



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
<p>Mike Wandszura (Resident) – March 24, 2012</p>	<p>Stricter building controls</p>	<p>Owens a lot in Tiny and is reluctant to build a nice higher-end home on it. The reason being is that the township seems to allow just about anything to be built as long as it meets the minimum requirements. Mike suggested introducing “stricter building controls to eliminate the ‘junkyard’ appearance’ that Tiny seems to find acceptable”</p>	<p>No change recommended Property standards matters are regulated by the Property Standards By-law and Clean Yards By-law which are enacted under the <i>Municipal Act</i>.</p>
<p>Pat Profiti (27 Tripp Lane) – August 24, 2017</p>	<p>Greenbelt lands and Groundwater</p>	<p>Suggests that the new Official Plan should protect and enhance Greenbelt area.</p> <p>The New OP dismisses or dilutes the current zoning in the immediate area of Park Road and Tripp Lane.</p>	<p>No change recommended The Draft OP, combined with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), Provincial Growth Plan and County Official Plan provides greater environmental protection than current Official Plan. The Draft OP establishes an Environmental Protection designation and Greenlands designation that are delineated based on the natural heritage features identified in cooperation with Provincial, County and the SSEA mapping.</p> <p>No change recommended The Draft OP designates the residential lots on Tripp Lane as Shoreline and the</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
			larger tracts to the rear as Greenlands
		Public policy should ensure that the current resident's groundwater is protected or is not harmed by its zoning policy.	No change recommended Draft OP has implemented the source protection plan policies in accordance with Clean Water Act requirements
		Addressed concerns with storm water management issues in the vicinity of Tripp Lane/Park Road and Tiny Beaches Road.	No change recommended The Public Works Department has reviewed this matter and is proposing action through the 2018 budget.
Shayne Large (Wyevale) – August 24, 2017	Greenland Designation	Concerned with the wording in Section B.2.16.1, B.2.17 and B.2.18 worry that this could be interpreted differently in the future if different persons are involved.	Change recommended B.2.16.1 – This Section lists permitted uses B.2.17 – This Section provides development policies B.2.18 – This Section applies to adjacent lands. These Sections will be reviewed to ensure wording matches intent/interpretation
Nicholas & Diane Leblovic (125 Birett Dr.)-		Expressed concern with specific section in New OP as outlined below:	No change recommended The projected population growth numbers are dictated by the Province



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p><u>A.3.1.5 & 6</u> Projected growth in both permanent and seasonal residents too small as it fails to take into account conversions from seasonal to permanent status as well as increase capacity in Multi Unit Residential, secondary dwelling units and garden suites.</p>	
		<p><u>A.3.2 & 3</u> Emphasis should be placed on attracting and maintaining commercial development which is consistent with the general character of the Township.</p>	<p>No change recommended These objectives relate to Growth Management and “commercial” is too specific for the policy basis. Objective (d) states: “to create opportunity for employment within the Township” which, from a growth perspective, provides for “attracting” commercial development.</p>
		<p>Affordable housing units should be primarily located in Settlement Areas. Significant intensification in the Shoreline Area has the potential to dramatically change the character of this Area and thus adversely affect both enjoyment and values.</p>	<p>Change recommended Second units not to be permitted in the Shoreline designation.</p>
		<p><u>8.4.3.1</u> Garden suites and secondary dwellings should be limited in both number in any shoreline area as over intensification could change character of the</p>	<p>Change recommended Second units not to be permitted in the Shoreline designation.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>area and adversely affect property values. They should also be limited in size relative to the principal dwelling and should be primarily for use by family members.</p> <p>Closer controls on construction of secondary dwelling units on residential properties is required as there are a number of clear abuses in the Balm Beach area (see 20 Tiny Beaches Road South which appears to have 3 large residences on one lot).</p>	
		<p><u>8.4.8.2</u> We concur with the policy which prohibits and new Multi Unit Residential in the Shoreline Area. The definition of Multi Unit Residential should make it clear that it extends not only to condominiums and co-ops but other legal structures that may their functional equivalent</p>	<p>No change recommended Official Plans avoid review of tenure thus co-ops/condos/apartments etc. may all be considered “multiples” in land use planning terms</p>
		<p><u>B.4.9</u> The commercial area of Balm Beach is unique in that it is surrounded by a major residential community which creates special problems concerning the potential negative impact of the commercial activity on its neighbours. The Official Plan should specifically require prior consultation between the business and residential communities with respect to any new</p>	<p>No change recommended The policies cannot compel consultation with special interest groups. However, Section E12.2 requires special notification for a zoning by-law amendment application in a commercial zone or proposed to be placed in a commercial zone. Many of the policies were authored to address consideration of potential</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		development proposals.	impacts of new commercial uses on predominantly residential areas.
		<u>B.4.9.2</u> The definition of "Marina" should include any commercial rental of powered watercraft (such is currently operated by the Sunport Motel) and establishment or expansion of such operations should be prohibited in the vicinity of any private or public water based recreational area (e.g. both public parks and private residential shoreline).	No change recommended The rental of equipment is a different use from a marina.
		<u>B.4.11.2</u> While the objectives of this policy (i.e accommodation of the Waterfront Park for public use and minimizing impacts on environment and adjacent residential communities) are both appropriate and commendable, the methodology adopted by the Township to date to achieve those objectives (primarily the Parking Strategy) of limited scope to achieve these ends. It fails to address the fact that much of the population using the public beaches will walk to the beach and that many others may be dropped off at the beach. In addition there are no objective bases for determining when the public beaches are overcrowded or for addressing the overcrowding	No change recommended A review of the beach capacity and specific recommendations and/or physical or policy changes respecting beaches and their capacity is beyond the scope of the OP update. This issue has been addressed in the Township's Strategic Plan (BEST Strategy)



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>by diversion to other underused areas. The Township needs to follow the example of numerous communities with public beaches in North America, Europe and elsewhere and determine maximum usable capacity for its public beaches using widely accepted formulas and put in place specific procedures for directing beach users to other areas. In the absence of these steps when public beaches become overcrowded, beach users will naturally migrate to the adjacent privately-owned beaches. Excess beach utilization also has potential negative environmental impact on the adjacent waters increasing the potential for public beach advisories and closures which would again result in beach goers moving to private beaches not impacted by such measures.</p>	
		<p><u>B.4.12</u> This section is solely a statement of intention and is bereft of any policy. The Township has known for years that road allowances such as Kitching lane are not in fact used on a low intensity basis and that such uses negatively impact the owners of adjacent private properties in terms of noise, vandalism, abuse, littering and threats to safety of both person and property. Any reasonable policy to address these problems would include a</p>	<p>No change recommended This issue has been addressed in the Township's Strategic Plan (BEST Strategy)</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		determination of applicable capacity of these areas and provisions for limiting public usage and enforcing such limits. The absence of any such policy to date indicates that Township Council does not have the political will to address this problem.	
		<u>D.9</u> It should be made clear that this section as it relates to Condominiums does not apply to the Shoreline Area as Section B.4.8 specifically prohibits MURBs in this Area.	No change recommended Condominium development is not exclusive to multi-residential use. A condo can be single detached, commercial, etc. thus the policy should remain
		<u>D.13</u> There should be limits on the number of Bed & Breakfasts in any part of the community as many of these are Airbnbs and have the potential to create problems outlined in the commentary on 8.4.3.1.	No change recommended Airbnbs are considered short term rentals of single detached dwellings and are not traditional B&Bs as described in the draft OP. The B&B policy provides criteria for establishing a B&B including the need for a rezoning (and public process). It may be appropriate to have multiple B&B's in one area and none in another. The introduction of number of B&Bs permitted would not assist with the determination of the appropriateness of them in a specific area.
		<u>E.4.6 & E.5</u>	No change recommended



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>There was a different standard applied to the approval of an existing non-conforming or non-complying use than there was to a proposed one. That is there was a reluctance to require a homeowner to remediate an existing non-conforming or non-complying use especially if it were to require the expenditure of significant monies. This same reluctance was not evident when the applicant was requesting a minor variance for a proposed project.</p> <p>There is a danger that this approach leads to the general impression that in Tiny "it is always better to ask for forgiveness than permission" and encourages some people to knowingly ignore the rules with the expectation that, if subsequently caught, he/she will be "forgiven" with a lesser or no consequence.</p> <p>To overcome this impression, we suggest that it be made clear that the same standards are to apply to both an existing and proposed non-conforming and non-complying use.</p>	<p>Non-conforming only applies to an existing use. It does not apply when a use is being proposed.</p>
<p>Don Morton – September 4, 2017</p>	<p>Garden Suites / Secondary Dwelling Units</p>	<p><u>Garden Suites</u> Expressed concern with Section D.12.2.3 (c) Because this is a residential building "appropriate buffering" should require the same minimum setbacks from front yard, back yard and side yards</p>	<p>No change recommended The Official Plan does not establish yard requirements. The Zoning By-law establishes yard requirements.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		as the main building. <u>Secondary Dwelling Units</u> Expressed concern with Section D.12.3.7 and how it might be interpreted. Stated that "minor additions" should be defined or not permitted. For example: an interpretation could read "such as stairs and/or decks but not an additional room or part room to the dwelling itself". → Clarification: "minor addition" could be interpreted to mean an addition to the footprint or height of the existing building. Perhaps the clause should read "minor additions may be permitted, but not including additions to the footprint or height, to appropriately accommodate the Secondary Dwelling Unit."	Change recommended Use of "Minor additions" was to allow the Township the ability to assess each application on its merits. Further definition of the extent of this could be added if desired by Council.
Don Morton (2) – September 19, 2017	Follow-up with item listed above (Secondary Dwelling Units)	<u>Clause D.12.3.1</u> Understood and OK	No change recommended
		<u>Clause D.12.3.2</u> Understood and Ok	No change recommended
		<u>Clause D.12.3.3</u> If clause D.12.3.5 immediately follows clause D.12.3.3 then the phrase "only permitted in other	Change recommended Move section D12.3.5 to follow after



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		designations as per the policies of this Plan" is not necessary and the Plan reads with more clarity.	D.12.3.3 and keep and remove "...and are only permitted in other designations as per the policies of this Plan." From D12.3.3
		<p><u>Clause D.12.3.4</u> Make this clause D.12.3.5 Sentence (a) What is the purpose of sentence (a)? How can a dwelling unit not be wholly contained within a dwelling unit? What is this trying to avoid?</p>	<p>Change recommended Move section D12.3.5 to follow after D.12.3.3 and keep and remove "...and are only permitted in other designations as per the policies of this Plan." From D12.3.3</p> <p>Modification to indicate that the secondary unit has to be located in the principal dwelling or principal building. This would not permit second units in accessory buildings.</p>
		Sentence (b) ok	No change recommended
		Sentence (c) buffering should be the same as that required for the primary dwelling	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>Additional buffering, if required, should be done on the merits of the new unit/use not on what currently exists thus no changes to (c) are recommended.</p>
		Sentence (d) (e) (f) ok	No change recommended
		Sentence (g) What is the purpose of this sentence?	<p>Change recommended</p> <p>Delete this section as it may potentially</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
			restrict a new secondary dwelling unit due to design constraints. The purpose of the policy is to try to make the second unit as unobtrusive as possible and not have the unit look like a semi-detached dwelling
		<u>Clause D.12.3.6 (c)</u> Setback requirements should be the same as the primary dwelling	No change recommended The Zoning By-law regulates setback requirements.
		<u>Clause D.12.3.7</u> Clause D.12.3.6 states that “no additions are required” but this clause talks about minor additions being permitted? Is it intended to permit minor additions that include additions to the footprint and/or the building height? Should clarify.	Change recommended Change required to ensure consistent language.
Bob Drapkin – August 25, 2017	Information regarding property located at 285 Hillcrest Road	Please confirm the new property zoning designation name, restrictions, effective date and any other relevant information.	No change recommended Property is proposed to be re-designated from Environmental Protection One to Greenlands and Rural
Janet Boyer (September 1,	20 th Concession Stump dump	- Suggested that stump dump could be added in brackets to the Waste Disposal Site	No change recommended The Ministry of the Environment and



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
2017)		designation on the map. The reasoning behind this is so that no one thinks that this site is an actual garbage dump.	Climate Change identifies stump dumps as waste disposal sites for the purposes of the D4 requirements.
Don and Gail Nowak (660 Concession Road 15 West) – September 19, 2017	Secondary Dwelling Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed concern with any proposal for Second units/suites, Garden Suites, Secondary Dwelling Units. - "I can see no advantage to this proposal other than a few individuals who will want to benefit financially from this "Open Door Policy". 	Change recommended Secondary Dwelling units proposed to be removed as a permitted use in the Shoreline designation.
		1) Stated that this will "create an on-slot of these units being built / renovated. Once established they will be extremely difficult and costly to "police". I'm quite certain that it will involve hiring a number of enforcement officers at a substantial cost that will be passed on to us...the taxpayers.	Change recommended See comments above
		2) If this is intended as "low cost housing" then it will attract the type of "renter" that will definitely increase the odds of being in that category. Our quality of life will diminish, our property values will diminish and what has attracted most of us to this area in the first place will be greatly undermined.	Change recommended See comments above
		3) No one should be allowed to rent out any	Change recommended



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		part of their house or Secondary Suites/Units, Garden Suites or Secondary Dwelling Units at any time. The only exceptions may be if you have a direct relative requiring a place to stay or the B&B scenario which I will address later.	See comments above
		4) Stated that the B&B scenario will work and that he approved of the wording about the owner being specifically required to reside in the dwelling they are renting	No change recommended
		5) Stated that the Official Plan should include a limit as to the number of days a B&B can be rented.	No change recommended This is hard for the Township to policy and there is no restriction on a person renting out a bedroom in their home for longer periods of time.
Elaine & Walt Stephenson (1952 Tiny Beaches Rd. S.) – September 29, 2017	Comments on Specific Sections in Draft Official Plan	<u>Section A.1.3.1 Goals (a)</u> The “Environment First” principle must be replaced. Many people, worked long & hard to achieve this important part of our “vision” for Tiny. “Environment Focused objective” waters down the original principle substantially & leaves too much room for “fuzziness”.	No change recommended The change to this goal reflects that in locations such as settlement areas or agricultural lands, it may not be the environment first. This is consistent with Provincial and County policy. As a whole, the draft Official Plan is more protective of environmental features.
		<u>Section B.4.1.1.</u>	Change recommended



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		Please keep the following in mind when preparing this OP as stated in this paragraph: "The Shoreline designation has limited commercial development, diverse geography and has a different character from the other developed areas of the Township." It pertains to much of what concerns us below.	Updated wording will be considered
		<u>B.4.3 Permitted Uses</u> Please remove "garden suites & secondary dwelling units...") from this section. The opportunity for short term rentals & stress on the water, sewage & beaches is far too great.	Change recommended The use of Garden Suites throughout the Township has been a long standing permission and recommend keeping. Draft Second Suites permissions to be removed from the Shoreline designation
		<u>B.4.6 Plan of Subdivision Development</u> <u>B.4.8.1</u> Additional multiple residential dwellings in the shoreline should not be permitted.	No change recommended The policy only permits EXISTING multiple residential units.
		<u>B.4.8.2</u> Please include the following: Any expansion will not consist of an additional dwelling unit but only a necessary enlargement of one particular area. All multiple residential dwellings must be zoned "commercial".	No change recommended The intention of the policy is to allow for an expansion to the building as well as addition of more units. It is not appropriate to zone residential units as "commercial" in a Zoning By-law.
		<u>B.4.11.2</u>	Change recommended



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		Please include the following highlighted wording:” In order to implement this Policy, Park Master Plans have been prepared for each of these Parks to ensure that they are effectively planned to both accommodate public use on a low intensity basis and minimize the impacts of that public use on the environment and adjacent residential communities.	Agreed; wording will be added
		<u>B.9.2 Objectives</u> Please insert the highlighted word: “..... b) To protect existing mineral aggregate operations and resources from activities that would unnecessarily preclude or hinder their continued use or expansion.”	No change recommended The Provincial language is “preclude or hinder” which is a well know test throughout the Province; additional wording may cause issues with interpretation.
		<u>D.12.2.2</u> Please omit “the Shoreline” from this section. In addition, we have a few questions or concerns, as follows:	No change recommended As discussed, it is recommended that Garden Suites remain a permitted use in the Shoreline designation
		<u>B.4.12.1</u>” These areas are intended to be used on a low intensity basis by all Township residents or for use by residents in the immediate community.” - This is confusing. What is the difference between Township residents and residents in the immediate community? Might this be	Change recommended Will change the word “community” to “neighbourhood”. The intention is that residents, Township wide as well as cottagers (who are not defined as “residents”) are the intended users of these areas and are not intended for the



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>referring to the surrounding areas such as Midland, Penetanguishene, Elmvale? If so, does this mean that visitors from areas other than these or Tiny are not permitted to use these smaller community beaches? How do you propose to enforce this? This section needs re-tweaking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This statement is in your Official Plan: The Shoreline designation has limited commercial development, diverse geography and has a different character from the other developed areas of the Township. 	<p>wider population.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In addition to the above, past councils have assured, in particular, both the Woodland Beach & Bluewater (Dunes) residents who host major parks, that use of the parks will be intended for the use of the residents of Tiny (& possibly surrounding communities) & not meant to encourage wide public use from farther regions. We would like to feel that our Township has the best interests of all residents, backlot, inland & shoreline in mind rather than catering so obviously to the “public at large”. 	<p>No change recommended See comments above</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our beaches are classed as “dynamic” in that they change from year to year & cannot 	<p>No change recommended See comments above</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		always sustain large groups. In addition, the shoreline was permitted to be developed abutting the beach areas with no buffer in between to protect the property & privacy of shoreline residents.	
		<u>B.1.5</u> - We would like to see building on wetlands that are not “provincially significant” not permitted.	No change recommended Development is not permitted in or in close proximity to Provincially Significant Wetlands and Other Evaluated Wetlands. Development may be permitted in Other Wetlands 2 hectares or larger with a planning application and the completion of an Environmental Impact Study.
		- We would also like to have a policy in place that prohibits the clear cutting of privately owned lands prior to a building permit & fixed date for building is submitted.	No change recommended This is a matter for a tree cutting by-law passed under the Municipal Act.
		- The cutting of healthy trees that do not pose a problem to structures on private property should also be prohibited. A prior inspection by the Township should be done to permit the removal of unhealthy or dangerous trees.	No change recommended See comment above.
		- Outhouses should not be permitted in the Shoreline area, particularly where there is	No change recommended This is a matter dealt with under the



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>an existing septic system unless it is there for temporary use such as special occasions where a septic may be challenged with guests.</p>	<p>Ontario Building Code not an OP.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Properties with existing additional cabins/bunkies should not be permitted to rent for profit without being rezoned to commercial. - We have also reviewed the submission by FoTTSA & agree with all of their comments. - Please note that some of these concerns may fall under Planning rather than belong in the Official Plan. However, we were advised to submit these concerns here since many of policies in the OP determine much of what the Planning regulations permit. 	<p>Change recommended Secondary suites are being proposed to be removed from the Shoreline designation</p>
<p>Shayne Large (66 Bailey Crescent) – September 29, 2017</p>	<p>General Concerns Mapping/ Schedules Greenlands</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I believe that each policy of the plan should be reconsidered with specific regard to the changes or improvements that can be made to benefit Tiny Township residents - Please take additional time to inform and educate the public before proceeding to adopt a new Official Plan 	<p>No change recommended All policies of the Plan have been considered through this review.</p> <p>The public engagement component of the exercise involves open houses, public meetings and the opportunity for</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mentioned that there is very little vacant land that remains available for development within settlements areas. 	<p>comment.</p> <p>Noted – The County is responsible for growth management.</p>
		<p><u>Mapping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Schedules provided are difficult to use at the scale provided. Due to the size of the Township it would be helpful if the Schedules could be broken up into multiple pages to permit a larger scale that would in turn allow residents to identify their properties and the land use designations that have been applied. - Numerous Mapping or land use designation errors appear to have been made. Specifically, large portions of Lot 13, Concession 5 have been identified as agricultural when they should be rural. - At present, the mapping appears very accurate and up to date in some locations, but significantly less in others. 	<p>Change recommended</p> <p>Consider modifications to the scale of mapping</p> <p>Additional review of mapping to be undertaken.</p>
		<p><u>Greenlands</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It appears that a significant portion of lands previously designated Rural are proposed to be pre-designated to Greenlands 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>This reflects the natural heritage features that are required to be included as a result of the Provincial and County policies.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based the Greenlands designation being placed over private reforestation areas, they should not be considered natural heritage and should be designated as Rural or Agricultural as opposed to Greenlands 	<p>No change recommended This is reflective of the County Greenlands Designation and possibly significant woodlands that are identified by the SSEA in accordance with the MNRF criteria for significant woodlands.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section B.2.16 – Permitted uses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Confirm that a new residential use would be permitted on an existing lot of record with an EIS. 	<p>Change recommended New residential uses are permitted in the Greenlands designation on existing lots. This section will be reviewed to ensure wording matches intent/interpretation</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section A.2.1.2. Why have the natural heritage features in the Shoreline Designation not been designated Greenlands? 	<p>No change recommended These are areas where growth is to occur. Do not want to require an OPA to facilitate development. Features have been recognized on Schedule B. Study of features is required where they exist as part of a Planning Act Application. Continue discussion with the County on the hierarchy of natural heritage features versus historically designated lands in the Shoreline.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		Mineral Aggregate Resources Two - Please amend Schedule "A" to remove this designation Lot 4, Concession 4. (Aggregate Investigation Report provided)	Change recommended Amend Schedule A to delete Aggregate Resource Overlay Designation accordingly based on comments received by MNR.
		Residential Secondary Units/ suites - The addition of the new policies pertaining to residential second units and suites is a very positive amendment to the official Plan - I question if the inclusion of these policies in the Shoreline designation will result in units being used as short-term rentals. The Township should consider removing these policies from the Shoreline designation while maintaining them for the remaining designations.	Change recommended It is recommended that Secondary Suites in the Shoreline designation be removed.
		Section B.8.5.2 - This Section outlines that no more than two severances will be permitted in the Rural designation. Why?	No change recommended The Growth Plan only permits new lots in Rural areas where there were policies that existed as of June 16, 2006; the two lot policy was in effect at the Township at that time and thus it is being carried forward. The Township is required to conform to the Growth Plan.
		- Clause B.8.5.2 d) is also unnecessarily	No change recommended



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		restrictive and should be eliminated completely.	Same comment as above.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clause B.8.5.2 b). The maximum lot size restriction should be reconsidered or removed. Sufficient restrictions exist in the zoning bylaw to prohibit unwanted uses that may be proposed on larger parcels. 	<p>No changes recommended</p> <p>The purpose of the policy is to provide for a sufficient lot size for a residential unit, well and septic while guarding against fragmentation of the Rural landscape with unnecessary large lots. Without specific policies, the Zoning by-law would have no context for consideration if a lot size variance is sought. In addition, County rural severance policies provide for a maximum 1 hectare lot area for residential lot creation.</p>
		<p>Section A.3.2. a), A.3.3.2, A.3.5 and B.8.8.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Placing restrictions on lands adjacent to settlement areas is unreasonable based on the policies currently in place. 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>The Township is subject to the Growth Plan which requires the County to determine what, if any, settlement boundaries should be adjusted. This is done only after a County Municipal Comprehensive Review which needs to review numerous factors.</p> <p>The 1 km development restriction around a settlement area is a prescribed policy of the County; Section 3.3.7 it has been brought forward into the Township OP as</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
			it is required to be conformed with.
		<u>Settlement Area Servicing</u> Statements throughout the document pertaining to servicing settlement areas are inconsistent and confusing.	Change recommended It would be helpful if examples be provided.
		<u>Tourism</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New policies to include opportunities for sustainable and diversified tourism in accordance with the PPS (Section 1.1.4.1 g) should be added to the Settlement Area, Rural, Agricultural and Greenland designations 	Change recommended Several policies have been added in the Agricultural and Rural designations including permitting on-farm diversified uses and agriculture-related uses. Definitions will be provided for these terms but it includes tourism uses.
		<u>Zoning By-Law Update</u> An update to the Zoning By-law typically follows a Municipal Official Plan review and update. Due to significant changes to the Official Plan and its land use designations as a result of new natural heritage policies I believe that it would be helpful to the residents of Tiny if the amendments to Zoning By-Law were drafted and presented prior to adopting the Official Plan.	No change recommended Zoning By-law Update is required to occur within three years of the adoption of a new OP as per the Planning Act.
Barb Hunt (430 Mertz Road) – September 29, 2017	Aggregates Climate Change	<u>Aggregate Section</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the section coincide with PPS (Section 2.5.2.5, public health, public safety environmental impact), Growth Plan, 	No change recommended Yes, the Aggregate Section is consistent with the PPS Aggregate policies.



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		County OP, Clean water Act Well Head Protection Endangered Species, Animal Corridors, Oak Ridges Moraine plan,	
		Question 1: have these studies been completed with applications by Dufferin Aggregate, Beamish, Miller, Sargeant etc., and submitted to Tiny Township before rezoning has been given?	<p>No change recommended All required studies, as per the date of the application was made, were provided to the Township as part of the application submission.</p> <p>Any specific application is not part of the OP update</p>
		Question 2: Rehabilitation Plans – progressive / as they mine aggregate is there a plan to keep topsoil when the pit is closed?	<p>No change recommended This would be addressed in the specific Aggregate Resources Act pit licence requirements</p>
		Question 3: truck routes for Township, County and Provincial Government?	<p>No change recommended County Roads and Provincial highways are truck routes and in some cases local roads are required to access the truck routes. The introduction of truck routes on Township roads is being reviewed by the Public Works Department outside of the OP update process.</p>
		Question 4: Who enforces the hours of operation for aggregate pits?	<p>No change recommended The Ministry of Natural Resources and</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
			Forestry as part of the gravel pit licence with the operator.
		Question 5: Who enforces Noise, Dust and Vibration?	No change recommended The Province (MNRF and MOECC).
		Question 6: P.T.T.W – How many litres per day? - How much aggregate is extracted per year?	No change recommended Unknown; not part of the OP update. This question can be directed to the MNRF relative to a specific gravel pit license
		Question 7 and 8: Do the MOECC and the MNRF work together?	No change recommended This is a question that is appropriate for the Province.
		Question 9: How much money does Tiny Township get per tonnes to rehabilitate/ repair local roads?	No change recommended Not part of the OP update. Refer to Public Works
		Question 10: how is school bus safety maintained on truck routes?	No change recommended This is not an OP matter.
		Question 11: Does the Aggregate Act and Planning Act Work in tandem?	No change recommended Yes. Prior to a new gravel pit or an



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
			expansion to an existing gravel pit license being issued under the ARA, Planning Act approval is required for the new land use
		Question 12: How are aggregate taxes compiled? Compared to agriculture and industrial?	No change recommended This is not an OP matter Refer to MPAC or Treasury
Peter Stubbins (238 Thunder Beach Road) - September 27, 2017		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove wording that says “making our environment a priority.” Using previous wording such as “Environment First” and including it in the opening section of the OP - Agrees with the County letter for not allowing the expansion of settlement areas. When it comes time, rural areas around Wyevale should be considered. - Agreed that Copeland Creek Estate shouldn’t be expanded - Recommended not prepare for large expansions of settlement areas 	No change recommended The change to this goal reflects that in locations such as settlement areas or agricultural lands, it may not be the environment first. This is consistent with Provincial and County policy. As a whole, the draft Official Plan is more protective of environmental features.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The New OP should not allow for the expansion of septage-spreading areas 	No change recommended This is MOECC jurisdiction. Not an Official Plan matter.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new OP should include natural 	No change recommended



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>heritage mapping and designations from the SSEA March 23, 2017 report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aggregate areas west of Darby Road be the topic of public conversation before the Draft OP is agreed upon - Agrees that garden suites should not be allowed in shoreline areas. However they should be allowed on large rural properties outside the settlement within the existing lot and without building development charges to provide affordable housing for youth populations. 	<p>The SSEA mapping was the basis for the features identified on Schedule B.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make the New OP an "ENVIRONMENT FIRST OP" 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>The change to this goal reflects that in locations such as settlement areas or agricultural lands, it may not be the environment first. This is consistent with Provincial policy.</p> <p>As a whole, the draft Official Plan is more protective of environmental features.</p>
<p>Gail and John Shrives (83 Summerwalk Place) – September 29,</p>	<p>Committee of Adjustment Planning Process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns with comments not being addressed at Committee of Adjustment meeting • Review of the skills sets and qualifications of members appointed to Committee of 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>Not an OP matter</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
2017	Public Consultation	Adjustment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments pertaining to the Planning Department needing to be more responsive, transparent and accessible to public • Committee appears to take a more permissive approach to allow development on shoreline lots 	
Michael Frustaglio (Resident – 29 Jules Avenue, Vaughan) – March 1, 2016	Concern with Land Use Designation on his property.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Property is known as Part 1, PLAN 51R-25420 - Property is currently designated Environmental Protection and Green Belt. - Expressed concern with the Greenbelt designation on the South West portion of property. - Noted that the property abuts the adjacent Tiny beaches Road North subdivision and is located on the end of the cul-de-sac at the end of Raven Hill Drive and is more reflective of a residential designation. - Stated that the Township would consider re-designating the property to residential so that 3 single detached dwelling lots could be created - Stated that stable land is treed and is not conducive to farming as it was once the 	Change recommended Review information provided in comparison with natural heritage features mapped by the SSEA



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		location of the Township's water tower	
Michael Frustaglio (2) (Resident – 29 Jules Avenue, Vaughan) – March 1, 2016	Shoreline Designation on Property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provided 8 pages of sketches pertaining to adjusting the designation boundaries on the property located on the Ravens Hill Cul de Sac - Expressed that Ravens Hill Cul De Sac was intended to be for future residential on the lower portion of the lands . 	Change recommended See comments above
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vacant area that does not have trees would be suitable for future residential development 	
Peter Stubbins (238 Thunder Beach Road) – November 5, 2017	Secondary Suites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognized that affordable home stock is low and allowing secondary suites as part of an accessory structured or part of the original residence should be encouraged where lot size allows. 	No change recommended
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stated that currently, accessory structures with an apartment are only allowed in rural zones that should be rethought because there are many lots that are very large that are not in rural zones. 	No change recommended The Draft OP permits secondary dwelling units in an accessory structure in the Rural, Agricultural, and Greenlands designations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stated that the process of building a secondary suite should be free of all development requirements, such as development fees, zoning fees. Septic requirements and safe building permits 	No change recommended The waiving of any fee is outside of the OP review process



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		should be required.	
Doug Moles (Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Associations) – August 25, 2017	Environment, Population growth, Aggregate Extraction, Shoreline Designation	Expressed 3 Areas of concern: 1) <u>Overall Dilution of the current Official Plan’s Environment First Thrust.</u> Concern that the environmental protection is “only when possible.” Suggested implementing the words “Environment First” to emphasize environmental priority.	No change recommended The change to this goal reflects that in locations such as settlement areas or agricultural lands, it may not be the environment first. This is consistent with Provincial and County policy. As a whole, the draft OP has identified more natural heritage features and is more protective of them.
		2) <u>Placement of population growth.</u> The Province directs growth to settlement areas. The OP proposes to permit development on properties in the Shoreline designation that are subject to the County Greenlands designation. Allowing development in the Shoreline designation in ANSIs or PSWs, would contradict the direction of current OP and County OP. The shoreline parcels designated for the County’s Greenlands system should become part of the Township’s Greenlands.	Potential changes recommended Continue discussion with the County on the hierarchy of natural heritage features versus historically designated lands in the Shoreline There is no proposed Shoreline designation in Provincially Significant Wetlands or Provincial Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest
		3) <u>Unchecked promotion of Aggregate Extraction.</u> Environmental concerns to	No change recommended Environmental policies related to



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>aggregate extraction should be dealt with first and new aggregate site should not be permitted. There should be requirements for sensitive land holdings of current extraction activities and remediation. Mitigation strategies should be implemented.</p>	<p>aggregate extraction are consistent with Provincial and County policies and are appropriate.</p>
		<p>Questions raised: <u>1) Lot size</u> p. 34, B.4.7.1 - Why is the size of new lots in the Shoreline designation created by Consent or by Plan of Subdivision to be 4,000 square metres? Why is this lot size so large? (4,000 square metres equals about 100 feet x 430 feet.)</p>	<p>Change recommended This minimum lot size has been in place for many years (in the current OP). This size is generally acceptable for a lot on a well and septic system. Amend Section B.4.7.1 from “shall have a minimum lot area” to “shall generally have a minimum lot area”. Slight variations to the minimum size requirement may be permitted, subject to justification and a zoning by-law amendment or minor variance application.</p>
		<p><u>2) Asphalt</u> We notice that portable asphalt plants are permitted and that there are references to the storage of asphalt. Asphalt is essentially bitumen and should not be allowed anywhere where it might get into the water table. The Province of Alberta, which has</p>	<p>No change recommended The Zoning By-law outlines permitted uses. Industrial uses must also be established in accordance with MOECC requirements.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		natural bitumen deposits, has almost no potable ground water.	
		<p>3) <u>Residential lots severed from farms</u> See p. 53, B.8.5.2. We are concerned about item d) severing a lot from a farm if a severance has not been granted since Jan. 1, 2000. Our understanding is that such severances (usually for a lot for a retiring farmer) are only permitted once. Why thenew start date? The one-time severance rule was put in place to prevent fragmentation of the Township's farmland</p>	<p>Change recommended The reason for the date is that the previous OP, which brought in the limited amount of Rural severances, was adopted by Council in 2000 (September 11, 2000). The intention was not to restrict further severances since the year of inception of the policy. The policy is actually more restrictive. Suggest: d) no residential severance has been granted since January 1, 2000</p>
		<p>4) <u>Proofreading</u> Would it be possible to have the entire document professionally proofread and edited prior to its adoption by Council? That would make this complex plan easier to read and understand</p>	<p>Change recommended It is sometimes difficult to balance required technical reference with plain language. This will be undertaken to the extent possible.</p>
<p>Herb Huck (Farlain Lake Community Association FLCA) – September 10, 2017</p>	<p>Setback Requirements Growth Planning Garden Suites Tree Cutting Septage</p>	<p><u>Setback requirements: Sections C3.2.1, C.4.2.1, and C.4.2.2</u> The Official plan mentions setbacks will be in place adjacent to Georgian Bay, 178.0 metres above the Canadian Geodetic Datum (CGD). Will there be setbacks declared for inland lakes like Farlain Lake. As expressed in the Farlain Lake</p>	<p>No change recommended The setback requirement from Georgian Bay is a natural hazard requirement embedded in the PPS. There is no such Provincial setback requirement for inland lakes.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>"Lake to Sky" document there is no current setback requirement on the shoreline. This is a sensitive ecosystem as it is a kettle lake with no above ground water outlets. Preserving natural habitat on shoreline is important to the health of the lake. Requiring reasonable setbacks for structures would help protect the shoreline. We would ask that consideration be given to include some form of setback requirements for inland lakes, in particular, Farlain Lake.</p>	
		<p><u>Growth planning: Sections A.3.1.4, A.3.1.5, and A.3.1.6</u> We are concerned about the logic used to establish a need for additional building lots for growth. Although this plan reflected the current inventory of vacant lots, we understand that a very limited factor was used to reflect the transition from seasonal to permanent residence. We know that the demand on infrastructure increase when someone decides to convert their cottage to a permanent residence. Given that 50% of all households in the Township are currently seasonal, and the likelihood that a significant number will convert to permanent residence based on recent evidence and intentions shared by our community members,</p>	<p>No change recommended The policy statements in the OP were generated from a Growth Management Study for the Township. The results of the study and the current direction of the new Provincial Growth Plan do not provide for any change in the status quo of designations or approach to growth. Please note that policy A.3.1.11 does recognize the trend of conversion of cottage units to permanent homes.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>(partly reflecting the impact of the baby boom generation and the increase number of retirees owning seasonal properties), we feel that any conversion from seasonal to permanent should reduce the number of required additional units. Based on conservative assumptions regarding the conversion from seasonal to permanent residence, it would not be difficult to demonstrate that no increase in building lots would be required to facilitate the growth being projected to 2013. This would also be consistent with directing growth to areas in the county that have fully serviced lots and proper infrastructure to support growth.</p>	
		<p><u>Garden Suites: Section D.12.2.2</u> Although we understand the intent of using such buildings and secondary residences to help provide affordable housing, we feel in the shoreline areas this will just add to more temporary rental units being created and greater strain being put on the ecosystem which is already stretched to its limits. We ask that such additional housing units not be permitted in the shoreline designated areas to avoid the inevitable conversion into vacation rental units.</p>	<p>No change recommended Garden Suites are permitted in the current OP through a site specific temporary use bylaw (and public process) in any designation.</p> <p>Change recommended There has been considerable concern expressed by the public that the use of a Secondary Dwelling units in the Shoreline designation would NOT be for the</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
			purpose of providing affordable housing opportunities but would be for the purpose of transient rental use.
		<p><u>Other considerations:</u> Tree cutting limitations - We did not notice any mention of a tree cutting limitation on smaller lots within the township. Although we support the removal of trees that are hazardous due to disease or damage, we are concerned about larger scale lot clearing in the shoreline area. We would ask that a tree cutting restriction be introduced into the official plan as recommended in the lake to Sky document for Farlain Lake.</p>	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>The Township has considered implementing a tree cutting bylaw in the past, however due to staffing and operational costs was not utilized. If Council in the future wants to re-visit this issue, a policy in the OP is not required.</p> <p>It is also noted that Township wide there is a very large amount of significant woodlands.</p>
		<p>Septage – We note that there is no mention of a position on the treatment of septage in the official plan. The current plan for the township is to wait until Provincial legislation requires haulers to use proper septage treatment facilities once they become available. Tiny needs to commit to a solution that will support the Provincial mandate to stop the spreading of septage on open fields as soon as possible after such legislation is enacted. This is very important to the environment and our</p>	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>Spreading of septage is regulated by the MOECC and is a use on the landscape and is not, in of itself, considered a “land use” and is thus not regulated in an Official Plan.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		community.	
Chuck Stradling (LASHA) – September 15, 2017	Section D12 – Secondary Dwelling Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed concern allowing Bed & Breakfast Establishments / Garden Suites in the shoreline areas. - He questioned if this meant that those currently operating B&B's in the shoreline area are doing so illegally? What are the zoning/permit requirements to operate a B&B? 	<p>Change recommended</p> <p>The statement in Section D.13, Point 1 of the Draft Official Plan is incorrectly worded. The current Official Plan does allow bed and breakfast (B&B) establishments in all of these designations through the approval of a zoning by-law amendment. The criteria used to evaluate a zoning by-law amendment for a new B&B only referenced the Greenbelt and Country Residential designations (see Section D11 in the current Official Plan).</p> <p>We are proposing to make the criteria consistent for all new B&B establishments in the Township regardless of the designation.</p> <p>Thus, the approach would not change regarding the requirement for a zoning by-law amendment to permit a new B&B.</p>
John Campbell, Mike Boyko, Robin Pereira	Protection of Georgian Bay Shorelines	1) Current Official Plan: Part A.1 The Vision stated in paragraph three that "...the protection of the environment shall take	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>This was removed as the policies should dictate when and where development</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
(The Balm Beach Community Association) - September 22, 2017		precedence over development." Draft Official Plan: The protection of the environment over development has been removed. We would like to see the protection of the environment over development reinstated into the Official Plan Draft.	can occur. Stating an intended goal of protecting natural heritage feature should be sufficient.
		2) Current Official Plan: Part B.2 Environmental Protection Two B.2.2 Location stated that "The "Environmental Protection Two" designation is intended to include the following components of the natural heritage system: The fifth component was "the shoreline of Georgian Bay". B.2.3.5 Shoreline of Georgian Bay stated, "The shoreline of Georgian Bay is a significant geographical feature in the Township that is well known for its beauty." Draft Official Plan: Under B.2 Greenlands we find B. 2.13 Dunes. The Dunes have been included under the Greenlands section for protection. We would like to see "the shoreline of Georgian Bay" reinstated as a protected significant geographical feature in the Official Plan Draft.	No change recommended The shoreline of Georgian Bay is protected by a development setback that is provided in the in the Zoning By-law.
		3) Draft Official Plan: Part C.4.2.3 Flood Hazards adjacent to Georgian Bay According to the Township of Tiny Zoning Bylaw 06-001,	No change recommended Zoning Bylaw dictates setback requirements



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		section 4.0 Part A. Setbacks from Georgian Bay states that the Tiny Township shoreline is considered a dynamic shoreline.	
		- We quote from Bylaw 06-001: "...Georgian Bay shoreline, since it all has been classified as a dynamic beach, by the Ministry of Natural Resources." We believe the definition of a dynamic beach would have been based on the "Technical Guide for Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Shorelines Part 2: Recommended Shoreline Classification Scheme to Determine Shoreline Reaches".	No change recommended Zoning Bylaw dictates setback requirements
		- We believe the fact that Tiny shorelines are dynamic must be taken into account in the Flood Hazards section of the Official Plan Draft.	No change recommended Zoning By-law dictates setback requirements
		- We suggest that no structures be built or erected below the 178.0 metre elevation location. This would ensure that development does not occur on land that is unstable or susceptible to flooding. It will also ensure that structures are not located in the water in years that the water is high.	No change recommended Zoning Bylaw dictates setback requirements
		- We also suggest that structures on the shore be more clearly defined. These issues are too important to be left to a Zoning Bylaw alone; rather they should be enshrined in the Official	No change recommended Zoning By-laws are the land use planning tool that is used to regulate the use of land.



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		Plan.	
Doug Lorriman (Business Association of Balm Beach) – September 28, 2017	Vision and Principles Commercial Development in Balm Beach The Shoreline of Georgian Bay Dark Sky Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed concern with losing the elaboration on the Township’s Vision outlined in Part A.1 of the current OP. - Guiding principles were removed - Mentioned that the vision as spelled out in the current OP should also be fully stated up front in the New Official Plan. 	Changes recommended Vision to be reviewed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed concern with the absence of a “Guiding Principles” section in the new OP. 	No change recommended The New OP provides for an “Introduction” section within each land use designation which spells out the context of the land use designation.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the full list should be included at the front of the Draft as it is in the current OP. 	No change recommended The Guiding Principles have been updated, and included in each designation’s Introduction, Objectives or the policy framework itself.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed concern with the lack of polices relating to the “Balm Beach Commercial Area” (Parts A2-21, Part B6.5.1 and Part B.6.3 in 	No change recommended The existing A2-21 policies identify that Balm Beach is the focus for tourism



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		current OP). The Balm beach commercial are is only mentioned once in the Draft (Section B.4.9.1)	commercial uses. New policy B.4.9.1 identifies that new commercial uses are encouraged to locate in Balm Beach.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed concern relating to the Draft OP missing the concept of “tourist” commercial, serving the wider region and recognition of the history. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o BABB considers these to be a significant and disturbing omissions. 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>The notion of “tourist commercial” has been removed from the OP as it is difficult to define theses uses in the implementing Zoning By-law and it is suggested that allowing uses that only serve the tourist population is too restrictive to the economic viability of the area and the permanent or seasonal population that may want more wide ranging uses.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed concern with no policies regarding the “Shoreline of Georgian Bay” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Part C.4.2 does go into more detail about what is/ isn’t allow near the shore. However, this section still contains the language allowing structures for boating purposes and flood and/or erosion control (terms which are subject to broad interpretation) to be built below the 178.0 metre elevation. 	<p>No change recommended</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed strong support regarding the inclusion of the “Dark Sky Lighting” policies. 	<p>No change recommended</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
Linda Lockyer (Woodland Beach Property Owners' Association)	Secondary Dwellings and Garden Suites Environmental Concerns	Secondary Dwellings and Garden Suites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WBPOA does not believe this section is appropriate for a shoreline community, especially one which views itself as a “family beach” and a recreational area. Woodland Beach is primarily a vacation community with the majority of residents being seasonal. It is not practical to target such a community for affordable housing. 	Change recommended Secondary units not to be permitted in the Shoreline Designation.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Woodland Beach presently lacks infrastructure, such as public transportation, which would be required to accommodate significant population growth, especially if the new residents are seniors. - Made reference to the Info sheet regarding Second Units. As stated in the info sheet:, it recognizes that second units may not be appropriate for a shoreline community. 	Change recommended See comment above
		<u>Environmental Concerns</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the previous Official Plan, the “Environment First” theme was evident. However, this wording in the draft version has been de-emphasized, and there are a number of references to being 	No change recommended The change to this goal reflects that in locations such as settlement areas or agricultural lands, it may not be the environment first. This is consistent with Provincial and County policy.



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>“environmentally focused” instead. (examples - Objectives Section noted in B.2.2, and the Waterfront Parks Section noted in B.4.11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is noted that although section B.2.13 Dunes (attached) discusses sand dunes, it does not commit to any protection or preservation. 	<p>As a whole, the draft OP is more protective of environmental features.</p>
		<p>Section B.1.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We suggest that the shoreline be designated as Environmental Protection, thus providing the greatest protection from development and site alteration 	<p>No changes recommended Appropriate development setbacks already implemented in the Zoning By-law</p>
		<p>Section B.2.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the objectives section, the focus on environmental protection should appear first (a not d). 	<p>Change recommended Reordering of the objectives</p>
		<p>Section B.2.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would like to see this section expanded to protect not only woodlots but trees located in shoreline communities - mentioned that a Tree-cutting by-law should be passed by council 	<p>No change recommended Official Plan is not the correct tool to protect vegetation removal. The County has a tree cutting By-law.</p>
		<p>Also suggested that the Township’s building code and bylaws be tightened up in order to ensure that the character of our shoreline</p>	<p>No change recommended This is not an OP matter.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		communities be preserved.	
Christine Johnston (Public Health Nurse) – January 16, 2017	Implementing policies directed towards public health	Mentioned the Health Unit's <i>Healthy Community Design Policy Statements for Official Plan</i> document. Suggested that some policies from the document be implemented into the new OP	Change recommended The health unit comments will be reviewed and incorporated into Draft 2 as appropriate.
Simon Picard (Huron Wendat Nation) - August 23, 2017		No comments received to date	Special invitation sent by the Township for a meeting to discuss new OP. No response received. Another invitation will be made once Draft 2 of the OP is released.
Jesse Fieldwebster (Metis Nation of Ontario) - August 23, 2017		No comments received to date	Special invitation sent by the Township for a meeting to discuss new OP. No response received. Another invitation will be made once Draft 2 of the OP is released.
Tanya Roote-Jamieson (Beausoleil First Nation Office of Council) - August 23, 2017		No comments received to date	Special invitation sent by the Township for a meeting to discuss new OP. No response received. Another invitation will be made once Draft 2 of the OP is released.
Michelle Hudolin (SSEA)	Significant Woodlands Update Project	- conducted Significant Woodlands Update project which provided <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Data use agreement 	No change recommended Significant Woodland mapping utilized in draft OP



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o GIS shapefile o Notes about the field in the GIS layer o A map of the Significant woodlands 	
		<p>- Provided a definition based on the Significant Woodlands update using County definition and what came out of the project : “SIGNIFICANT WOODLANDS means an area which is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) ecologically important in terms of features such as species composition, age of trees and stand history; b) functionally important due to its contribution to the broader landscape because of its location, size or due to the amount of forest cover in the planning area; or c) economically important due to site quality, species composition, or past management history. <p>(County) Identification of Significant Woodlands is based on the recommended criteria in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry’s Natural Heritage Reference Manual (second edition, 2010). Woodland cover in the Township of Tiny is approximately 54% of the land cover; a woodland was considered ‘Significant’ if it met one or more</p>	



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>of the following criteria.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Woodland size criteria: woodlands 50 ha in size or larger. 2. Ecological functions criteria <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Woodland interior: woodlands with 8 ha or more of interior habitat, measured as forest habitat 100 m or further from a woodland edge. b. Proximity to other woodlands or other habitats: woodlands 20 ha in size or larger that are located within 30 m of a significant natural feature or fish habitat. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Significant natural features include: significant woodlands, evaluated wetlands, coastal wetlands, wetlands 2.0 ha and larger, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, deer yards (Stratum I) and deer wintering areas (Stratum II), and significant valleylands. ii) Fish habitat includes watercourses, coastal areas, open water portions of 	



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>wetlands, and inland lakes.</p> <p>c. Linkages: woodlands 20 ha in size or larger that provide a connecting link between two other significant features or fish habitat, each of which is within 120 m of the woodland.</p> <p>i) Significant natural features include: significant woodlands, evaluated wetlands, coastal wetlands, wetlands 2.0 ha and larger, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, deer yards (Stratum I) and deer wintering areas (Stratum II), and significant valleylands.</p> <p>ii) Fish habitat includes watercourses, coastal areas, open water portions of wetlands, and inland lakes.</p> <p>d. Water Protection: woodlands 10 ha in size or larger that are located within 50 m of sensitive groundwater features or fish habitat.</p>	



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>i) Sensitive groundwater features include the following vulnerable areas identified in the Severn Sound Source Protection Authority Approved Assessment Report (South Georgian Bay-Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee, 2015): Highly Vulnerable Aquifers, Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas, Well Head Protection Areas, and areas under stress from water quantity (also known as Well Head Protection Area Q1-Q2).</p> <p>ii) Fish habitat includes watercourses, coastal areas, open water portions of wetlands, and inland lakes</p> <p><i>Significant woodlands</i> can also be determined through an <i>Environmental Impact Statement</i>. For the purposes of this definition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A patch is a distinct, separate area of 	



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>contiguous <i>woodlands</i>. The edge of a patch is delineated by the outermost dripline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Woodlands</i> remain contiguous even if interrupted by natural clearings, or clearings for <i>agricultural uses</i>, other <i>rural</i> land uses, or <i>infrastructure</i>, provided the clearing is not more than 20 metres wide, edge to edge. - Patch size is not deemed to terminate if the <i>woodland</i> crosses municipal, county, or regional boundaries. 	
<p>Michelle Hudolin (SSEA) –September 27, 2017</p>	<p>Natural Heritage Environmental Impact Studies Greenlands</p>	<p>1) The OP refers to Natural Heritage policies of this plan" in a number of places (e.g. B.3.4.1, D.8.2 i). For clarity, this text should also include a reference to sections B.1 and B.2.</p>	<p>Change recommended</p>
		<p>2) Land use designations and policies may need to change or be updated based on the provincial Natural Heritage System and provincial Agricultural System designations for the Greater Golden Horseshoe</p>	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>The Provincial mapping is currently in draft form</p>
		<p><u>Environmental Impact Studies</u></p> <p>3) With respect to requirements for an Environmental Impact Study (EIS), the SSEA recommends including language such as</p>	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>The Township is the decision maker. Wording enables the Township to consult</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		„completed to the satisfaction of the Township and any applicable agencies“ or „approved by the Township, in consultation with any applicable agencies“.	with SSEA, but it is not required by the legislation.
		4) SSEA noted that it supports the pre-consultation on the scope and requirements for an EIS	No change recommended
		<p><u>Section A.2.1.2 - Greenlands</u></p> <p>5) Item A 2.1.2 (b) in the list of natural heritage features and areas in the Greenlands designation includes coastal wetlands (non-provincially significant), but it appears that coastal wetlands smaller than 2 ha would be excluded.</p> <p>a. Note: this comment applies throughout the OP where reference is made to „other wetlands 2 hectares or larger“</p>	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>This is correct – this mirrors the approach to wetlands that is provided in the County OP.</p>
		6) Section A2.1.1 states that “Greenlands features in Settlement, Shoreline, Country Residential and Employment Area designations not included in Greenlands designation” and also that “Significant Woodlands and Unevaluated Wetlands 2 hectares and greater in size have not been included in the Agricultural or Rural designation”. Many of these features have	<p>Potential changes required</p> <p>To ensure conformity with County OP and consistency with PPS. Additional review required.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		policies in the PPS and/or the County of Simcoe Official Plan that apply, and the Township OP must be consistent with these documents.	
		<p><u>Section B.1 Environmental Protection</u></p> <p>7) The brief explanation (that will not form part of the OP) and B.1.3.1 clearly state that the EP designation includes Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) and Coastal PSWs. However, the wording currently in subsequent sections B.1.4 [Description of Components of the Natural Heritage System] and B.1.5 [Wetlands] may need changes to ensure this is clear in the final OP</p> <p>a. Section B.1.4 and B.1.5 describe wetland in general but does not include any information relating to PSWs or specify that only PSWs are included in the EP designation,</p>	No change recommended
		8) Suggested modifying the text in section B.1.8.1 to include site alteration as well as development, to be consistent with the PPS - i.e., "... Site alteration and the development of buildings or structures in this zone shall not be permitted".	Change recommended Site alteration to be added to this section so that the development of buildings or structures. It is noted that the Township does have a Fill Control By-law that prohibits site alteration in the EP1 Zone.



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
			Another approach would be to have a site alteration by-law and allow it to regulate site alteration.
		<u>Greenlands:</u> 9) SSEA agrees with Section B2.1.1 and B2.3.3.	No change recommended
		10) The list of features/components in the Greenlands designation in section B.2.3.1 and B.2.3.4, and section A.2.1.2 are different a. the SSEA suggests that the contents of these similar lists should be consistent to avoid potential confusion.	Change recommended Change recommended to ensure consistency
		11) Section B.2.5 [Other Evaluated Wetlands] should be clarified. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) has two designations for evaluated wetlands: PSW and non-PSW. Non-PSW wetlands are sometimes, but not always termed „locally significant wetlands" by upper- or lower-tier municipalities, this terminology is not used by MNRF	No change recommended Terminology used in the OP is the same terminology used by the Province and has been vetted with the County.
		12) Clarify that Section B.2.6 [Other Wetlands 2 hectares or larger] is unevaluated wetlands.	No change recommended This applies to any wetland that is more than 2 hectares that is not a PSW.
		13) The Township may need to confirm with the province that section B.2.7.2 (Significant	No change recommended Approach to significant woodlands



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		Woodlands outside settlement areas) conforms to the PPS. The MNRF Natural Heritage Reference Manual (second edition, 2010), which supports the PPS, does not differentiate between woodlands inside and outside of settlement areas.	mirrors the County Official Plan.
		14) At the request of the Township, in late August 2017, SSEA provided language (via email) that may be suitable for use in sections B.2.7.3 and B.2.7.4.	Change recommended Policies of Draft OP reflect the County OP. Review of these policies to be undertaken in preparation of Draft 2.
		15) The SSEA proposes modifying the wording in section B.2.9.1 to "Significant Wildlife Habitat is an area that is ecologically important in terms of features, functions, representation or amount and contributing to the quality and diversity of the area, and is identified using provincially-defined Significant Wildlife Habitat criteria." a. The Township may also wish to refer to the MNRF's Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide (2000) and the supporting Significant Wildlife Habitat Criteria Schedules for Ecoregion 6E (2015).	Change recommended Change to reflect proposed revision from SSEA. Item a. to be included.
		16) Section B.2.9.2: "Significant Wildlife Habitat includes waterfowl nursery areas, deer	Change recommended Definition of Significant Wildlife Habitat to



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		wintering areas, and other important bird areas” – these features need to be described or referenced in the OP.	be included.
		17) Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) – Section B.2.10.5 is incomplete, and sections B.2.10.5, B.2.10.6 and B.2.10.7 should be separated from the rest of section B.2.10 [Habitat of Endangered Species and Threatened Species].	Change recommended Update Sections to reflect comments from SSEA.
		18) Section B.2.11 [Fish Habitat] currently only refers to the shoreline of Georgian Bay. The federal Fisheries Act applies to most watercourses and water bodies in Canada, and this section of the OP should be updated accordingly to include inland lakes and watercourses in the Township	Change recommended Update to include inland lakes and watercourses.
		19) B.2.13.1 [Dunes] – This is the first time dunes are referenced in the Greenlands section; it may be appropriate to reference them earlier in section B.2 as well. There is a typographical error in the last sentence; it should be “include locations where dunes are known to exist”.	Change recommended Consider earlier reference to dunes
		20) B.2.14 [Natural Linkages] – These are referred to in section B.2.3.1 (i) as “Potential Natural Linkages”. To ensure consistency throughout the OP, remove the word “potential”.	Change recommended Consider removing the reference to “potential”



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		21) There is a typographical error in section B.2.17.1 c: "Significant Woodlands Lands ".	Change recommended
		22) Item B.2.17.1 e can be removed since it is covered in policy B.2.17.3	Change recommended
		23) Clarification required: is Significant Valleylands missing from policy B.2.17.1?	Change recommended Change to reflect PPS and County Plan.
		24) Clarification may be needed in section B.2.17.6. Is this intended to cover natural heritage features such as natural linkages?	No change recommended
		25) The Township may need to confirm with the province that section B.2.17.10 conforms with the PPS	No change recommended Dwellings are permitted on existing lots in the Greenlands designation. This policy reflects this permission.
		26) The SSEA suggests more clearly differentiating the EP and Mineral Aggregate Resources II hatching on Schedule A (Land Use) (e.g., angled hatch versus horizontal hatch, instead of two similarly angled hatchings of different colours).	Change recommended
		27) ANSI (provincial and regional) sometimes overlap with wetlands in the Township. The SSEA suggests using a different fill (e.g., transparent stippled fill) rather than a solid colour to represent ANSI on Schedule B (Natural Features) so that this is clearer.	Change recommended



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
Charles Gardner (Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit. CEO and Medical Officer of Health)- October 6, 2017	Introduction Goals Growth Management Shoreline Development Agricultural Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section A.1. SMDHU recommends the following revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Official Plan provides a policy context for land use planning <i>and guides sustainable growth and development for the overall health and wellbeing of its population and the environment. A community and its ability to prosper can only be achieved if its population is healthy.</i> ○ “....ensure that planning decisions enhance and protect the health and safety of all community members to ensure wellbeing and an opportunity for a healthy lifestyle.” 	Changes recommended Consider changes to reflect the comments of the Health Unit.
		<u>Section A.1.3.1</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recognizing the Township of Tiny is a rural community and the understanding the importance of agriculture, SMDHU recommends adding an additional goal statement as follows: ○ f) Preserve and protect land currently used and land with the potential for use in the growing and 	Change recommended Availability of healthy food is important. The goals in the OP should guide the policy basis and “preserving and protecting” existing and potentially future land for growth and production of food is not the basis of the Township’s OP. The Rural and Agricultural sections of the OP provide for support of the food sectors as provided for by the Province and County and historical use. Further, it is difficult to



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>production of food and ensure that healthy food is available in every neighbourhood.”</p>	<p>provide a policy basis in a land use plan to ensure that healthy food is available in every neighbourhood. It is suggested that a goal to be considered for inclusion in A.1.3.1 be: “protect prime agricultural areas for long term agricultural use and support the agricultural sector”.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While it is recognized that the Tiny Official Plan is focused on land management, SMDHU also recognizes that the Official Plan land-use guidance and zoning rules will impact health and wellness for both part and full-time residents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Therefore SMDHU recommends adding an additional goal as follows: ○ g) Manage the growth and development of the Township to allow for the maximization of health and wellness of its residents, through accentuation and improvement of the Built Environment 	<p>No change recommended It is difficult to develop policies emanating out of a goal to “accentuate and improve the built environment”.</p>
		<p><u>Section A.3.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMDHU suggests that Tiny consider 	<p>No change recommended</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>strengthening the language as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ e) To develop complete communities within the Settlement Areas of Perkinsfield, Wyevale and Lafontaine 	<p>The strength of this objective is understood however, it may be difficult to author policies that require complete communities given the servicing constraints of the settlement areas, the historic character of some of these settlement areas and the logistic of doing so. The draft OP objective “encourages the development of complete communities”</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMDHU further suggests that Tiny consider expanding on what is meant by “complete communities” or add a definition to the glossary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The objectives in A.3.2. could be strengthened by adding an additional goal statement to acknowledge the power of the built environment to influence health and well-being. 	<p>Change recommended Definition to be added</p> <p>No changes recommended The comment is understood but it may be difficult to have policies emanate out of the objective intention.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMDHU recommends the addition of the following goal statement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ f) To incorporate wherever possible, built environment features into the settlement areas of Perkinsfield, Wyevale and Lafontaine that accentuate active transportation, 	<p>Changes recommended</p> <p>Section A.3.2 is a Growth Management Section objective. Section B.3.2 is the Settlement designation objectives and it is suggested that a new objective may be better suited to this location. Suggest the</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>safety, and social cohesion and well-being. Such features could include but are not limited to trails, signage, sidewalks, lighting, parks and playgrounds, road and intersection modifications that both emphasize pedestrian travel, and accommodate vulnerable populations such as children and the elderly.</p>	<p>following: g) To provide for a healthy community through the use of active transportation, provision of safety features in public areas, and accessibility.</p>
		<p><u>Section B.3.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o As in A.3.2, this section could be strengthened to include more detail as to <i>how</i> the settlement areas are to be developed into <i>complete communities</i>. o SMDHU recommends repeating the suggested statements provided in section A.3.2 Objective e) and f into the Objectives in B.3.2. for form objectives g) and h) SMDHU recommends the addition of an objective related to affordable housing, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o h) To create complete neighbourhoods that include 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>It is suggested that providing for affordable housing as an objective in the Township where full services, and thus limited higher density opportunities may be difficult. Affordable housing opportunities through the policy context by permitting multi-residential units and second suites has been provided for.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>mixed densities and affordable housing options for people of all ages and socioeconomic status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access to nature, open spaces, recreation facilities and age appropriate recreational programming in settlement areas encourages physical activity and social networking and has been shown to have a positive effect on physical and mental health. SMDHU recommends the addition of an objective related to access to greenspace and recreational opportunities, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ i) To provide access to greenspaces, places to play and gather, and recreational facilities and opportunities for all. 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>Providing access to recreation and greenspace is important but the access to these amenities is not a land use matter and would need to be considered by the Township as an Objective as opposed to other worthy matters. Various policies provide a land use framework for this notion such as B.3.4.3 (trails) B.3.7.3 (b) and the parkland policies of E.9</p>
		<p><u>Section B.3.4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In support of the Objective suggested directly above SMDHU recommends the addition of the following policy statement: ○ <i>“The municipality shall provide spaces for active and passive parks that enhance access to recreation</i> 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>This is a consideration in decision making but it is not necessarily the priority.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p><i>and nature as an essential component for physical and mental health and well-being, and shall make this a priority in land use decisions”</i></p>	
		<p><u>Section B.3.6.1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMDHU recommends expanding this section to include many of the highlights and suggested road upgrades as indicated in the Tiny Trails and Active Transportation Master Plan, 2011. Upgrades to existing roads or new roads in the settlement areas should include widened shoulders or dedicated bike lanes, as visualized on Page 24 of said plan. 	<p>Change recommended</p> <p>Agreed; policies for road design in B.3.6.1 will be amended to provide for opportunities for bike lanes where appropriate</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is implied in B.3.6.1 clause b), however SMDHU recommends expanding B.3.6.1. b) as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ b) the establishment and maintenance of all new and upgraded roads within the settlement areas shall emphasize active transportation through the use of widened shoulders, bike lanes, abutting trails and/or sidewalks, as appropriate. 	<p>Change recommended</p> <p>Agreed; this wording will be considered</p>
		<p><u>Section B.3.7.2 and B.3.7.4</u></p>	<p>No change recommended</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both of these policies treat traffic and pedestrian traffic in a vague, non-specific sense. SMDHU recommends that all multi-unit dwellings (or the subdivisions they be within) be designed to have exterior land oriented to the pedestrian and cyclist. 	<p>It is questioned whether this comment is satisfied by the policy B.3.7.4 which states:</p> <p><i>Section B.3.7.4 Multi-lot or unit development proposals by plan of subdivision or condominium shall include active transportation routes both internally and linkage to external routes and public areas. These elements may include but not be limited to sidewalks, trails and bicycle paths. Dedication of land for trails will be in accordance with the Planning Act.</i></p>
		<p><u>Section B.4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With respect to Tiny Beach Road and part of the shoreline active transportation network, this road should be given special consideration and study, as to how best to support safety and usage for all users (vehicle, cyclist, pedestrian, tourism, congregation). 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>This is not an OP matter.</p>
		<p><u>Section B.7.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMDHU commends The Township of Tiny for their list of Objectives that collectively protect and support the agricultural system. SMDHU recommends strengthening the language in objective b) as follows: 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>The protection and conservation of land and water for agricultural production would preclude some of the economic activities allowed in the OP and by the</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect and conserve land and water suitable for agricultural production from development and land uses unrelated to agriculture..... • SMDHU recommends the addition of an objective related to the availability of healthy food for local residents, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ j) To ensure that healthy food is available in every neighborhood. ○ Policy statements within the Official Plan that refer to “seasonal produce stands” assist to support this objective. 	<p>Province</p> <p>It is unsure how land use policy would be able to address this objective.</p> <p>A seasonal produce stand would be allowed as an accessory use as of right and typically accessory uses are not addressed in OP’s unless there is a specific purpose. The concern is if we list this one, what ones are being missed?</p>
		<p><u>Section D.3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMDHU commends the Township of Tiny for developing Township of Tiny Trails and Active Transportation Master Plan (June 2011). • SMDHU recommends that Active Transportation language be strengthened in objective f) supporting the developed Trails and Active Transportation Master Plan, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ f) To ensure a built environment that supports and promotes safe active transportation such as cycling and walking within 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>Trails are not a priority travel option.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		Settlement Areas as well as other appropriate areas as a priority travel option.	
		<p><u>Section D.3.3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As listed elsewhere in this feedback document, all new roads and upgrades to roads should include active transportation features, including integrated safety elements (markings, paint, signage, upgrades to intersections where appropriate/necessary), and the transportation hierarchy should give priority to the pedestrian. 	<p>Change recommended</p> <p>Additional wording is to be added to encourage pedestrian laneways within the road allowance when possible/feasible</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMDHU recommends the addition of a definition for “Complete Communities” as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Complete communities, whether urban or rural are communities that are well designed, offer transportation choices, accommodate people at all stages of life and have the right mix of housing, a good range of jobs, and easy access to stores and services to meet daily 	<p>Change recommended</p> <p>We agree that a definition should be provided however, we suggest using the definition from the 2017 Growth Plan.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		needs.	
<p>Paul Charlebois (Dingle Charelebois) – August 3, 2017</p>	<p>Land Abutting Airport (designated as Employment Area)</p>	<p>Solicitors for Airport Industries Ltd. (50 acres of vacant land abutting east side of Huronia Airport). Their client would like to use the property for warehousing, open storage and shipping container storage. Would like the uses that are allowed on the airport lands to be allowed on the abutting lands. Would like to have the uses added through OP Review process.</p>	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>Storage and/ or warehousing uses are permitted uses in the Employment Area Designation of the Draft Official Plan (OP). Owner can submit site specific Zoning Bylaw Amendment to allow proposed use.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		Stated that he had an aggregate evaluation done on his lands and that the new OP should remove the Aggregate Resource Overlay Designation from this parcel as there is no viable aggregate potential.	<p>Change Recommended</p> <p>Amend Schedule A to delete Aggregate Resource Overlay Designation accordingly based on comments received by MNRF.</p>
<p>Innovative Planning Solutions (Rob MacFarlane) – September 29, 2017</p>	Greenlands Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Innovative Planning Solutions represents McMahan Woods Development Ltd. who are landowners in the Township of Tiny. - McMahan Woods Development Ltd. has lands located at Part of Lot 23, Concession 4 in the Township of Tiny. - The subject lands are designated as Shoreline by the current Township of Tiny Official Plan (2015 Consolidation). They are zoned Future Development Hold (FD(H5)) in the Township of Tiny Zoning By-law 06-001. The lands are currently vacant. 	
		Schedule A identifies the subject lands as remaining Shoreline. Schedule B of the Official Plan identifies conflicting information, indicating the subject lands are located within Significant Woodlands and Regionally Significant ANSI.	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>The Significant Woodlands and ANSI information is provided by the SSEA and the MNRF. This matter to be reviewed with the County of Simcoe to determine the hierarchy between historically</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
			designated development lands and natural heritage features.
		<p>Section 2.3.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is to be assumed by this policy that Schedule B is simply a more detailed version of lands designated Greenlands in Schedule A. The extent of the Greenlands system shown in Schedule B is in fact a much more geographically expanded version of Schedule A, including lands that are provided different designations (ie. Shoreline) in Schedule A. This leaves it unclear whether lands identified in Schedule B are designated as Greenlands, and if the Greenlands policy is to apply 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>Site specific considerations to be reviewed in the preparation of Draft 2.</p>
		<p>Section 2.3.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is clear that lands on Schedule B are subject to the Greenlands policy. Schedule B identifies the above noted features on lands that are not designated as Greenlands on Schedule A, including the lands subject to this letter. 	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>Schedule A establishes the designation. Schedule B identifies specific natural heritage features. Although the subject lands are not designated Greenlands, where a development application is proposed, a review of the features identified on Schedule B would be required to be undertaken.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is understood that the intent of the updated Official Plan is not to include lands designated as Settlement Area, Shoreline, Country Residential, or Employment within the Greenlands designation, as per Note 3 of Section B.2. The current draft version of the Official Plan does not reflect this intent, as displayed in the Schedules that have been provided. This discrepancy between Schedule A and B appears to occur frequently throughout the Township, including the lands subject to this letter. This discrepancy could potentially preclude development in lands that have been identified for development by the Township. In particular, Section B.2.17.10 reads: Lots in the Greenlands designation that are in a Residential zone as of the date of adoption of this Plan are not subject to the policies of the Greenland designation and shall be subject to the residential policies that are applicable to the Rural designation. 	<p>No change recommended This matter to be reviewed with the County of Simcoe to determine the hierarchy between historically designated development lands and natural heritage features</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the lands shown in Schedule B are subject to the Greenlands policies, and 	<p>No change recommended See comment above</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>Rural policies could apply as noted above, growth in the Shoreline designation will be severely limited. Development would be restricted to two (2) new residential lots, where the intent of Shoreline lands are to develop to fit the surrounding character, and be developed by Registered Plan of Subdivision</p>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Schedule B of the draft Official Plan be revised to resemble the extent of the Greenland system as shown in Schedule A. subject lands are requested to be removed from identified Significant Woodlands and Regionally Significant ANSI on Schedule B. 	<p>No change recommended See comment above</p>
<p>Kevin Sansom (C.C. Tatham & Associates) – September 29, 2017</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Representing Don Stubbs of Georgian Bay Park - Mr. Stubbs is considering incorporating the inclusion of a retirement lodge facility, complete with assisted living amenities within the Georgian Bay Park development property as part of an Official Plan Amendment. - The letter provided is to advise the Township that there are no concerns with the inclusion of the retirement lodge 	<p>No change recommended This is not a permitted use on the subject lands (925 Concession 3 West) and should be dealt with through a site specific Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 1 of the Official Plan
November 22, 2017**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		facility with respect to negative impacts relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Water distribution o Sewage collection and treatment o Stormwater management and drainage o Access and utility capacity 	

Appendix **B**



Township of Tiny – First Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table– 22 November 2017

Official Plan Open House Comments

Organization / Member of the Public	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Response
		Did the Growth Management Study consider conversions from seasonal cottages to permanent dwellings	Yes
Bob Drapkin – 285 Hillcrest Road		Is there a process to review Environmental Protection designation?	KM stated that all environmental mapping has been provided by the Province, County or through the SSEA. Note: SP provided email response to this question.
Councillor Richard Hinton		Can Council propose a “Blue Zone” relative to aggregate lands?	The OP does not deal with zoning matters.
Herb Huck, President of the FLCA		Can a setback to Farlain Lake be established, similar to the setback to the 178 metre contour line of Georgian Bay	KM stated that there is no provincial standard for setback to inland lakes. The Georgian Bay contour is related to flood levels



Township of Tiny – First Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table– 22 November 2017

H. Huck		Question regarding septage and waste disposal policy of the Official Plan.	There are policies in this regard.
Mike Frustaglio – 1592 TBRN		Can the Official Plan impose site alteration measures along Georgian Bay?	KM stated Council may consider a separate site alteration and fill by-law. SP stated that the Township ZBL provides for a setback to the 178 metre contour line and the MNRF provides restrictions below the 176.96 metre contour line and the Township currently requires a Lot Grading Plan for all new dwellings.
M. Frustaglio		How have growth pressures and impacts for back lots and conversion to permanent residences been considered	KM identified that the Growth Management Strategy details can be viewed in that document – available on Township’s website
M. Frustaglio		Why is there a setback to the 178 metre contour line?	KM: This is a provincial requirement through the MNRF Technical Guideline and the PPS.
Shayne Large		Is there a possibility to maintain an existing farm dwelling as a secondary dwelling unit when a new dwelling is constructed on the same property as it is a shame to demolish these old heritage buildings	KM: The draft OP does not contemplate this and there is PPS does not consider two dwellings on one property



Township of Tiny – First Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table– 22 November 2017

<p>Elaine Stephenson – 1952 TBRS</p>		<p>Can the OP deal with short term rentals, which are a concern in the shoreline community?</p>	<p>KM: This is not a policy matter that should be dealt with through the OP. It is better dealt with through a licensing by-law under the Municipal Act.</p>
<p>E. Stephenson</p>		<p>Development on vacant inland lots should not be permitted to develop with a requirement for sump pumps</p>	<p>SP: This would be reviewed on each lot through submission of Lot Grading Plan and indication of the seasonal high water level.</p>
<p>D. Moles</p>		<p>Indicated FOTTSA has submitted detailed written comments regarding the Draft Official Plan.</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
Jessie Garland – Bluewater Dunes Ratepayers Association – April 12, 2018	Council Adoption	<p>Stated that the Official Plan should be approved by Council prior to the municipal elections in October 2018.</p> <p>Items in red ink indicate where a change is requested.</p> <p>A1.3.1 We concur with FOTTSA (Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Association) that in order to ensure protection of the environment, there should be an “Environment First” objective as opposed to “Environment Focused”.</p> <p>A.3.2.b Objectives – To maintain the Shoreline designation lands as an area to accommodate controlled permanent and seasonal growth in the Township.</p> <p>B.1.2 a. To implement the Environment First goals of this plan.</p>	<p>“Environment Focused” maintained. The Draft OP provides additional environmental protections over the current OP.</p> <p>Modification to Section A.3.2. (b) has not been proposed.</p> <p>Environment Focused maintained. The Draft OP provides additional environmental protection policies over the current OP.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>B.1.6.3 & B.1.6.4 We disagree with these statements and request that the entire sections be deleted.</p> <p>B.2.3.1 Add l) “any and all dune systems” as a component of the natural heritage system.</p> <p>B.2.7.2 We disagree with not to identify, “not” should be deleted and phrase should be as follows: “...it is appropriate to identify significant woodlands within these areas.”</p> <p>B.2.7.3 We believe that 50 hectares is too large and suggest 20 hectares. A 20 hectare woodland would provide better protection.</p> <p>B.2.8.3 Delete this entire section as it contradicts B.2.8.1 and B.2.8.2</p> <p>B.2.14 We agree with the statement but this should be consistent with Severn</p>	<p>Removal of a PSW or CPSW is a decision made by the MNRF. It is a technical environmental matter which is why no OPA is required and the public process has been exempted.</p> <p>The section provides exemptions for existing lots of record. No changes have been proposed.</p> <p>This standard is from the County Official Plan definition of a significant woodland. No changes proposed.</p> <p>The section provides exemptions for existing lots of record. No changes proposed.</p> <p>Unclear what is being requested by this comment.</p> <p>Section is proposed to be updated with reference to SSEA study.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>Sound Environmental Association (SSEA) "Evaluation of Natural Heritage Conditions in the Township of Tiny" March 20, 2015 should be included to identify the dune system.</p> <p>B.2.18.5 We request that the paragraph be modified as follows:</p> <p>In instances where dunes exist outside of Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest that are not identified by mapping "a study should be undertaken to evaluate the significance of the feature as defined by the SSEA (Severn Sound Environmental Association). "Evaluation of Natural Heritage Conditions in the Township of Tiny".</p> <p>B2.19.2. Add (viii.) dune systems</p> <p>B.3.14.1 We request that this sentence be added to the end of the paragraph "When a Park Master Plan has been completed and approved by council its findings will be implemented."</p> <p>B.4.11.1 We totally disagree with the designation of Bluewater Beach Park as a</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>It is proposed that the following policy be added to the major beach park section: "All major beach parks shall be developed in compliance with the approved Master Plans. If a Master Plan identifies areas for environmental protection, then the Greenlands policies shall apply to those areas."</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>major beach park because it contradicts the Master Plan for Bluewater Beach approved by Council in 2006 which states:</p> <p>Page 14(4.1) “ In the case of Bluewater Beach Park, the most appropriate uses and those recommended in this report are passive in nature and support conservation initiatives aimed at protecting and restoring this valuable resource.”</p> <p>Page 21: “In terms of use, it is recommended that the lands be used on a passive low intensity basis. However, the lands are an “asset” to the Township and residents should be permitted to access these public lands as well, provided the access is carefully managed. In addition, both Trew Avenue and Nicole Boulevard are local roads and should not be planned to become major parking areas as a result of the function of the roads and the character of the neighbourhoods they serve.”</p> <p>We, therefore, do contest the findings of the previous Official Plan, and urge Council to correct</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>accordingly the new Official Plan.</p> <p>C.2d. We request the sentence be amended as follows: "to protect and maintain the quality and quantity of water available for drinking water purposes."</p> <p>Glossary: Key Natural Heritage Features should include dunes as follows: ...(including habitat of special concern species); dunes, sand barrens, savannahs and tallgrass prairies; and alvars.</p>	<p>No change proposed difference in terminology not clear.</p> <p>The definition comes from the province. Sensitive Features that are identified by an EIS are subject to the Greenland Policies of the OP.</p>
<p>Glenna Gould – 44 Centre Street</p>	<p>Bluewater Dunes</p>	<p>B.4.11.1 is incorrect in identifying the Bluewater Beach Park as a "major" park. That identification is not consistent with the Park Master Plan upon which it is based. The Bluewater Beach Park is designated as a "low density" park in this report and, as such, should not be classified the same as the other parks - as "major."</p> <p>The Bluewater Beach Park has already been identified as a "low density" park and as such, this unique park should not be classified the same as</p>	<p>Bluewater Beach Park is identified as a "Major Beach Park" in the current Tiny OP. This designation has been in place since at least 2000. There is no modification proposed in this regard. The decision to remove Bluewater Beach Park as a Major Beach Park lies solely with Council.</p> <p>It is proposed that the following policy be added to the Major Beach Park Section: "All major beach parks shall be developed</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>the other Township parks - as "major."</p> <p>The Township should revise its marketing materials to appropriately reflect the unique nature of the Bluewater Beach Park and no longer promote it as a "major park."</p> <p>Council should reconsider any plans for further development of this area – most particularly in terms of parking. There has already been a detrimental effect to the surrounding area and property owners because of the improper designation as a "major" park.</p>	<p>in compliance with the approved Master Plans. If a Master Plan identifies areas for environmental protection, then the Greenlands policies shall apply to those areas."</p>
<p>David Wiseman and Sheila Wiseman – 26 Purdon Drive – April 13, 2018</p>		<p>See comments above from Glenna Gould.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
<p>Peter Stubbins – April 13, 2018</p>	<p>Site Specific - 239 Thunder Beach Rd.</p> <p>"Environment First"</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Queried how difficult it was to rezone their property from Greenlands to Rural. 2. Expressed that they prefer the "Environment First" wording. 	<p>Rezoning from Greenlands to Rural would require an EIS</p> <p>Enhanced environmental policies exist throughout the plan. The Environment "Focused" terminology has been used to</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>3. Secondary suites should not only be in basements but also could be additions attached to the existing house.</p> <p>4. Expressed that the Official Plan should be passed before the lame duck period at the County and Township level.</p> <p>5. In the future there should be wording in the OP for the rehabilitation of cold water streams.</p>	<p>recognize that in some cases environment isn't the first consideration. For example – settlement areas.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Acknowledged. No changes proposed.</p>
<p>Anne and John Nahuis – April 10, 2018</p>	<p>Mineral Aggregate Resources</p>	<p>The lack of requirements to include an analysis of supply and demand is a barrier to undertaking comprehensive planning that would ensure that establishment of new pits and quarries is justified.</p> <p>The mineral aggregates policies in the PPS stating that neither demonstration of need, nor supply and demand analysis is required prior to establishing a new aggregate extraction operation.</p>	<p>Aggregate extraction is managed and licenced by the MNRF.</p> <p>Proposed Township policies reflect Provincial Policy.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		Suggested edits to PPS, Growth Plan and the SCOP regarding aggregate resources.	Acknowledged.
Kerigan Kelly, Groundswell Urban Planners Inc. – April 13, 2018	Site Specific – 564 Overhead Bridge Road	<p>Agent for the owners of 564 Overhead Bridge Road</p> <p>Property is currently designated as Country Residential and would be Greenlands/Rural based on the draft mapping and policies contained within the proposed Official Plan (section D.7).</p> <p>Stated that these designations would significantly alter any future plans that they have for their property.</p>	Application of natural heritage mapping provided by the Province, County, or the SSEA (Natural Heritage Report) is consistent throughout the Township. No changes proposed.
Celeste Philips – November 20, 2017	Site Specific – 759 Concession 17 East	<p>Stated that she represent the owners of 759 Concession 17 East, consisting of approximately 2.4 hectares and located on the west side of Fairlain Lake.</p> <p>Requested to designate the lands Rural-Special to allow for the creation of one new lot for residential purposes. In addition to the removal of the Environmental Protection 2 overlay on the lands, which I understand relates to a perceived significant woodlot on the property.</p>	Application of natural heritage mapping provided by the Province, County, or the SSEA (Natural Heritage Report) is consistent throughout the Township. No changes proposed.



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
Chris Williams – 1119 Marshall Road – April 9, 2018	French's Hill Source Water Protection	<p>Stated that the Official Plan offers no classification for the area in the southeast corner of Tiny known locally as French's Hill.</p> <p>Designate French's Hill as a highly vulnerable aquifer and or a natural heritage feature.</p>	<p>The Highly Vulnerable Aquifer and Significant Groundwater Recharge Area features that are identified in the Official Plan Schedules have been obtained from Chapter 4 of the Assessment Report that was completed for the Severn Sound Source Protection Area in 2014. This information does not identify French's Hill as either a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer or a Significant Ground Water Recharge Area.</p>
Judith Grant – March 28, 2018	Site Specific 13 th and 14 th Concessions	<p>Queried if the Greenlands designation is a stronger protection or a less strong one than Environmental Protection. And if it's less strong, why was the protection downgraded with regard to the large EP1 zone in solid green in the 13th and 14th Concessions just below the Nipissing Ridge.</p>	<p>EP1 in current OP and Greenlands in the Draft OP contains the same level of protection for certain features (like non PSWs). For example, wetland features have the same level of protection.</p>
Angela and Stephen Klym – March 26, 2018	Accessory Dwellings Seniors Housing	<p>Stated that they wish to be acknowledged for their strong support of the adoption of this proposal in May 2018.</p> <p>Stated that they are in favor of the language presented in regards to accessory dwellings.</p> <p>Stated that it is very important for them to be able</p>	<p>Acknowledged. No changes proposed.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		to support their family by providing them with accommodation and are currently stuck waiting for the Township to adopt language already adopted by the County.	
The Board of Directors, FoTTSA – March 20, 2018	Community Beaches Mineral Aggregate Resources Dark Sky Lighting Secondary Suites	Stated that they are glad to see that shore road allowances and smaller community beaches are to be used on a low intensity basis by all Township residents or by residents in the immediate vicinity. “pleased to see that there is more detail about the rehabilitation of gravel pits (though there's nothing about protection of aquifers impacted by aggregate extraction).” The addition of the section on Dark Sky Lighting is much appreciated, as is the removal of Secondary Suites from the Shoreline area where they would probably be used for short term rentals.	Acknowledged. No changes proposed.
Janet Boyer – March 2018		Suggested modifications: A number of elements in the Plan seem very <i>restrictive</i> . Believes the following items should be	This language is taken from the Growth Plan, and the Official Plan is required to conform to the Growth Plan.



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>made <i>less restrictive</i>:</p> <p>1) No site alteration in Environmental Protection (EP); Greenlands or Natural Heritage Zones. Sections B.1.6.1 & B.2.18</p> <p>There are ways to manage environmentally sensitive lands and forests.</p> <p>If Tiny Township wants the woodlands, it needs to allow owners the freedom to maintain them <i>as the owners see fit</i>. It's our land! Sustainable forestry management practices work. Moreover, careful pruning and cutting of diseased or dangerous trees make for healthy forests. Please help out the foresters in the Township. Don't institute a tree-cutting by-law as mentioned in Section E.4.10. Doing so would just make the process slower and more expensive. Such a by-law would only be warranted if an owner wanted to clear-cut a huge tract of property.</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>2) Sections D.3.10 & D.3.11.1 & D.3.11.2 & D.3.11.4 - Please <i>do not prohibit development</i> on land accessed by private or un-assumed roads. What is the objective of this policy? Why state you cannot “enlarge or renovate” without entering into a Private Rd. Agreement with the Township? We must not be prevented from doing repairs and enhancements to our own properties. What do owners gain by entering into a private road agreement with the Township if there are no services from Tiny in return? To do this presumably costs time and money, i.e. the cost of a lawyer etc.</p> <p>3) Section B.3.13 Consent to Sever. Having allowed properties to sever a certain way in the past, if another similar property wishes to sever in the same way, it seems fair to permit it. Creating a lot or two should be permitted if the originating land is sufficiently large, and has not already</p>	<p>There are liability concerns and public health and safety concerns with development proceeding on Private Roads.</p> <p>Private road agreements identify to current and future owners that the service level is reduced in a manner that can impact on emergency service vehicles.</p> <p>Limited opportunities for lot creation are permitted. See Section B.8.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>been severed, even if access is by a private road.</p> <p><i>Surely variances on a case-by-case basis would be acceptable to the Township.</i></p> <p>4) Waste Disposal Sites: Section D4:</p> <p>Many waste disposal sites in the Township have been closed.</p> <p>Simcoe County is in the process of closing the 20th Concession West Stump Dump. I understand that testing is complete. Stumps have been ground up. Reports are being finalized & closure is pending. Some planting may be done in the spring. Neighbouring landowners are awaiting the reduction or removal of D4 setback zones. H3 holds on surrounding properties which we own should be lifted.</p> <p>Please continue to work with Simcoe County to close, de-list and remove the 20th Concession West Stump Dump from the Schedule D map of the Plan as soon as</p>	<p>Acknowledged. No changes proposed.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>possible. Table A5 Other Zones - note that Recycling Establishments, Waste Sites and Waste Transfer Stations are permitted uses. This is totally unacceptable for this site given the proximity to Georgian Bay and existing log homes.</p> <p>Section D.1.7.5 mentions <i>new</i> waste disposal sites in the Township. <i>No new waste disposal sites in Tiny Township should be created!</i></p>	
<p>Dr. John Byron Alldred – BF2D5 EF660 ODC3B, TINY BEACHES RD S. CON 3 PT LOT 25,26 – March 4, 2018</p>	<p>Site Specific</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expressed concern that the change in designation “shoreline” to “greenlands” will greatly reduce the value of their property as it would appear to greatly reduce ability to divide of residential building lots or for other potential uses if desired in the future. 2. Queried what future development potential/uses in the “greenlands” designation. 3. Has Township got a sound basis for designated this area from shoreline to greenlands on basis of provincial mandate 	<p>Application of natural heritage mapping provided by the Province, County, or the SSEA (Natural Heritage Report) is consistent throughout the Township. No changes proposed.</p> <p>The Greenlands mapping has been modified to reflect the requirements of the Growth Plan.</p> <p>Permitted uses for the Greenlands are identified in Section B.2.17. Additional</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p style="text-align: center;">and it is no use arguing the designation?</p> <p>4. Has the Township just changed this designation somewhat arbitrarily taking away some property owners shoreline designation to push future development into “settlement areas?</p> <p>5. do you think it would it be possible to reverse this proposed change if you prepared and sent report/ letter to Township? or am i wasting time and financial resources? “</p>	<p>development potential is limited.</p> <p>Growth Plan requires the mapping of additional features such as Significant Valleylands and Significant Woodlands, which were not previously required to be mapped.</p> <p>If an EIS is prepared and it identifies that the feature is not present, the mapping can be modified.</p>
Byron Cell Young – March 29, 2018	Site specific conversation with S. Persaud	S. Persaud meeting with B. Young on March 16, 2018.	<p>See comment above.</p> <p>Current and Draft Official Plan schedules were provided to resident.</p>
Jürgen and Betty Lou Pape	Septage Spreading	Expressed concern with the lack of septage spreading policies in the Official Plan.	This is the jurisdiction of the MOECC.



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
– 260 Concession 15 East – March 17, 2018		Expressed concern that MOE guidelines are not strict enough for monitoring the saturation of Township septage waste, field dumping and spreading areas.	Township undertaking research to consider options for consideration of septage spreading in the Official Plan.
Jürgen and Betty Lou Pape – 260 Concession 15 East – March 10, 2018	Septage Spreading	Expressed concern with the lack of septage spreading policies in the Official Plan. Stated that the site on Concession 15 East has been used for the past 8 years for septage spreading. This area is identified as a SGRA.	This is the jurisdiction of the MOECC. Township undertaking research to consider options for consideration of septage spreading in the Official Plan.
Don Stubbs – 4230 Crossland Road, Tiny Georgian Bay Park – March 23, 2018	Site Specific	Requested that property be re-designated through the Official Plan Update process to allow for the property to be used for a retirement lodge facility, completed with assisted living amenities within the ‘Georgian Bay Park’ development property. Provided an accompanying letter from C.C. Tatham (September 29, 2017) to states that there appears to be no negative impacts on water distribution, sewage collection and treatment, stormwater management, drainage and access for the overall development.	It is not appropriate to add a new site specific use to a property through an OP Update process. In this instance, a number of supporting studies would be required. This is more appropriately dealt with through a site specific OPA.



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
Judith Grant - Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Associations – March 23, 2018	Vision and Approach	<p>Noted that Section A.1.1.2 says that "Council determined that the Vision and Land Use Concept and many of the policies articulated in that document still maintained the vision and the approach that the Township of Tiny wanted to maintain."</p> <p>Stated that the Vision in the original document does not appear in the draft OP and modifications may be required in the third paragraph.</p>	<p>Many of the guiding principles included in the current OP's Vision section are now embedded into specific sections of the draft OP.</p>
Frank Dunnigan – 58 Trew Ave., Tiny 188 Burnet Street, Oakville – March 23, 2018	Bluewater Dunes Environment First	<p>Requested that the Bluewater Dunes be re-designated to Environmental Protection 1 and as part of the Natural Heritage in the Township.</p> <p>Stated that there has been environmental studies completed that examine the Dunes.</p> <p>Stated that he does not support the watering down of the "Environment First" wording in the current Official Plan.</p>	<p>It is proposed that the following policy be added to the Major Parks Section: "All major beach parks shall be developed in compliance with the approved Master Plans. If a Master Plan identifies areas for environmental protection, then the Greenlands policies shall apply to those areas."</p> <p>Only PSW's and CPSW are designated as EP.</p> <p>Environment Focused maintained. The Draft OP provides additional environmental protection policies over</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
			the current OP.
<p>James Deep – 1151 Chapelton Place, Oakville – March 23, 2018</p>	<p>Bluewater Dunes</p> <p>Environment First</p>	<p>Requested the 5 Major beach Park designation be abolished.</p> <p>Re-evaluated the Natural Heritage scope of the Bluewater Dunes as threatened species have been confirmed by the MNRF.</p> <p>Requested that the Bluewater Dunes be re-designated to Environmental Protection 1 and as part of the Natural Heritage in the Township.</p> <p>Stated that there has been environmental studies completed that examine the Dunes.</p> <p>Stated that the support the watering down of the “Environment First” wording in the current Official Plan.</p>	<p>Bluewater Beach Park is identified as a “Major Beach Park” in the current Tiny OP. This designation has been in place since at least 2000. There is no modification proposed in this regard. The decision to remove Bluewater Beach Park as a Major Beach Park lies solely with Council</p> <p>It is proposed that the following policy be added at the end the major beach parks section: “All major beach parks shall be developed in compliance with the approved Master Plans. If a Master Plan identifies areas for environmental protection, then the Greenlands policies shall apply to those areas.”</p> <p>Only PSW’s and CPSW are designated as EP.</p> <p>Environment Focused maintained. The Draft OP provides additional environmental protection policies over the current OP.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
<p>John Shelley – 92 Shoreline Road, Tiny</p> <p>82 Glenvale Blvd., Toronto – March 23, 2018</p>	<p>Official Plan release date</p>	<p>Queried when a copy of the Official Plan will be available to the public before going to Council for adoption.</p>	<p>Draft 3 of the OP will be released a minimum of 20 days before the statutory Public Meeting.</p>
<p>Kevin Mullan – March 26, 2018</p>	<p>Lafontaine Loop Trail</p>	<p>Requested that an accessible, multi-use nature trail to connect to the Great Trail (Trans-Canada Trail).</p> <p>The trail would connect to the main attractions of the area (Awenda Park, White Pines Fishing and Golf, Thunder Beach, Lafontaine Village, Lafontaine Creek, Balm Beach).</p> <p>Stated the length of the trail would be approximately 28 kms.</p> <p>Stated that recreational trails have many benefits such as minimal infrastructure costs, many health and safety benefits.</p>	<p>The Township has a Trail Committee and a Recreational Master Plan that would address this topic. The new trail policies in the OP promote the use of trails when considering new development.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
<p>Kathy Wiele – 34 Trew Ave. Tiny – March 23, 2018</p>	<p>Bluewater Dunes Environment First</p>	<p>Requested that the Bluewater Dunes be re-designated to Environmental Protection 1 and as part of the Natural Heritage in the Township.</p> <p>Stated that there has been environmental studies completed that examine the Dunes.</p> <p>Stated that she does not support the watering down of the “Environment First” wording in the current Official Plan.</p>	<p>It is proposed that the following policy be added to the major beach parks section: “All major beach parks shall be developed in compliance with the approved Master Plans. If a Master Plan identifies areas for environmental protection, then the Greenlands policies shall apply to those areas.”</p> <p>Only PSW’s and CPSW are EP.</p> <p>Environment Focused maintained. The Draft OP provides additional environmental protection policies over the current OP.</p>
<p>Lynn Borysiuk – 22 Trew Ave, Tiny 1151 Chapeleton Place, Oakville – March 23, 2018</p>	<p>Bluewater Dunes Environment First</p>	<p>Requested that the Bluewater Dunes be re-designated to Environmental Protection 1 and as part of the Natural Heritage in the Township.</p> <p>Stated that there has been environmental studies completed that examine the Dunes.</p> <p>Stated that she does not support the watering down of the “Environment First” wording in the current Official Plan.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
<p>Mary-Beth Dunnigan – 62 Trew Avenue, Tiny</p> <p>118 Burnet Street, Oakville – March 23, 2018</p>	<p>Bluewater Dunes</p> <p>Environment First</p>	<p>Requested that the Bluewater Dunes be re-designated to Environmental Protection 1 and as part of the Natural Heritage in the Township.</p> <p>Stated that there has been environmental studies completed that examine the Dunes.</p> <p>Stated that she does not support the watering down of the “Environment First” wording in the current Official Plan.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>
<p>Robert Easto – 34 Trew Ave., Tiny</p> <p>443 Ste. Marie Street, Collingwood – March 23, 2018</p>	<p>Bluewater Dunes</p> <p>Environment First</p>	<p>Requested that the Bluewater Dunes be re-designated to Environmental Protection 1 and as part of the Natural Heritage in the Township.</p> <p>Stated that there has been environmental studies completed that examine the Dunes.</p> <p>Stated that he does not support the watering down of the “Environment First” wording in the current Official Plan.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>
<p>Tara Marshall – BDPA</p> <p>David Wiseman</p>	<p>Bluewater Dunes</p>	<p>Meeting with Mayor Cornell, Deputy Mayor Walma and members of BDPA on April 6, 2018.</p> <p>Discussed action plan to achieve re-designating Dunes to EP1.</p>	<p>It is proposed that the following policy be added to the major beach park section: “All major beach parks shall be developed in compliance with the approved Master Plans. If a Master Plan identifies areas for</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
<p>– BDPA</p> <p>James Deep – BDPA</p> <p>– April 6, 2018</p>		<p>Stated that the Bluewater Dunes park is not just the area behind the 530ft of beachfront but the whole 14 acres of land that extends north and east down Trew Ave toward TBRS</p>	<p>environmental protection, then the Greenlands policies shall apply to those areas.”</p> <p>Only PSW's and CPSW are EP.</p> <p>Environment Focused maintained. The Draft OP provides additional environmental protection policies over the current OP.</p>
<p>Anthony Rovito</p> <p>– 50 Glenholme Ave., Toronto</p>	<p>Bluewater Dunes</p>	<p>Requested that the Bluewater Dunes be re-designated to Environmental Protection 1 and as part of the Natural Heritage in the Township.</p> <p>Stated that identifying the site as a "Major Park" misrepresents the actual permitted uses on the site when considering the studies that were completed.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>
<p>Tara Marshall –</p> <p>603 Hedde Cres., Newmarket –</p> <p>March 22, 201</p>	<p>Bluewater Dunes</p> <p>Environment First</p>	<p>Requested that the Bluewater Dunes be re-designated to Environmental Protection 1 and as part of the Natural Heritage in the Township.</p> <p>Stated that there has been environmental studies completed that examine the Dunes.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		Stated that the support the watering down of the “Environment First” wording in the current Official Plan.	
Stuart McKenzie – 46 Trew Avenue, Tiny – April 9, 2018	Bluewater Dunes	Requested that the Bluewater Dunes be re-designated From “Open Space” to Environmental Protection 1 and as part of the Natural Heritage in the Township. Stated that the freshwater dunes are globally rare and must be protected.	See comments above.
James Deep -20 Trew Ave.,Tiny - April 11, 2018	Bluewater Dunes	Addressed letter and concerns to K. Pechkovsky (County of Simcoe), S. Persaud (Tiny), and MNRF. Requested that the Bluewater Dunes be re-designated From “Open Space” to Environmental Protection 1 and as part of the Natural Heritage in the Township Made reference to a petition that has approximately 725 signatures requesting the change in the Draft Official Plan. Requesting that: 1. The OMNRF investigate and evaluate the	Bluewater Beach Park is identified as a “Major Beach Park” in the current Tiny OP. This designation has been in place since at least 2000. There is no modification proposed in this regard. The decision to remove Bluewater Beach Park as a Major Beach Park lies solely with Council It is proposed that the following policy be added the major parks section: “All major beach parks shall be developed in compliance with the approved Master Plans. If a Master Plan identifies areas for



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>Bluewater Dunes as General and Specific habitat for the Lake Huron Grasshopper and Calamovilfa Longfolia;</p> <p>2. The County of Simcoe evaluate the Bluewater Dunes and designate it as a regional ANSI (extending the existing ANSI in their OP which ends @ County Rd 29) on the basis of the landform and presence of threatened species of grasshopper and dune reedgrass;</p> <p>3. The SSEA evaluate and identify the Bluewater Dunes (the most intact dune in public ownership in the township) as a Natural Heritage Feature of Tiny Township;</p> <p>4. The Township remove reference to Major waterfront/beach parks in the draft OP and the draft recreation master plan, and instead spread community and visitor use of the beach equally among all township owned waterfront properties;</p> <p>5. Town Council and their Planning Consultants designate the Bluewater</p>	<p>environmental protection, then the Greenlands policies shall apply to those areas.”</p> <p>Only PSW's and CPSW are designated as EP.</p> <p>Environment Focused maintained. The Draft OP provides additional environmental protection policies over the current OP.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>Dunes as EP in the Official Plan;</p> <p>6. The Township hire AMEC Earth and Meridian to update their reports regarding the Bluewater Dunes;</p> <p>7. The Township reconstitute the Bluewater Dunes Restoration Advisory Committee;</p> <p>8. The Township carry out the balance of the restoration work suggested in the Meridian/AMEC report; and</p> <p>9. The Township and the County formally provide me with written notice of the adoption and/or approval of the Township of Tiny Official Plan. For this purpose, my address is as follows:</p> <p>Email — james@jamesdeep.com Mail — James Deep, 7-209 Speers Road, Oakville, ON L6K OH5</p>	
<p>Jack and Liz Diserardino – 33 First Street – April 13, 2018</p>	<p>Bluewater Dunes</p>	<p>Stated Section B.4.11.1 is incorrect in identifying the Bluewater Beach Park as a “major park.”</p> <p>Stated that this is not consistent with the Park</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>Master Plan where it identifies it as a "low density" park.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2nd draft of the 2018 OP is currently not correct and should be amended to reflect its guiding Park Master Plan and designated as a "low density" park. 2. The Township should revise its marketing materials to appropriately reflect the unique nature of the Bluewater Beach Park and no longer promote it as a "major park". 3. Council should reconsider any plans for further development of this area - most particularly in terms of parking. There has already been a detrimental effect to the surrounding area and property owners because of the improper designation as a "major" park. 	
<p>Nick Ainley – September 29, 2017</p>	<p>Site Specific</p>	<p>Submitted a letter of concern on the First Draft of the Official Plan. However, it was received past the comments response deadline, therefore the</p>	<p>Based on the hierarchy of settlements required by the County, Toanche is considered a minor settlement area and</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
(resubmitted on April 30)		<p>comments are being addressed in the Draft 2.</p> <p>Stated that they represent K. Hindson (property owner of 570 Champlain Road in the hamlet of Toanche.</p> <p>The property owner has an active ZBA application before the Township to permit the establishment of a boat storage facility on the property. At present, the proposed rezoning is in conformance with the policy provisions for the “Settlement Area” designation of the Township’s adopted Official Plan, which provide for, small scale commercial, industrial uses servicing the needs of the community and the travelling public (Section 7.3.</p> <p>Stated that in reviewing the “Settlement Area” designation in Draft 1 of the Township’s Official Plan (Section B.3 of Draft OP), they noted that the policies applicable to Toanche differ significantly and they propose to exclude as a permitted use, “small scale industrial development in the form of...warehouses...”, (Section B.3.3.1 & 2 of Draft OP).</p>	<p>thus would host a lower order of uses and would not permit industrial. It is understood that the application for rezoning was commenced over 2 years ago and justification is still being compiled by the applicant. It can continue to be processed until approval of the OP. No changes to the policies are recommended.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>Stated that this proposed policy deviation obviously is of great concern to their client in view of the impact it potentially could have on their current rezoning application and development plans for their property.</p> <p>Requested that the draft policy of the proposed new Official Plan be modified in a way that ensures that their client's intended use of his property and, requested ZBA remains in conformance with the Official Plan.</p>	
<p>Doug Lorriman - Business Association of Balm Beach – March 18, 2018</p>	<p>Vision and Principles</p> <p>Commercial Development in Balm Beach</p> <p>Tourism Policy in Balm Beach</p> <p>Georgian Bay Shoreline</p>	<p>1) Part A 1 Stated that the current OP lays out the vision for the plan in this section. The Draft new plan ("Draft") references this vision in A.1.1.2 but does not elaborate. Also states that the vision as spelled out in the current OP should also be fully stated up front in the new document.</p> <p>2) Part A2 Stated that Part A2 in the current OP lays out the guiding principles for the plan. No similar section is included in the Draft Official Plan. Although some of the</p>	<p>The vision aspects have be consolidated throughout the document for increased readability.</p> <p>Acknowledged. Wording has been added.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
	Dark Sky Lighting	<p>language is found scattered throughout the Draft, they stated that they believe that the full list should be included at the front of the Draft as it is in the current OP.</p> <p>3) B.4.9.1 - Amend the third sentence of this section as follows: "New commercial uses including tourist commercial that serve the wider region are encouraged to locate in the Balm Beach area."</p> <p>4) Stated that they are concerned that tourism is not addressed in the new draft Official Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Tourism is addressed in County OP. Township of Tiny is involved with ECSNS Awenda Park is a key tourist area within the Township. Draft OP is silent on Awenda Park. <p>5) Part B2 (both Plans)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that the Shoreline of Georgian Bay has been left off the list of components of the natural heritage system in the Draft, what is the reasoning for this? agree with replacement of the vague concept of the "100 year 	<p>The enforcement of the development occurring below the 178 metre contour line is addressed through the regulations of the MNRF and could be dealt with through a Township Site Alteration By-law.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan April 22, 2018

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>flood level” with the “Regulatory Flood Elevation” (178.0 metres).</p> <p>c. Concern with Section C.4.2 still allowing structures to be built below the 178 contour.</p> <p>6) Stated that they strongly support the inclusion of this section in the new Draft Official Plan.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing - April 17, 2018</p>	<p>Conformity with Provincial Documents</p>	<p>1) Stated that it should be made clear that the Township is planning to accommodate for a range and mix of uses to a 2031 planning horizon as per Schedule 7 of the Growth Plan, rather than a 20 year horizon or beyond.</p> <p>2) Ensure that the language of the draft OP appropriately reflects this planning window.</p> <p>3) It is additionally recommended that the County ensure no re-designations are proposed in this OP that would be subject to a municipal comprehensive review (MCR), such as the designation of agricultural lands for urban development purposes.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and will be considered in the preparation of the Third draft of the OP.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>4) Ensure that the proposed designations in the OP schedules will not impact the County’s future Land Needs Assessment exercise.</p> <p>5) The now in-effect Provincial Natural Heritage and Agricultural Systems also need to be considered in the review of this OP as decisions are now required to conform to the provincial maps as per sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.6 of the Growth Plan respectively.</p> <p>6) It is recommended that the County consult the provincial implementation guidelines for both systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Regional Natural Heritage System for the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe: Summary of Criteria and Methods b. The ‘Implementation Procedures for the Agricultural System in Ontario’s Greater Golden Horseshoe 	



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>7) The County may also want to consider what implications there may be for outstanding site-specific appeals of the County OP, both within the Township and, more generally, elsewhere in the County as OP update programs in other local municipalities proceed.</p> <p>8) It was noted that there are some restrictions on the creation of second units including requirements for re-zoning and buffering. The County should consider if these provisions are more restrictive than what is intended by the Planning Act and the COP</p> <p>9) Ensure consistency with the italicised terms in the document.</p>	
<p>County of Simcoe – K. Pechkovsky - April 17, 2018</p>		<p>1) Ensure correct terminology for ‘key natural heritage features’ and ‘natural heritage features and areas’.</p> <p>2) Provincial Mapping and County Land Use have discrepancies. Further thought and discussion is needed.</p> <p>3) Ensure correct development setbacks</p>	<p>These comments are noted and will be considered in the Third Draft of the OP.</p>



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 2 of the Official Plan
April 22, 2018**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>from the edge of any features in the Greenlands designation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4) Ensure enough Intensification options are provided. 5) Utilize County's Climate Change Action Plan 2016 and Ontario's Climate Change Strategy as a guide. 6) Ensure correction definition for 'Prime Agricultural Area'. 	



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

Official Plan Open House Comments

March 22, 2018 – Vaughan, Springhill Suites Conference Centre

Organization / Member of the Public	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Response
Herb Huck – Farlain Lake Association	Garden Suites/Second Units Septage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in rental units for income generation • Why weren't they removed in Shoreline • Times are changing with baby boomers • Definition not for short term rentals, restrictions on rental terms • Undeveloped tracts of land to protect NHS • Developed lots should be protected (Dunes) • Tree cutting by-law is similar • Spreading of septage • Policies for discharge of septage close to water bodies and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garden Suites allowed in current OP in most designations (including Shoreline) since 2000 • Second Units removed from Shoreline • Septage spreading is a MOECC approval



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

		greenlands	
Nicholas Leblovic	Second Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports removal of second units in Shoreline • Over-crowding from rental units in Shoreline • Restriction on rental terms • Restriction on Garden suites and how long the can be rented • Short term rentals vs. affordable housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft OP policies reflect this approach. • Garden suites are regulated by the Planning Act. • OP policies do not permit second units in the Shoreline designation.
Jessie Garland – Bluewater Beach	Second Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queried whether policies could be included for Seasonal vs. affordable housing in Shoreline • Queried whether policies could be included for Permanent vs. seasonal residential units in the Shoreline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft OP policies reflect this approach • Policies do not reflect seasonal vs. permanent. Planning documents do not typically contain this distinction. Building code regulations differentiate building standards for permanent vs. seasonal construction
Judith Grant - Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline	Aggregate Groundwater Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision statements from current OP does not translate into Draft • Aggregate extraction impact on drinking water - Another 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vision is no longer a stand-alone section but rather embodies throughout the various policy sections in the



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

Associations (FOTTSA)	Policies	<p>Walkerton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mechanism in OP for protection of features before development is proposed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ French's Hill ○ First Nations ○ Aquifer under Site 41 	<p>draft OP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Aggregate policies are as strong as possible under what is permitted by Provincial Policy ● Draft OP has policies to protect environmental features when they are identified through a Planning Act application
Patt Profiti	Environment First vs. Environment Focused	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● EP designation ● Environment is not priority ● Environment First vs. Environment Focused – does not agree with change ● Policies to prohibit aggregate extraction completely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Environment Focused wording is more reflective of policy content in Draft OP ● Environmental objectives and policies are stronger than what is in the current OP
Paul Cowley – FOTTSA	Aquifers and SGRAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Nothing about aquifers ● Not enough teeth or policies to deal with the impacts on aquifers (aggregate extraction) ● Absence of aviation policies ● Local municipal support and protection for airport ● Airport is an economic and tourism resource ● Challenge province to prohibit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Policies are not included for aquifers specifically because it is hard to know where they are located ● Groundwater must be reviewed for any new aggregate development ● Source Water Protection mapping has been included as a schedule in the Draft OP



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

		aggregate	
Tara Marshall – Bluewater Beach	Bluewater Dunes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bluewater dunes not included in draft OP • Restoration Plan and subsequent environmental reports prepared for Bluewater Dunes Lake Huron Grasshopper • 2 decades trying protect the Dunes • Identify as significant natural heritage feature • Request for protection policies I the OP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MHBC and Township staff to review previous reports and provide a recommendation to Council



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

March 23, 2018 – Township of Tiny Council Chambers – Open House #2

Organization / Member of the Public	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Response
Danny Vistole – Bluewater Beach	Approval Timeline Bluewater Dunes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does County have a deadline to approve the Tiny OP? • E.12.3.1 – removal of EIS requirements can create inconsistency between applications • If Tiny planning staff changes in the future there might be inconsistency in the content required for supporting studies • Add policy “plus any other up-to-date study requirements” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County has a specific number of days to approve the OP once adopted by Council, but the timeline may be effected by the municipal election • EIS terms of reference were removed as it was felt that the experts can determine the terms of reference through preconsultation, based on the proposal and the features that may be present • E.12.3 and E.12.4 provide the



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

			Township with flexibility in requesting what is included in EIS studies. Township has the ability to consult with SSEA
David Wiseman – Bluewater Beach	Bluewater Dunes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the SSEA study is incomplete relative to dunes, how can mapping and policies be completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MHBC and Township staff to review previous reports and provide a recommendation to Council
Chris Williamson – Friends of the Waverley Uplands	Mineral Aggregate Resources Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule E – are boundaries HVA and SGWA fixed or subject to change? French’s Hill to be included in HVA or SGWRA? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These boundaries were established by the source protection authority as part of the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Protection Plan
Anne Ritchie-Nahuis - Friends of the Waverley Uplands	Mineral Aggregate Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groundwater concerns near aggregate pits Is there a designation that prohibits aggregate extraction? If yes, can it be used in Tiny? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggregate resources are mapped by the Province and are to be protected as set out by Provincial Policy Province has a series of tests that any new aggregate operation



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect area behind the Wye Marsh that is identified in the County mapping 	<p>must meet and they are embodied in the Draft OP</p>
Andre Deroches	Seniors Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perkinsfield needs housing for seniors • How to keep elders within that they are from? Lack of nursing home/senior residences in Tiny 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor opportunities in Garden Suites, institutional uses are promoted in Perkinsfield
Dick Wesselo	Mineral Aggregate Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is there no EIS requirement for the removal of land for aggregate? • Why is there a requirement for an aggregate potential assessment? • There should be a balance between zoning and Official Plan • Vertical zoning? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Province has a series of tests that any new aggregate operation must meet, including an EIS, which are embodied in the Draft OP • An aggregate potential assessment is required where new lots are proposed in proximity to an operation or in an area of aggregate resource potential. It is a Provincial interest to protect aggregate supply in Ontario.
Unknown	Mineral Aggregate Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moratorium policy for aggregate licence that remains dormant for 10+ years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the jurisdiction of the MNRF.



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

James Deep– Bluewater Beach	OP Timelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquired about comment deadline • Is there a meeting to view the next draft of the document before it gets adopted? • Stretch out timeline or target a later date so the OP doesn't get rushed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new draft of the OP will be prepared prior to the statutory Public Meeting
Kate – Bluewater Beach	Aggregate Rehabilitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Made reference to B.10.4.4.2 • Rehabilitation in aggregate areas • How can an Aggregate pit be rehabilitated back to agricultural land? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not an OP policy issue. Rehabilitation of aggregate operations can take many forms.
David Barkey - Friends of the Waverley Uplands	Mineral Aggregate Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GTA companies owning the aggregate pits and the resources. Once pit is past its lifetime, it's left for the Township to deal with • Questioned whether more policies can be included in the OP regarding the protection of the resource and employment policies • Made reference to the province's "closes to market policies" and queried whether they could be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OP and ARA require the preparation of rehabilitation plans. B.10.4.4. • No changes proposed to the policies to deal with close to market supply.



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

		included in the OP	
Angela Haskill	Garden Suites and Second units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an opportunity to have parts of the Official Plan be considered at a later time? • Wants to support family and seniors • Not legally allowed to have a second unit on her property to support an elderly family member • Wants to have the applications for second suites to be reviewed at a case by case basis • How long does it take the County to adopt the OP? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the OP could be deferred. It is unlikely that the Township would favour this approach. • The OP recognizes instances where second units are permitted. In some instances a ZBA may be required – these applications are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. • Approval of the OP by the County would take a number of months.
Pete Stubbins	Environment First Dune Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expedite planning process to have it approved due to elections timing • Dislikes the Removal of Environmental First because of the amount of time spent 20+ years ago developing that notion at “kitchen table meetings” • Protection of Dunes should be promoted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft OP provides enhanced environmental policies. First changed to focused as there are some instances where other considerations may take priority over the natural environment.



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

John Nahuis		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies for testing fill removal and dumping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an MOECC requirement. • The Township has a Fill Control By-law.
Unknown	Mineral Aggregate Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No enforcement of rehabilitation plans for aggregate pits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an MNRF responsibility
Cathy Wheelie	Environment First Dunes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports change to environment first • Where are the policies relating to dunes in the document? • Where is the anchor for the policies relating to dunes? • Dunes to be included natural heritage feature policies in the OP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft OP provides enhanced environmental policies. First changed to focused as there are some instances where other considerations may take priority over the natural environment. • Dune policies were added in the draft OP • Dunes identified as part of an EIS would also be subject to the Greenlands policies.
Unknown	Greenbelt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquired about the relationship between the Provincial Greenbelt Plan and the protection from aggregate resource • Expansion of Provincial Greenbelt Plan into Tiny and the development impacts on the Township 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenbelt Plan does not exist in Tiny • Greenbelt Plan policies would have to be considered, should the Province include Tiny in the future.



Township of Tiny – Second Draft Official Plan Comment Summary Table

Unknown	Definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why does the draft OP remove the 100 year storm definition? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is included in elements of the floodplain policies
Unknown	Council Powers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What does “lame duck” status mean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 3/4 of council decide not to run again, then there WOULD be a “lame duck” period
Don Stubbs – Georgian Bay Park	Site Specific Seniors Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inquired about re-designating property through the OP Update for an “Amica” retirement home facility He mentioned that he is prepared to invest in the necessary studies Township mentioned that they would need to look into it further Amica is independent care – Not a nursing home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing for seniors should be located in Settlement Areas Policies similar to: “suitable housing for seniors is to be considered at appropriate locations”



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
André Claire 35 Nadia Crescent, Tiny, Ontario– July 14, 2018		Following the July 11th OP statutory public meeting, Mr. Claire has requested to be kept informed on the future stages of the process both at the Township and County levels.	The Township sent a letter to all individuals who were present at the public meeting and requested to be kept informed of the next stage in the process. The letter noted the date the final plan was to be presented to Council.
Janet Boyer - July 16, 2018	Illegal Dumping	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water really is the most important element in the Georgian Bay area. This is why we need to continue to press Simcoe County and the MOECC to permanently close the stump dump and remove the waste site certificate. There should not be any waste sites near the shores of Georgian Bay. I do think that getting it off the Tiny map would help reduce illegal dumping. 2. Section D3 10.1: I would like to reiterate 	The County of Simcoe notified the Township on October 30 that the County stump dump ECA has been officially revoked by the Province. As such, Schedule D Waste Disposal Sites of the new Township Official Plan has been updated to remove this site accordingly.



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>my earlier dislike of this section of the plan that restricts the creation of a new lot on a private road unless it is a plan of condominium.</p> <p>Frankly the higher density units (condos) are not desirable because of concerns over short term renters as in Airbnb. Perhaps now the provincial Liberals are out, there will be less emphasis on affordable housing.</p> <p>I do think that Tiny should allow some landowners to sever at least one time as long as it involves the creation of a reasonably sized lot.</p> <p>Please allow landowners to appeal or request a variance on this no severance policy. (I presume that a plan of subdivision is a totally different process.)</p> <p>3. Section D 14.2: Lastly I do believe Tiny should be an unwilling host for Wind Turbines.</p>	<p>The current Plan does not permit lot creation on a private road.</p> <p>The reference to a plan of condominium is so that the road is part of a condominium. This provision does not pertain to the built form of housing.</p> <p>Lot creation policies are found in the designation sections D.6 & D7.</p> <p>Section D.14.2 of the new OP states that the Township is an unwilling host for Industrial Wind Turbines.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		They seem so industrial, noisy, problematic for health and pit neighbour against neighbour.	
<p>Herb Huck (Farlain Lake Community Association) – July 13, 2018</p>	<p>Garden Suites</p> <p>Environment First</p>	<p>1. Continue to have concerns with the allowance of Garden Suites on shoreline properties.</p> <p>We feel these suites may be used for commercial purposes instead of the intended purpose of providing affordable permanent housing. We ask that you consider adding an additional condition for determining whether a temporary use permit should be issued in section D.10.2.2 along the lines of the following;</p> <p><i>"The property owner signs an affidavit swearing that the Garden Suite will never be used for commercial purposes including short term rentals of less than 60 consecutive days, business ventures of any type, or any other use not aligned with the provision of permanent affordable housing accommodations. Violation of this representation will result in a notice to remove the Garden Suit within 30 days, revocation of any previous consent, and an inability for the property owner to apply for a new permit to erect a Garden Suit on the property for a period of 10 years."</i></p>	<p>Additional item added to the agreement section of D 10.2.6 c) that requires the agreement to include that the garden suite will not be used for short term accommodations.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		2. We also support the request made at the meeting by Judith Grant from FoTTSA to re-introduce a vision to the official plan that focuses on the environment first. That should be our guiding principal where situations arise that may not have been contemplated or addressed by specific provisions in the plan.	Vision has been included. Modification to the current vision to reflect “Environmental Focused” language in the rest of the Plan.
Lynn Borysiuk – July 18, 2018	Bluewater Dunes	1. In the existing Official Plan and in the proposed new Official Plan, the Bluewater Dunes are not protected. I would strongly suggest that the Bluewater Dunes be designated EP in the new Official Plan, however, as I understand it, the new Official Plan may not go through as a result of the aggregate issue. My question is, how can we protect the Dunes in the meantime? 2. What is possible in terms of a site specific amendment to the zoning bylaw that would offer greater protection of the Bluewater Dunes? 3. The Bluewater Beach Management Plan maps out the area to be protected. The boundaries have not changed.	Bluewater Dunes Parks is proposed to remain in the shoreline designation. Section B.4.11.3 has been added to reflect that development and activities must occur in accordance with the Bluewater Beach Management Plan and Bluewater Beach Environmental Restoration Plan (Phase I and II).



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>The fact that the dunes need to be protected has not changed. It is highly improbable, if not impossible, that a new assessment of the dunes will suggest that they no longer need protection. I'm not sure why we need to spend more money on an updated assessment prior to zoning the dunes EP.</p> <p>If there needs to be an updated evaluation, that will take a considerable amount of time, during which the dunes will remain "unprotected". Out of an abundance of caution, wouldn't it make more sense to zone the dunes EP immediately?</p> <p>4. The policies of this Provincial Policy Statement represent minimum standards. The Provincial Policy Statement does not prevent planning authorities and decision-makers from going beyond the minimum standards established in specific policies, unless doing so would conflict with any policy of this Provincial Policy Statement." (Provincial Policy Statement 2014)</p> <p>I would respectfully request that a site specific amendment to the zoning bylaw be implemented to designate the Bluewater Beach Dunes EP.</p>	
Mark and Paula	Greenlands		



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
<p>Dubeau – Roll Number 4368000083750 5, Overhead Bridge Road</p>	<p>Designation of lands on Overhead Bridge Road</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Greenlands designation on property <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Property is not identified as significant woodland in the current Township Official Plan Schedules and should not be identified as significant woodlands now, when there has not been any study or analysis to support the re-designation of the Property. o The woodland on the Property does not satisfy the tests for significant woodlands. o Current Official Plan: Country Residential o County OP: Rural o Re-designating property from Greenlands to Rural or Country Residential would conform to the County OP. o it is also significant that the Property is currently zoned as FD - Future Development. Where the current zoning and the current County Official Plan would allow for limited development of the subject Lands, there is no justification for re-designation to significant woodlands or greenlands. 2) Objection of the greenlands policies, the Rural policies and the Country Residential policies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o None of which would adequately provide for development on the subject Property which is already 	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>The property is designated Greenlands due to the presence of a significant woodlands designation identified on Schedule B as it was delineated by work completed by the SSEA</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		zoned as Future Development.	
Kathy Wiele 34 Trew Ave Tiny, Ontario – July 30, 2017		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include the wording "Management Plans" in the recommendations as noted in the photos attached from the last public meeting. 2. Add an OP recommendation to direct Council to create a by-law to designate the Bluewater Dunes as EP. <p>Council has the authority to do so and must act now to protect this unique Township-owned investment and asset and to avoid the potential for mismanagement of Bluewater Dunes in the future.</p>	<p>The wording "Management Plan" added.</p> <p>Section B.4.11.3 has been added to reflect that development and activities must occur in accordance with the Bluewater Beach Management Plan and Bluewater Beach Environmental Restoration Plan (Phase I and II).</p>
Paul Peterson (HGR Graham Partners LLP) – September 26, 2018		<p>HGR Partners represents Mark and Paula Dubeau, the Owners of property on Overhead Bridge Road (Part of Lot 9, Concession 12 East described as Roll Number 436800000837505.</p> <p>The Owners are in objection to the designation of their property as 'Greenlands'.</p> <p>The Property is not identified as significant woodland in the current Township Official Plan Schedules and should not be identified as significant woodlands now, when there has not been any study or analysis to support the re-designation of the Property. The woodland on the Property does not satisfy the tests for</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>The property is designated Greenlands due to the presence of a significant woodlands designation identified on Schedule B as it was delineated by work completed by the SSEA</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>significant woodlands.</p> <p>In the current and in effect Township Official Plan the Property is designated as Country Residential. Surrounding lands to the north, south and west are also designated Country Residential in the existing Township Official Plan and that designation is carried forward into the proposed new Official Plan.</p> <p>Significantly, the subject Property, together with the lands to the north, south and west are all included in the Rural designation in the recently approved County of Simcoe Official Plan. Country Residential or Rural designation of the subject Property in the new Township Official Plan would conform to the County Official Plan.</p> <p>It is also significant that the Property is currently zoned as FD - Future Development. Where the current zoning and the current County Official Plan would allow for limited development of the subject Lands, there is no justification for re-designation to significant woodlands or greenlands. Maintenance of the current Country Residential designation or designation as Rural would be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>In addition to the objection to the greenlands map designation, the Owners object to the adoption of the greenlands policies, the Rural policies and the Country Residential policies in the proposed Township Official Plan none of which would adequately provide for development on the subject Property which is already zoned as Future Development.</p>	
<p>Lynn Borysiuk 22 Trew Avenue Tiny, Ontario – August 29, 2018</p>		<p>1) AMENDMENT TO PARAGRAPH B.2.14.2 - DRAFT 3 OF THE OFFICIAL PLAN</p> <p>Suggested amendment to the draft Official Plan is in italics and in red.</p> <p><i>B.2.14.2 The Bluewater Beach Management Plan November 14, 2005, The Bluewater Beach Environmental Restoration Plan Phase 1 Report dated October 2006 and The Bluewater Beach Environmental Restoration Plan Phase 2 Report dated March 2007, included recommended restoration activities and a five-year management plan which was to be initiated in 2007. Since that time, the Township has undertaken active restoration and management to protect and restore the dunes, in partnership with the local community.</i></p> <p>2) REMOVAL OF BLUEWATER BEACH PARK FROM</p>	<p>The OP did not define Major Beach Parks.</p> <p>Section B.4.11.3 Major Township Beach Parks section of the OP has been modified to remove the term “major” and reference those Parks with Master or Management Plans.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>LIST OF MAJOR BEACH PARKS/PERMIT ONLY PARKING</p> <p>Bluewater Beach Park should not be considered a Major Beach Park and should be identified as an area for environmental protection. The significance of the Bluewater Beach Dunes is outlined in the Bluewater Beach Management Plan, November 14, 2005, Public access to these areas should be prohibited to help the dunes regenerate.2</p> <p>4.3.5 Since it is suggested that Bluewater Beach Park be used for passive use parking should be minimized to assist in managing the number of people who can access the area in an effort to restore the dunes.</p> <p>3) PERMIT PARKING ONLY ON TREW AVENUE The Bluewater Beach Management Plan (BBMP) recommended low intensity passive use of Bluewater Beach Park and recommended parking be minimized to assist in managing the number of people who can access the area in an effort to restore the Dunes.</p> <p>4) RISING WATER RESULTS IN REDUCED "DRY BEACH"/CARRYING CAPACITY</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>On Saturday, August 25, 2018, on a day when the water was calm and there were no waves, the area of "dry beach" measured at 1884 square metres. This area of "dry beach" has decreased significantly since 1999/2000 due to climate change and rising water levels. Accordingly, using the MNR calculation method as suggested in the Bluewater Beach Management Plan, the carrying capacity of the beach has also decreased significantly. If we apply the approach suggested in the Bluewater Beach Management Plan, using the current size of the dry beach, the number of allotted parking spaces at 50% of the low density standard would be a total of 5 on street spaces.</p> <p>Currently, there are 16 paid parking spaces on Trew Avenue alone. This is in excess of 3 times what the management plan recommends based on the current water levels. This does not take into account the virtually unlimited permit parking located in the subdivision directly behind Bluewater Dunes.</p> <p>Due to the rare significance of the dune feature, the sensitivity of the dune landscape and the carrying capacity of Bluewater Beach "dry beach" area, I strongly believe Bluewater</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>Beach Park should not be identified and/or listed as a major beach park. In the interest of preserving this amazing land feature, I urge you to remove Bluewater Beach Park from the list of major beach parks in Tiny Township.</p> <p>5) DESIGNATE BLUEWATER BEACH DUNES AS ENVIRONMENTALLY PROTECTED OR AN AREA OF NATURAL AND SCIENTIFIC INTEREST (ANSI)</p> <p>The significance of Dune systems, of which Bluewater Beach Dunes is one, is also outlined in the Bluewater Beach Environmental Plan Phase 1 Report,</p> <p>I am unclear as to why we would spend additional funds to update the plan when we have not followed through on the recommendations of the existing plan. We need to complete the recommendations in the original plan and re-establish an advisory committee</p> <p>6) Draft 3 of the Official Plan proposed amendments in 'red'.</p> <p>B.4.11.3 All Major Beach Parks shall be</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>developed in compliance with the approved Master Plans/<i>Management Plans</i>. If the Park Master Plans/<i>Management Plans</i> identify areas for environmental protection, then the Greenlands policies shall apply to those areas.</p> <p>Although the Bluewater Beach Management Plan identifies Bluewater Beach Park as an area that requires long term protection, it does not specifically state it requires "environmental protection". As a result, Bluewater Beach Park would not fall under the protection of the Greenlands policies. Moreover, I question the strength of the Green lands policies with respect to environmentally protecting the Dunes.</p>	
<p>Andrea Sykora, Lot 31 Champlain Road, Tiny Ontario – August 20, 2018</p>		<p>I noticed in Draft 3 Schedule C - Transportation, that the north east end of Awenda Park road and north part of Kettle's Beach road are marked as Township Arterial Road.</p> <p>In the current draft these roads are classified as Township Local Roads, why the change?</p> <p>I would like to ask to reconsider and keep these roads Local. Making these roads higher capacity roads that</p>	<p>No modification proposed to the mapping. This road has functioned as an Arterial Road for some time. However, there is a mapping error contained in the Transportation Schedule in the current Plan, which has been corrected in the new OP to reflect the location of the actual road.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>carry more traffic would result in increased traffic which would consequently negatively impact the Awenda park natural environment, wildlife, as well as people who very often use these park roads - from trail crossings, to walking/bicycling on the road side to access the park beaches, events, and etc.</p> <p>From an accessibility point of view, there is an alternative way of accessing residential properties along northern and eastern shoreline. which is via Concession Road 16 East and Champlain Rd. This is where the focus should be, not through Awenda Park.</p>	
<p>Shayne Large – September 25, 2018</p>	<p>Sewage, Water and Stormwater</p>	<p>Include wording similar to the Provincial Policy Statement in the New OP. The statement she was referring to is 1.6.6.4 from the Sewage, Water and Stormwater section of the PPS.</p> <p>1.6.6.4 Where <i>municipal sewage services</i> and <i>municipal water services</i> or <i>private communal sewage services</i> and <i>private communal water services</i> are not provided, <u><i>individual on-site sewage services</i></u> and <u><i>individual on-site water services</i></u> may be used provided that <u>site conditions are suitable for the long-term provision of such services with no <i>negative impacts</i>. In <i>settlement areas</i>, these services</u></p>	<p>The comment appears to request confirmation of whether a development utilizing individual on-site water and individual on-site sewage services is permitted in a settlement area with municipal water services.</p> <p>The proposed policies would provide the opportunity for private water services to be considered. However, the preferred means of servicing is with municipal water services.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p><u>may only be used for infilling and minor rounding out of existing development.</u></p> <p>My interest in including the essence of this statement in the OP relates specifically to 904 County Road 6 S. The OP currently suggests that partial services is the preferred means of servicing in the settlement of Wyevale. Unfortunately, I suspect that the small future development area at 904 CR6S will not be able to support a viable expansion and extension of the existing municipal water system which currently service the northeastern portion of the settlement area. As such, we would like ensure that the opportunity to explore and consider private servicing is an option. Statement 1.6.6.4 refers to minor rounding out of development within a settlement area and I believe that in the context of development throughout Simcoe County, the 13 or 14 acres at 904 CR6S could reasonably be considered to be minor rounding out of development with a designated settlement area.</p> <p>I don't believe that including wording similar to Section 1.6.6.4 in the OP would have any negative impacts. However, it may provide some flexibility for the Township and Developers when considering servicing options for small development parcels within the existing settlement areas.</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
<p>Vivian Chan, Simcoe County District School Board – June 20, 2018</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replace all "Day Care" and "Day Care Centres" with "Child Care" and "Child Care Centres" respectively. 2. Insert as B.2.17.1 i) Institutional use such as schools, places of worship and community centre which were zoned prior to the adoption of the Official Plan are permitted, and may be repurposed in accordance with the applicable zoning by-law provisions." 3. Insert "child care centre," in B.3.3.1 f) after "schools," 4. Delete B.3.4.9 and replace with "Consideration of a trail system, including vehicular separated pedestrian and bicycle trails linking parklands, schools, and other leisure and cultural activity areas within new development proposals shall be considered and accommodated where appropriate." 5. Insert ", such as where possible parks shall be located adjacent to school sites." In B.3.4.11 after "Township" 6. Insert as B.3.9.3: "Where lands have been designated as for a school use in a plan of subdivision the lands shall be reserved for that use for a specified period of time unless an alternative site is designated. The time period of reservation shall not be less than 10 years and shall be sets out in the implementing 	<p>The comments of the SCDSB have been reviewed and items 1, 4 & 23 have been modified as requested.</p> <p>Modifications pertaining to the other comments are not proposed.</p> <p>Many of the other comments relate to items that the SCDSB has the ability to comment on as part of the circulation of individual development applications.</p> <p>Many other items are not applicable to a rural municipality or area site plan control matters.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>subdivision agreement. The time period will not begin until the first building permit is obtained within the phase of the plan of subdivision in which the community service block is located. In the case of school sites this reservation will be established in consultation with the school boards and such reservation shall expire upon confirmation in writing by each school board that the site is not required by the school boards."</p> <p>7. Insert as B.3.11.2: "When reviewing plans of subdivision and applications for consent confirmation of sufficiency of school accommodation is required"</p> <p>8. Insert as B.3.13.2: "This is the policy of this Plan when developing new parkland and recreational facilities that there be consultation with the local residents other providers of open space such as school boards."</p> <p>9. Insert "including elementary schools" in B.4.3.1 after "small scale institutional uses"</p> <p>10. Insert as B.4.6.2: "When reviewing plans of subdivision and applications for consent confirmation of sufficiency of school accommodation is required"</p> <p>11. Insert "and may be repurposed in accordance with the applicable zoning by-law provisions."</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>At the end of paragraph of B.8.3.4</p> <p>12. Insert as D.3.8.3: "On all new local roads sidewalks will be required on one side of the street. Sidewalks on both sides of local roads may be required in the vicinity of schools to ensure the safety of students."</p> <p>13. Insert "such as schools" in D.3.13.4 after "public areas"</p> <p>14. Insert as D.3.13.7: "Considering winter maintenance of multi-use trails particularly along routes that connect pedestrians to key destinations such as schools."</p> <p>15. Insert as D.3.13.8: "Council will consider the provision of crossing guards in school areas."</p> <p>16. Insert as D.3.13.9: "Through the development approvals process active transportation amenities including bicycle parking and racks shall be required."</p> <p>17. Insert as D.8.8: "When reviewing plans of subdivision and applications for consent confirmation of sufficiency of school accommodation is required"</p> <p>18. Insert "to plan for a range of uses which promote community wellness, social cohesion, and well-being" in D.15.3 after "Public Service Facilities"</p> <p>19. Delete "schools and" in D.15.5 as schools are covered under D.15.4</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>20. Insert as E.2.3.3 f): "Any amendment to the OP shall address the adequacy of publicly funded schools to support the development."</p> <p>21. Insert as E.9.6: "Designated school sites do not comprise part of the net developable area of a development with respect to parkland dedication or cash in lieu of parkland. Redevelopment of designated school sites for non-school related purposes is subject to parkland dedication."</p> <p>22. Insert as E.14.2: "To plan for a range of uses which promote community wellness, social cohesion, and well-being."</p> <p>23. Insert "schools," in E.14.3.1 c) after "libraries,"</p> <p>24. Insert as E.14.3.1 l): "The area has active transportation amenities including bicycle parking and racks shall be required."</p> <p>25. Insert as E.14.2.1 n): "The area shall consider partnerships with school boards for new community spaces"</p> <p>26. Insert as E.14.5.1 j): "Written confirmation of how pupil accommodation is addressed is required from each school board."</p> <p>27. Insert as E.14.5.3: "A community facility needs assessment which addresses the capacity of existing facilities and the need for additional facilities including publicly funded schools must be completed. Written confirmation of</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan

Committer	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		how pupil accommodation is required from each school board.”	
<p>Madeleine Corradi - Sunset Bay Community Association – Nov 1, 2018</p>		<p>A few years ago, the Executive of the Sunset Bay Community Association (SBCA) was promised land for the development of a local community centre. This promise was made during election time and it has been made again in this year’s election materials. However, we observe that the land where we had anticipated a centre to be located has now been designated as wetland on the new map.</p> <p>The Executive of the SBCA, on behalf of our community, request that you designate a location in our neighbourhood for a community centre where our families and seniors can come together. We feel that we are being ignored because we have been labelled as a “minority”. We find this to be unfair. The Township's Official Plan should include the minority, which includes the Sunset Bay/Sawlog Bay area, which needs local services as well.</p> <p>A school size portable structure or mobile home could be used as a temporary structure to test the viability of this endeavour. It could be temporarily placed at Corrie Hamelin Park as part of this trial.</p>	<p>No modifications to the Official Plan proposed. Comment has been provided to the Recreation Department to be considered as part of the Recreation Master Plan.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
<p>Janet Boyer – November 13, 2018</p>		<p>B4.7.2 states "Vacant lots on the shoreline should be encouraged to consolidate". Does this not seem to encourage enormous properties or apartment/condominium development? I don't think many property owners Tiny Township are really interested in having condominiums & higher density units around their quiet, forested and waterfront properties. Maybe I'm just not getting the purpose of that item. See plan section D3.10.1 & my comment below.</p> <p>I am pleased to see some mention of New Residential lots allowed by Consent to Sever in sections B3.12; B4.7.1; & B8.5.2</p> <p>Also Section B4.4.2 "Development on private roads is not permitted except in accordance with transportation policies" That's the H2 process, correct? I still think you should allow some new lot creation on private roads "by consent to sever".</p>	<p>Response provided by Email dated November 13, 2018.</p> <p>No change proposed to the Plan.</p> <p>Many of these comments were considered in previous drafts of the new Official Plan.</p> <p>The Plan does permit new development on private roads in accordance with Section D.3.11.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>Section D3.10.1 states "restrict lot creation on private roads or right-of-way unless a plan of condominium". I would recommend you remove the phrase "unless a plan of condominium" . Keep it as a preference to restrict extensive development on private roads i.e. large subdivisions, but do allow some lot creation. B8.5.2 says 2 lot creation through severance. Maintain some flexibility.</p>	
<p>Andrea Sykora – November 16, 2018 and November 25, 2018</p>		<p>I disagree with the Township's comment from the Planning Report presented to Council on November 14, 2018. The South part of the Awenda Park road (between Cons. 16 and 17) may have functioned as arterial road but not the North part of Awenda park road and Kettle's Beach road, these should stay as Local roads. The Road study data confirm this fact (The North half between Concession 17 and Kettles Beach is a class 5 with an ADDT of 200-499, which classifies as local road). From access point of view argument, there is alternative access point outside of Awenda park. I do not see the reason why the roads through the park should be arterial roads.</p>	<p>Response provided by email dated November 23, 2018.</p> <p>No change proposed to the Plan.</p> <p>The Director of Public Works has confirmed that the traffic count is one component when determining if a road should be an arterial road. The other is the use of a road as an access point into an area. In this case, the road through Awenda Park is used as a main access point into the northeast corner of the</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
			Township. Also, there is a mapping error in the current Official Plan, which shows the arterial road going north from Concession 20, however there is no municipally maintained road in this area.
<p>Thomas G. Jamieson – Part Lot 24-25 Concession 19 – November 13, 2018 and November 23, 2018</p>		<p>The purpose of this letter is to provide my opposition to the current proposed new Official Plan policies respecting "Shoreline Designated Parcels". My particular concern is the introduction of more aggressive consent policies without any regard, analysis or study of the existing status of the landform features and committed buildings on the subject property. As the Township is aware, the subject property is currently designated Shoreline and Rural. A very small area is shown as a "Significant Woodlot" that applies on a small portion of the site at the rear within the "Rural designation. The "Nipissing Ridge" also applies to the subject property, which is recognized as a major geographical feature that extends along the coastal areas of the Township, formed during the Nipissing</p>	<p>Response provided by email dated November 16, 2018 and November 23, 2018.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the Plan.</p> <p>The subject property is proposed to be designated as Greenlands in the new Township of Tiny Official Plan due to the presence of a significant woodland feature identified on Schedule B as it was delineated by work completed by the Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA). The SSEA completed a report entitled "Evaluation of Natural Heritage Conditions in the Township of Tiny" in March 2015. A copy of the report can be downloaded</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>phase high-water period of the Lake Huron/Georgian Bay.</p> <p>Under the proposed and emerging Official Plan policies flowing from the Official Plan Review and Update: Shoreline Designated Parcels (the "Review"), the majority of the subject property is proposed to be designated Greenlands. While we recognize that the Township's motivation is to adopt an "environment first" approach in processing the Review, I am concerned that the broad brush approach by changing the subject property's designation to Greenlands, represents an act of convenience rather than a science based approach.</p> <p>The existing identified functions and features that exist on the subject property have not changed over the years and the new suggested approach is an overreaching, unjustified and aggressive form of land use controls. As the Township is aware, the proposed Greenlands designation would not permit any land</p>	<p>from the Township website at: https://www.tiny.ca/Pages/Official-Plan-Review-and-Update---Natural-Heritage-Policies.aspx"</p> <p>In addition, the subject property is included in the Provincial Natural Heritage System mapping.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		severances, even to divide the subject property into two portions for the existing residences of our two families.	
Darren Vella Innovative Planning Solutions – November 19, 2018		<p>Letter Dated: November 14, 2018</p> <p>Further to the correspondence submitted to you on September 29th, 2017 (Appendix 1) on behalf of McMahan Woods Development Ltd (McMahan), the following correspondence provides comments on the final draft Official Plan that is being considered on November 14th, 2018.</p> <p>As you know, McMahan’s landholdings are located at Part of Lot 23, Concession 4. All of their landholdings where subject to a draft plan approval that ultimately allowed for a 20 lot residential subdivision.</p>	<p>Response provided by email dated November 23, 2018.</p> <p>No Change proposed to the Plan.</p> <p>The lotted portion of the registered plan has been zoned Shoreline Residential. The remaining blocks of the Plan where the principle of use has yet to be</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>registered plans of subdivision or existing lots of record within the Country Residential and Shoreline designations.</p> <p>The subject lands are located within a Registered Plan of Subdivision and would not meet the description contained within B2.7.2.</p> <p>3. B.2.20.1 states that: The Province has developed Natural Heritage System mapping, which applies across the Township, and is mapped on Appendix 1 to this Plan. The Township recognizes and appreciates that growth and development shall conform to this mapping, however, until such time that it is implemented by the County and the errors and omissions have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Township, this mapping will only apply when it is consistent with the other Schedules of the Official Plan.</p>	<p>The Township mapping of this is not only based on the NHS mapping, but is also based on the SEEA mapping of natural heritage features. This mapping was completed by the SSEA on behalf of the Township and is the best information available.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>It is our respectful submission that if the Township is making the decision to implement this mapping in advance of the County of Simcoe, it is taking on the responsibility of ensuring that this mapping is accurate and has no errors and omissions. Particularly, as it relates to the subject lands, the Township is proposing to redesignate these lands from Shoreline to Greenland utilizing what appears to be the Provincial Natural Heritage Mapping without ground truthing this information. The Township is required to utilize the best information possible when updating Official Plan documents.</p> <p>This emphasis becomes even greater given Section B.4.4.1 which states that “The establishment of new Shoreline Areas or expansion of the Shoreline designation shall be prohibited.” The Township cannot expect to remove a landowners Shoreline designation with</p>	<p>The Township is confident based on the mapping of natural heritage features provided by the SSEA, the Growth Plan policies pertaining to natural heritage features that the designation of the lot in question as Greenlands is appropriate.</p> <p>Section E2.1 establishes minimum requirements. The Township may initiate</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>no opportunity to have it reconsidered through the County process as suggested in B2.20.1.</p> <p>4. Section E2.1 states that the Township shall initiate a review of this Official Plan no less than every ten (10) years after approval of this Plan and no less than five (5) years thereafter, unless this Plan has been replaced by a new Official Plan. Official Plan Review Letter Page 3</p> <p>Given this duration, the Township should ensure that the correct designations are applying to every property within the municipality if a landowner must wait 10 years before an update is undertaken.</p> <p>5. As mentioned earlier, the current County of Simcoe Official Plan remains under appeal as it pertains to the proposed Greenland designation affecting these lands. For the purposes of this Official Plan update, the upper tier Official Plan</p>	<p>modification outside of the minimum statutory requirements.</p> <p>Given the SSEA work and the NHS mapping, the correct designation for these lands is the Greenlands designation.</p> <p>Section 4.2.3 of the Growth Plan (2017) does not permit development or site alteration in key natural heritage features, which includes significant woodlands and ANSIs.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>designation is Rural and Agricultural. The proposed Greenland designation is not consistent with this designation. It is my understanding that the majority of the lands designated Shoreline in the Township Official Plan are designated Rural in the County Official Plan.</p> <p>6. Under Section 2.2.7.6 of the Growth Plan (2017), New Multiple Lots or Units for Residential Development will be directed to Settlement Areas, but may be allowed on Rural lands in site specific locations with approved zoning or designation in an official plan that permitted this type of development as of June 16, 2006.</p> <p>This policy provides McMahan with the ability to develop their lands for residential purposes. The new Official Plan proposes to eliminate this opportunity. It is our respectful submission that the Shoreline designation should continue to apply to</p>	<p>The Township has based the Greenland designation in this area primarily on the mapping prepared by the SSEA. This is the best information available.</p> <p>The OMB decision on the plan of subdivision prohibited any planning applications to be submitted until 2020. The reason for this was to allow both the County and the Township an opportunity to update their respective Official Plans in compliance with provincial policy. The provincial policy framework today is more restrictive on development in rural areas (especially where natural heritage features</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>this Block of land within a Registered Plan of Subdivision.</p> <p>7. Section 4.2.2.2 states that Municipalities will incorporate the Natural Heritage System as an overlay in Official Plans. The Township is not proposing an overlay designation to the Natural Heritage system, rather in this instance, are modifying the designation of these lands to permanently preclude further subdivision development as was always contemplated for this Block.</p> <p>8. Section 4.2.2.5 states that in implementing the Natural Heritage System, upper and single tier municipalities may, through a municipal comprehensive review, refine provincial mapping with greater precision in a manner that is consistent with this Plan. This implementation does not require the local municipality to implement this mapping until such time that it is</p>	<p>exist) than when the original plan of subdivision application was made.</p> <p>The Township has based the Greenland designation in this area primarily on the mapping prepared by the SSEA. This is the best information available.</p> <p>A key component of the OP Update was to undertake a PPS consistency and Growth Plan conformity exercise.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>completed by the upper tier municipality. The Township is not providing any opportunity for refinement or dialogue based on the approach taken with this new Official Plan.</p> <p>9. The Planning report dated November 14, 2018 by MHBC Planning fails to discuss how the Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement are being implemented by this new Official Plan. It provides no direction on conformity and consistency.</p> <p>10. Under the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), Section 1.1.5.2(c) limited residential development is permitted on Rural lands with direct reference back to Section 1: Building Strong Healthy</p>	<p>No response required.</p> <p>No response required.</p> <p>The Township is not considering site specific development proposals as part of the Official Plan Update.</p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>Communities, as well as the policies of Section 2: Wise Use and Management of Resources and Section 3: Protecting Public Health and Safety.</p> <p>11. Section 2.1 Natural Heritage requires natural features to be protected for the long term. The diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area, and the long term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems, should be maintained, restored or, where possible, improved, recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features.</p> <p>12. Section 2.1.5 states that development and site alteration shall not be permitted in:</p> <p>b) significant woodlands in Ecoregions 6E and 7E (excluding islands in Lake Huron and the St. Marys River)</p>	



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>Unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.</p> <p>The EIS prepared supports this position given the subject properties location on the fringe of the woodland area.</p>	
<p>Paul Peterson – November 20, 2018</p>		<p>Further to our recent discussion, the following is a very short, simple submission on the employment use issue.</p> <p>If necessary, and if there is time, we can provide a more formal submission from the planning consultants for the land owner.</p> <p>Please accept this submission on behalf of 182088 Ontario Inc., the owners of property in the settlement area of Toanche, with respect to the proposed new Official Plan policies for commercial and employment uses.</p>	<p>Response provided by email dated November 22, 2018.</p> <p>Proposed change to Section B.3.3.1 of the Plan with the addition of the following permitted use:</p> <p><i>B.3.3.1 j) Legally existing small scale industrial uses</i></p>



Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan Comments Received After Final Planning Report

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		<p>The lands of 182088 Ontario Inc. at 570 Champlain Road have existing residential and small workshop uses which the owners would like to continue as fully legal and permitted uses. The proposed policies for Settlement Areas in section B.3.3 of the proposed new Official Plan could be interpreted as limiting small scale repair garages and workshops to the larger settlement areas not including Toanche.</p> <p>We can understand that the Township may want to have a hierarchy of settlements and to direct most industrial uses, warehouses, contractor yards and manufacturing or fabrication plants to the large settlement areas. However, uses in the nature of workshops and repair garages are very small scale and may serve a local area. Permission for these uses in even the smallest settlement areas is appropriate.</p> <p>Please consider an amendment to the provisions of B.3.3 to allow these truly small scale uses to continue as legal uses in Toanche. This might be accomplished for example by adding to the permitted uses in B.3.3.1 e) small scale</p>	



**Township of Tiny – Comment Summary Table – Draft 3 of the Official Plan
Comments Received After Final Planning Report**

Commenter	OP Section / Policy Number / Topic	Summary of Comments	Action/Comment
		commercial uses and local employment uses such as repair garages and workshops.	