focus for intensification and are to accommodate mixed-use forms of development that include a mixture of uses within each Designation, a mixture of uses on individual development blocks and a mixture of uses within buildings.” We request clarification that a mix of uses within a site and building is not required under all circumstances, including within the Regional Commercial District Designation as stated in Policy 5.3.4.3(f).</p> <p>Policy 5.3.4.2(a) states, “All permitted uses within [the] Regional Commercial District Designation shall be developed within Mid-Rise and High-Rise Buildings.” We suggest that “where appropriate” be incorporated at the end of this subsection to allow for a transition to mid- and high-rise buildings within these areas, as this requirement would create barriers to infill and expansion applications in existing low-rise contexts.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.4.3(e)i. states “All development shall incorporate a minimum floor to ceiling height of the ground floor of 4.25 metres” in the Regional Commercial District designation. We suggest adding “Where appropriate” before “All development” to allow for flexibility and account for operational needs.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.4.3(e)ii. states that the required minimum building height is the greater of 2 storeys or 8.0 m within the Regional Commercial District designation. We suggest the language of this section be adjusted to allow for flexibility, operational needs and sensitivity to existing context. A minimum building height of 2 storeys within the Regional Commercial District designation may not be appropriate in all circumstances, particularly as the designation covers many large-format retailers where a 2 storey building height may not be appropriate or feasible, such as a gas bar or expansion to an existing 1 storey building. Such a requirement would be limiting if applied in cases of infill or building expansions.</p>	<p>Correct, mix is required in a general sense unless otherwise stated and as clarified in 5.3.4.3(f). More detailed policies guiding the development of mixed use sites or buildings are included in each applicable designation.</p> <p>Agree. Wording to be adjusted to permit new stand-alone retail, service commercial, and restaurant uses to be 1 storey in 5.3.4.3 e)</p> <p>A minimum ground floor of 4.25 metres is necessary to support most non-residential land uses, particularly retail and service commercial uses, and restaurants. No change necessary.</p> <p>See comment with respect to 5.3.4.3 e).</p>

		<p>Policy 5.3.4.3(i) states that “a Master Stormwater Management Plan must be prepared and approved by the Town in consultation with any agency having jurisdiction prior to development of the lands within the Regional Commercial District designation.” We request clarification that in circumstances where a Master SWM Plan has already been prepared on developed sites that a new Plan would not be required to be prepared to facilitate minor expansions to existing structures.</p> <p>The 2 storey or 8.0 m minimum building height required by Policy 5.3.2(e)ii. presents inconsistencies with the Mid-Rise policies found in Policy 5.1.8.2(a), which are meant apply to the Regional Commercial District designation. We request clarification as to what the prevailing minimum height requirements will be for commercial uses within Regional Commercial Districts. We further suggest that the minimum height requirements for all designations be made consistent to align with the stated definitions of Low-, Mid-, and High-Rise buildings in Policies 5.1.8.1 to 5.1.8.3.</p> <p>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 request clarification regarding the intent of the term “theme concepts” and how they may be evaluated in a proposal.</p> <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 suggest “where feasible” be added to this subsection to allow for flexibility to account for site context and operational needs.</p>	<p>Existing policy. Add policy to recognize that there is already a Plan in place.</p> <p>Height in commercial and mixed-use context are different than for stand-alone residential development. See comments on height above.</p> <p>Existing policy. Add policy to recognize that there is already a Plan in place.</p> <p>Partly agree. Policy to add "loading and garbage facilities may be located between buildings subject to the satisfaction of the Town".</p>
		<p>Policy 5.3.4.4(g) states “parking facilities are discouraged between the building(s) and any public road right-of-way. Where parking is located between the building(s) and any public road right-of-way, adequate landscape treatments shall be provided to enhance the visual appearance of the development and to improve pedestrian comfort and safety, to the satisfaction of the Town.” We suggest that “new” be added before “parking facilities are discouraged” and before “parking is located” to ensure that existing conditions are reflected.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.4.5(b) and (d) contain mentions of “Area A – North of First Street Extension” in relation to the area specific policies for Area F – North of First Street Extension. We suggest this be corrected to “Area F” for consistency.</p> <p>The legend of Draft Schedule 4 – Landfills/Source Water Protection contains two Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (“HVA”) designations – one municipal and one from the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, and Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Plan. The subject lands are covered by both of these HVA designations. We request clarification be provided as to how the segments of these designated areas may be treated, as the Draft Policies 5.6.5.4(b) and (c) do not differentiate between the two HVAs.</p> <p>Policy 6.2.6(c) states that “all applications ... shall be accompanied by a Stormwater Management (“SWM”) Report.” We suggest that “where appropriate” be added to this subsection, as the submission of a SWM Report may not be appropriate under all circumstances, such as minor additions or expansions to existing structures.</p> <p>We request clarification as to the applicability of Section 22(2.1) of the Planning Act, that states that no person or public body shall request an amendment to a new official plan before the second anniversary of the first day any part of the plan comes into effect.</p> <p>Policy 3.5(d) – (g) provides guidance with respect to development that would be considered “compatible.” Within these sections, there is 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. In our submission, the Official Plan should expand the policy of what may be considered compatible development to extend to matters of noise, vibration, odour, and air quality.</p> <p>Policy 5.1.8.1(a)v. states that beyond residential and mixed uses, a Low-Rise Building is “Any other use that is accommodated in a building that is 3 storeys, or 11 metres in height, whichever is less.” We suggest that “a maximum of” be added before “3 storeys” for clarity.</p> <p>Policy 5.1.8.1(c) states “Low-Rise Buildings shall have a minimum density of 15 dwelling units per gross hectare and a maximum density not exceeding 20 dwelling units per gross hectare.” We suggest adding “Residential” before “Low-Rise Buildings” for clarity.</p> <p>Policies 5.1.8.2(c) and 5.1.8.3(c) propose to cap Floor Space Index for Mid- and High-Rise buildings. We suggest removing prescriptive metrics from the Official Plan related to FSI to account for site specific context. Specific metrics (including FSI maximums) are appropriate to regulate through an implementing Zoning by-law.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.1 refers to the “Downtown” designation identified on Schedule 2 – Land Use Plan as “Downtown Core.” We suggest harmonizing the names of the designations between the policies and schedules of the Official Plan for consistency.</p> <p>Policy 5.3.1.3(e)i. states “All development within the Downtown Core Designation shall incorporate a floor to ceiling height on the ground floor of 4.25 metres”, which in our submission is overly prescriptive. We suggest adding “minimum” before “floor to ceiling” and “where appropriate” before “all development”.</p>	<p>Sufficient flexibility to interpret this policy is provided by the use of “discouraged” and “to the satisfaction of the Town”. No change necessary.</p> <p>Agree. Will be corrected.</p> <p>The information and mapping data was included directly from the work carried out by the relevant Source Protection Plan, including the associated policy framework. One HVA category applies to lands within the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Plan, while the other HVA category applies to lands within the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan, with no overlap. Clarification can be sought from the relevant Conservation/Source Water Protection Authorities.</p> <p>Bill 23 deleted this provision, previously there was flexibility for Council to permit amendments anyway.</p> <p>Incorrect. S.3.5.d), in the definition of "compatible development" the requirement of "without causing an undue, adverse impact on surrounding properties" is included. Noise, vibration, odour, air quality, and other impacts not identified are all inherently captured in that statement.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>The permitted FSI densities are considered generous. No change proposed.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree with adding "minimum". To change to "all new development".</p>