COMMENT RESPONSE MATRIX 2022-2024

	Lisa and Jim Neville May 31, 2024		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	Is there a way to note that 2086 Telford Line should be considered "Greenlands" and not "Agriculture"? We are under the "Managed Forest Tax Incentive Program. The area marked on your maps as "agriculture" has been planted with trees since 2015 and is part of the Greenlands areas to the north, west and south.	MHBC and Township staff	Request has been reviewed and considered appropriate to correct the designation to reflect the existing use and conservation of the Greenlands on the property. Note: Appropriate map schedules have been updated to reflect this change.
	TransCanada PipeLines Limited June 12, 2024		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
2.	Requested specific textual revisions to Section. 4.5.5 Land Use Compatibility, and to Section 19.3.7 Public Uses and to Section 19.3.16 TransCanada PipeLines Limited.	MHBC	Requested revisions were made to the text given the comments were received early enough to incorporate the changes.
	Morgan Planning & Development – 3185 Riverdale Drive June 17, 2022		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	respectfully request that Land Use Schedule 'C' of the Township's proposed Official Plan for 3185 Riverdale Drive from "Agricultural" amended to apply both the 'Shoreline Residential' and the 'Environmental Protection' designations as approved by OMB Decision 3353.		Mapping has been corrected to Shoreline Residential to recognize the existing former OMB approvals.

	Morgan Planning & Development – 8675 Highway 12 June 19, 2022		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	respectfully request that the property known municipally as 8675 Highway 12 be re-designated from the Settlement Employment Area designation to the Settlement Living designation through this Official Plan review process.		As this may be an employment land conversion request and the Township has a current deficit of employment lands, this would warrant a site-specific application(s) in order to provide the appropriate studies and justification to support the proposal.
	Morgan Planning & Development – 2748 Marine Drive June 19, 2024		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	formal request for the Township to redesignate the subject lands from 'Settlement Employment Area' to 'Resort Employment' through the current Official Plan review process. MP&D have reviewed the draft Official Plan and are of the opinion that the proposed change to the 'Resort Employment' designation is consistent with the lands associated with the proposed development concept illustrated above and its use, and also aligns with the adjacent Starport Marina use which obtains vehicular access through the subject property.		As this is part of the 'resort employment' land holdings, we support asking the County to modify the mapping to allow the subject property to be designated as 'resort employment' in keeping with the rest of the resort land holdings. This is seen as one type of employment designation to another employment designation with no loss of employment land.
	Morgan Planning & Development – 3372 Agnew Road June 19, 2024		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	we respectfully request that Schedule 'C' (Land Use South) of the modified draft of the Township's Official Plan be amended to retain the 'Rural' designation which currently applies to the northern undeveloped portion of the subject property in the Township's current Official Plan. Alternatively, we request that the northern undeveloped portion be designated "Country Residential" to be consistent with the other backlot properties located along Cox Drive and the		We have designated the lands to be in conformity with the County Greenlands designation.

	properties on Agnew Road, including the adjacent property located at 3511 Huffman Road, in which our client also owns.		
	Celeste Phillips Planning Inc - 2956 Southorn Road, Coldwater June 18, 2024		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	Request for a change in land use designation from "Employment" to "Settlement Living Area" for the reasons being its neighboring land uses are Residential, and unlikelihood of the land. being developed for industrial uses		As this is an employment land conversion request and the Township has a current deficit of employment lands, this would warrant a site-specific application(s) in order to provide the appropriate studies and justification to support their proposal.
2.	Request to Modify Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the new Official Plan to clearly indicate that although pre-consultation with the municipality may be encouraged, the province has legislated that pre-consultation is not mandatory		The policies are worded clearly to note that pre-consultation is not mandatory
3.	Request to Delete Policy 6.5.6 of the new Official Plan as it does not conform to Provincial policies.		The proposed OP is aligned with new provincial direction. An application presently still has to conform to conversion policies in the Growth Plan.
	Miller Planning Services – 10394 Highway 11 (Washago) June 18, 2022		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	Though we are supportive of the intent of the proposed site -specific policy we would like to ask the Township include language in policy 11.4.3.7 which acknowledges that the lands can be developed based on water access subject to the typical permissions. We also note that the Schedule SA1 incorrectly identifies the site-specific policy applicable to these lands as 11.3.3.7 rather than 11.4.3.7. We understand Staff already aware of this error and in the process of correcting. same.		The wording in the policy requires additional approvals under the Planning Act. This situation would warrant a ZBA for lack of frontage on a public road-maintained year-round. The mapping has been corrected to reflect the site-specific situation.

2.	Regarding policy 8.5.1.1.e, Our interpretation and our consulting civil engineer's		This policy reflects the provincial policy requirements.
	Miller Planning Services – 10394 Highway 11 (Washago) June 18, 2022		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	interpretation of the foregoing policy is that the policy as drafted arbitrarily removes the opportunity for development to occur on higher points of land which meet all other land use planning requirements including proving that safe access can be maintained during a flood event. We would respectfully ask that the last sentence of the proposed policy be deleted.		
3.	Regarding policy 12.4.4. and 12.4.4.a, with respect to the first sentence, we would suggest that the policy be modified to establish a minimum 15 M shoreline vegetation setback. A setback of 30 M can be encouraged. The final setback should be subject to the recommendations of a study prepared by a qualified arborist on a case-by- case basis. We would also suggest that the second sentence be redrafted to which requires Development to be located outside of the controlled or high-water mark rather than requiring a setback from same. We note that many Conservation Authorities do not require development setbacks at from a high-water mark. We would further recommend that the development setback be the greater of the required vegetation setback or high-water mark.		The proposed policy allows for consideration of less than a 30m shoreline setback through site specific analysis as part of a development application including an EIS.

	interpretation of the foregoing policy is that the policy as drafted arbitrarily removes the opportunity for development to occur on higher points of land which meet all other land use planning requirements including proving that safe access can be maintained during a flood event. We would respectfully ask that the last sentence of the proposed policy be deleted.		
	interpretation of the foregoing policy is that the policy as drafted arbitrarily removes the opportunity for development to occur on higher points of land which meet all other land use planning requirements including proving that safe access can be maintained during a flood event. We would respectfully ask that the last sentence of the proposed policy be deleted.		
3.	Regarding policy 12.4.4. and 12.4.4.a, With respect to the first sentence, we would suggest that the policy be modified to establish a minimum 15 M shoreline vegetation setback. A setback of 30 M can be encouraged. The final setback should be subject to the recommendations of a study prepared by a qualified arborist on a case-by- case basis. We would also suggest that the second sentence be redrafted to which requires Development to be located outside of the controlled or high-water mark rather than requiring a setback from same. We note that many Conservation Authorities do not require development setbacks at from a high-water mark. We would further recommend that the development setback be the greater of the required vegetation setback or high-water mark.		The proposed policy allows for consideration of less than a 30m shoreline setback through site specific analysis as part of a development application including an EIS.

	SMCDSB June 18th, 2024		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	Regarding policy 3.6.1.5, The SMCDSB encourages the use of Secondary Plans where possible, which provides an opportunity for appropriate school siting to be considered during the land use planning process for new community areas. SMCDSB recommendation: 'A Secondary Plan shall be required by Council [..]'		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.
2.	Regarding policy 8.3.5, The SMCDSB recognizes that the majority of growth and development should be directed to identified Settlement Areas; however, given evolving settlement pattern and pupil need changes, in some instances the SMCDSB may require new. or expansions to existing school sites located outside of Settlement Areas.		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.
	SMCDSB June 18th, 2024		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	SMCDSB recommendation: 'Schools and major institutions are encouraged to be located within Settlement Areas and placed in the Community Uses Designation. It is recognized that individual community needs may require that new or modified schools be established. outside of Settlement Areas, where deemed appropriate.'		
3.	Regarding policy 9.7.2, SMCDSB recommendation: '[…] include Active Transportation routes both internally and linkage to external routes and, where feasible and applicable: public areas and community uses such as schools and childcare facilities. […]'		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.

4.	Regarding Policy 11.4.3.2.e, SMCDSB respectfully requests that all references to 'daycare' and/or 'daycare facilities' be replaced with 'childcare' and/or 'child care facilities to recognize modifications to applicable legislation		We will request this of the County through the approval process.
5.	Regarding policy 11.6.2.1, Please revise as follows: 'Minor institutional uses which directly serve the needs of the Settlement Area and surrounding community including but not limited to private and public schools, daycare child care facilities and places of worship, subject to the policies of this Section; and' 'The primary permitted uses within the Community Uses designation shall include a range of community uses and Public Service Facilities such as, but not limited to schools and educational facilities, daycare child care facilities, religious institutions, emergency services and facilities, public parks, community and recreational facilities and services, hospitals and other health care facilities and services, long-term care and retirement homes, group homes and other forms of Additional Needs Housing and assisted living facilities.'		We will request this of the County through the approval process.
6.	Regarding the entirety of Policy section 11.6, The SMCDSB requests that the Township consider adding policy that would support reduced parking requirements where opportunity for shared and any adjacent public park, or similar, exists. This approach would provide a number of benefits, including: 1. Reduced pressure on SMCDSB to provide extensive parking spaces on site that are often significantly underutilized other than during drop off and pick up times.		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.

	2. Reduced pressure on provided ‘kiss and ride’ areas; 3. Encourage larger play areas on school sites, by permitting reduced parking areas; and, 4. Encourage pupils to walk/bike through provided public park spaces, providing both social and health benefits for educational/ childcare facilities		
7.	Regarding all of policy section 12.2, SMCDSB requests that the Township consider policy language to provide exemption for schools from architectural design guidelines. As the Township is aware, the majority of school design, siting and size requirements are dictated by the Ministry of Education. Though the Board always seeks to work with its municipal partners, it is found that architectural and design guidelines that are requested at the municipal level may conflict with Ministry requirements, leading to unnecessary Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment requirements		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.
8.	Regarding policy 17.5.4.1. f, SMCDSB recommends that further emphasis should be placed on policies related to proposed subdivision and condominium developments to be integrated to not just adjacent infrastructure, but also specific school and/or childcare facilities that may be located in close proximity to the proposed development. SMCDSB recommendation: ‘Any proposal shall be integrated with the adjacent plans with respect to matters including but not limited to appropriate transition to existing neighbourhoods, Public Service Facilities such as school and childcare facilities, parkland dedication, trails, roads and infrastructure;’		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.

9.	Regarding policy 17.7.6, SMCDSB recognizes that the majority of growth and development should be directed to identified Settlement Areas; however, given evolving settlement pattern and pupil need changes, in some instances SMCDSB may require new or expansions to existing school sites located outside of Settlement Areas. SMCDSB recommendation: 'Schools and major institutions are encouraged to be located within the Settlement Area designation. It is recognized that individual community needs may require that new or modified schools be established outside of Settlement Areas, where deemed appropriate.'		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.
	SCDSB June 19th, 2024		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	Section 3.6.1.4 of the draft Official Plan discusses the components that may be included within a Secondary Plan. The SCDSB would respectfully request that an additional criterion for public service facilities be included in this section. Secondary Plans are preferred by the board to ensure orderly development and that appropriate public service facilities are provided for those areas in a timely		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.
2.	7.3 – Sewage Servicing The draft Official Plan includes various policies related to sewage servicing within Section 7.3. Currently, Marchmont Public School uses a private on-site septic system as municipal sewage servicing is not available. As such, the school's population has a limit set by the MOE's Reasonable Land Use Policy based on the capacity of the septic system, which limits the number of portables that can be placed on the site. This limits the pupil growth that can be accommodated at Marchmont		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.

	Public School. While municipal servicing is the preferred method of servicing for the school should that become available sometime in the future, it is possible that growth in the Marchmont/Bass Lake area may require other solutions in the meantime. SCDSB planning staff respectfully request that an additional provision be added to Section 7.3.3 to require development applications proposing new Private Communal Sewage Services be required to connect public service facilities such as schools should the development application create growth that cannot be handled by the current private system		
3.	7.4 – Water Servicing SCDSB planning staff respectfully request that language be added to protect the water quality and quantity of public service facilities, should new development applications propose new Private Communal Water Services or new Individual On-site Water Services. Additional protective language would ensure that development projects do not negatively impact the water quality and quantity of private water systems at places like schools. Marchmont Public School currently uses a private well water system and protect the viability of the system is crucial for the operation of the school.		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.
4.	9.4.3 – Local Roads Multiple policies are provided in the draft Official Plan relating to local roads. SCDSB planning staff note that Section 9.4.3.7 indicates that in Settlement Areas, local roads will generally be developed to an urban standard with sidewalks on one side of the street. Planning staff respectfully request that this provision be amended to include that sidewalks will be provided on both sides of the street in proximity of public service facilities. This will ensure that safe active transportation for students to and from schools is possible, which contributes to healthy active lifestyles, reduces carbon emissions		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.

	from private vehicles, and minimizes traffic impacts around public service facilities.		
5.	17.5 – Subdivision of Lands The subdivision of land in the Township of Severn is discussed in section 17.5 of the draft Official Plan. Of particular relevance to the SCDSB are the policies provided for Plans of Subdivision and Plans of Condominium. Section 17.5.4.1 provides policies that shall be considered with each Plan of Subdivision and Plan of Condominium application. SCDSB planning staff respectfully request that an additional provision added as, “i) Any proposal shall consider the availability and adequacy of public service facilities, and may require a public service facility needs assessment.” This proposed provision will ensure that Plan of Subdivision and Plan of Condominium applications consider public service facilities such as schools		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.
6.	SCDSB planning staff note that “minor institutional” and “major institutional” are both terms used throughout the draft Official Plan but are not clearly defined. SCDSB planning staff would respectfully request that definitions for these terms be added to the definitions list in Section 18.5 in order to provide clarity and ease of use of the Official Plan.		These comments can be discussed with the County through the approval process.
7.	SCDSB planning staff also note that there are multiple references throughout the draft Official Plan of “day nurseries”, “day care centres”, and “daycare facilities”. Planning staff respectfully requests that the Township changes all references and definitions of the previous terms to “childcare” or “childcare centres” as applicable. The Day Nursery Act has been replaced by the Child Care and		We will request this of the County through the approval process.

	Early Years Act, 2014, which provides these updated terms as well as updated		

Verbal Comments Received at the Public Meeting

	Severn Planning and Development Meeting June 19th 2024		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	Celeste Phillips– provided remarks reiterating written correspondence regarding 2956 Southorn Rd, Coldwater		See comments above under written comments received on this site
2.	Kevin Wood, 4338 Hamilton Street Land is designated EP with a portion designated as Settlement Employment. Why Is this property under 2 different designations? This makes it difficult to utilize the property.		The limits of the environmental feature might need to be updated through a site specific evaluation. Note: GA2 reflects the lack of servicing to that portion of the property which could be further evaluated through a development proposal. Nothing has changed and reflects the same designations as the Township's current OP
3.	Phil Azzopardi, Lots 21,22,23, and C on plan 174 Washago Owner believes there is an existing site plan approval in place. He objects to Greenland's/EP designation on portion of property and believes designations need to reflect past approvals.		By way of a review of Township records it has been confirmed the site plan approval granted in 1987 is no longer valid and any new development proposal would have to seek appropriate Planning Act approvals to proceed. The designations reflect what is on the ground now. The natural features would have to be assessed through any future development application and confirm the limits of the features and any opportunity to develop the property.
4.	Keith Prentice, 2400 Kinnear Sideroad In general concern with respect to level of complexity in using policy document such as this OP where there is a need for housing. There should be fewer requirements for extra studies when simply looking to add a house or addition to an existing house.		The OP must provide guidance with respect to the types of studies and requirements of an application that the Township may require and be evaluated on a case-by-case basis depending on the scale of a development being proposed.

5.	Fred Weening, 1016 Bonnybrook Drive Expressed concerns regarding the proposed group home from the committee of adjustment meeting the night prior. Questioned why was a meeting held if it was a forgone conclusion.		A Public Meeting was held in accordance with the Planning act for a minor variance.

Questions from Members of Committee

	June 19th 2024		
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
Judith Cox	We are hearing that we have a need for more residential lands, but the infrastructure required to support that growth is expensive and we would need other levels of government to help covering the costs of that infrastructure		Request the County of Simcoe to update the land budget when reviewing the OP for approval
	Are garden suites still in the OP or do they need to be?		Garden Suites are still permitted under the Planning Act. They are meant to be a temporary housing option, whereas Additional Dwelling Units (ADU) are now permitted, and they are a permanent housing option. ADU's are permitted in most residential areas. Property owners could still have the option to consider a Garden Suite if they did not want a permanent ADU unit on their property.
	Subsequent question: Will deposits be coming back to residents?		Agreements for Garden Suites are registered on title for the property. Following approval of this OP and subsequent new zoning by- law, property owners could request to be released from that agreement and turn the garden suite into a permanent additional unit.
	Severances in the AG and RU designations: does this version of the OP provide more opportunity to create lots?		The OP has been updated to provide opportunity for infilling where appropriate.

	Regarding policies 6.5.5 and 6.5.6, Questioned whether the current OP section 6.5.5 and 6.5.6 would affect a site-specific application for employment land conversion compared with the adopted November 2022 OP. Is there a time limitation for a site-specific application?		The proposed OP is aligned with new provincial direction. An application presently still has to conform to conversion policies in the Growth Plan. The Planning Act has changed and there is no longer a 2-year moratorium on amendment applications following approval of a new OP
	Seeking clarification that amendments are different from the OP itself.		Amendment applications can be made to an OP at any time whereas the new OP was a comprehensive conformity exercise for creating a 20-year snapshot of the future of the Township.
Phil Brennan	Regrets that the province doesn't require a study to demonstrate the need for aggregates through an application for an aggregate operation.		Provincial policy does not allow a municipality to impose more restrictive requirements.
	2.4.4 Renewable energy sources have to gothrough an emissions test whereas fossil fuel energy sources do not		The OP policies reflect the provincial policy requirements
	2.3 What does a watershed framework mean?		Response was provided describing the definition of a watershed and the purpose of planning at a watershed level.
	Parking review in section 2.5.3 Do we have an oversupply?		Policy pertains more to the implementing zoning bylaw and ensuring uses have appropriate associated parking.
	Regarding Schedule D - Why is natural heritage different from EP different from Greenlands? Wetlands larger than 2Ha, but all of them are important? Did changes in wetland evaluation criteria impact this in anyway and is it considered or reflected in schedule D		Wetlands are based on current County and provincial criteria and mapping. The Greenlands designation is a trigger that could be used to further investigate natural heritage features in concert with schedule D.
	Is in support of moving the OP forward to the County for approval		Noted
	June 19th 2024		

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
Burkett	Asked for clarification with respect to the natural heritage system and the mapping for the secondary plan area		Noted that the Secondary Plan Area contains its own mapping and policies that help to guide when an EIS would be required.
	If the Township were to ask to support the redesignation on a site-specific basis would that delay the County's decision-making timeline on the new OP, or is it better to go through site specific amendments?		There are options as to how the County might chose to deal with a site-specific request through the OP approval however the County is aware of the Township's deficit of employment lands and would have to take that into consideration.
	Do we know what the timing is of when the County may no longer be the planning approval authority and what will happen after that?		The timing is unclear, and the process is unclear. This is why the Township is seeking to advance approval of this plan under the current structure as soon as possible
	Doesn't support the site specific and issue specific requests to modify this plan as it would likely delay the approval.		No comment
W. Minnings	Wanted to note that she was not on the previous council that had adopted the November 2022 OP.		Noted
	Will the OP include Doggy daycare as previously discussed with Township staff?		As further directed by council this matter will be addressed in the future as a separate process including public consultation.
	Were STR's referred to in the November 2022 version under "other bylaws" section.		Yes, they were specified in section 17.4.12.1
	Should Bed and Breakfasts be removed from the OP?		A Bed and Breakfast is a commercial use and should be kept in the document
	In policy 11.5.3.2 "core commercial" could Cumberland Beach be included in the list of referenced commercial districts?		This policy is intended for distinct commercial areas on a Township road/Mainstreet as opposed to a provincial highway corridor.
	Regarding 11.2, The OP should contain proactive language regarding wetland protection and environmental protection		The OP reflects the provincial and County policy direction and mapping.

	Would like to support redesignation development requests moving ahead where they would not slow down the approval of the plan or warrant a site- specific development application		This comment chart deals with the specific requests.
	Why is there a rush to approve this OP		Township would like to see the County of Simcoe deal with the approval of the OP in advance of any changes by the province to remove their planning authorities.
Taylor	Digital copy of the OP needs to be more user friendly		The formatting has been updated to correct this situation
	Remove the STR references in the OP		These are enabling policies that would allow the Township council to consider this and other topics in the future however it does not obligate the Township to enact by-laws listed in the examples noted in the OP
	Seeking clarification Regarding the nature of the life science ANSI in the north part of the Township		The ANSI asked about is an important feature identified by the province. It was confirmed as mapped from their data
	If you have a property designated Greenland's, can you build a home?		If you have a property designated Greenland's and appropriately zoned, then owner could apply for a building permit subject to no Planning Act application being required.
	Section 9.4.4.3, Clarification regarding the private roads being "upgraded' and what was meant by that term, and could it be made more clear? Wanted to ensure this does not preclude the Township from undertaking trivial maintenance on identified existing roads.		It's not meant that the Township would assume ownership of a private road however we can look at the working with County to ensure clarity of this point through the approval process.
	Policy 4.4.5 regarding enforcement was questioned.		All municipalities follow a reactive enforcement policy, and are a complaint driven enforcement approach due to staffing resource limitations. Any proactive enforcement strategy would come to council for consideration. Council

			would have to direct this action through the enabling OP policy.

County of Simcoe Comments Received from Circulation August 13, 2024

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
1.	Wendake, Huron Wendat Nation, dated September 12, 2024 The adopted OP, 2024, does not include all 'First Nation and Indigenous communities", rather it is specific to Rama. HWN would like the language changed in 14.1.5 to be inclusive of all. Additionally, the word 'may' should be changed to 'shall', with respect to consulting FN & Indigenous communities in the preparation of reports and 'shall' be notified in being notified when archaeological resources and/or burial grounds are found.	County of Simcoe	The adopted OP, 2024, has been modified to accommodate comments.
2.	Alexandre Thibault, WSP Consultant on behalf of Canadian National Railway Company CN recommends a 1km area of influence for sensitive land uses around rail yards. Additionally, OP, 2024, needs to include specific regulatory policy language for lands within proximity to rail facilities.	County of Simcoe	The adopted OP, 2024, has been modified to accommodate comments and regulatory requirements for rail lines and rail facilities.