Ontario Land Tribunal
Tribunal ontarien de l'aménagement du territoire

ISSUE DATE: January 23, 2026 **CASE NO(S).:** OLT-24-001113

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant:	Adventurous Holding Limited
Appellant:	Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc. (Bridgewater on Georgian Bay)
Appellant:	DNRN Holdings Inc.
Appellant:	Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd.; and others
Subject:	Proposed Official Plan Amendment
Description:	To institute a new official plan for Collingwood
Reference Number:	By-law No. 2023-095
Property Address:	Township-Wide
Municipality/UT:	Collingwood/Simcoe
OLT Case No.:	OLT-24-001113

Heard: January 12, 2026 by Telephone Conference Call

APPEARANCES:

Parties	**Counsel**
Town of Collingwood	Steven O'Melia (*in absentia*) Thomas Sanderson Elizabeth Gaudet
County of Simcoe	Will Thomson (*in absentia*) Thomas Sanderson
2322254 Ontario Inc.	Max Laskin

	Cristin Hunt (*in absentia*)
12123045 Canada Inc.	Sobiga Kamalakaran
Adventurous Holdings Limited	Sobiga Kamalakaran
Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc.	Scott Snider (*in absentia*) Shelley Kaufman
2182890 Ontario Inc. c/o EDEV Inc.	Stephen Watt
1549003 Ontario Inc.	Victor Vandergust
Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd.	Kyle Gossen (*in absentia*) Liam Valgardson
Lorablue Developments Inc.	Al Burton
MacPherson Builders (Cranberry) Limited	Scott Snider (*in absentia*) Shelley Kaufman
Mason Homes (Collingwood) Limited	Matt Hodgson Carly Emmett (*in absentia*)
Vincent Maffei on behalf of the Estate of Grazia Maffei	Amber Stewart
2204604 Ontario Inc.	Alan Heisey
Denis Martinek	David Finbow
Di Poce Management Limited	Marisa Keating Signe Leisk (*in absentia*)

MEMORANDUM OF ORAL DECISION DELIVERED BY S. TOUSAW ON JANUARY 12, 2026 AND ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL

Introduction

[1] This Case Management Conference ("CMC") was convened to finalize the Procedural Order ("PO") for the scheduled Hearing on the Merits of appeals filed against the County of Simcoe's approval in 2024 of the new Official Plan ("OP") for the Town of Collingwood ("Town"), adopted in 2023.

[2] Given the ongoing discussions and/or mediation of several site-specific appeals, the Hearing will focus on the general appeals to the OP. The Parties consent to releasing dates from the scheduled Hearing based on the revised Hearing Plan circulated by the Town and approved below.

Lorablue Developments Inc. (Appeal 8)

[3] The only remaining procedural disagreement involves Lorablue Developments Inc. ("Lorablue"). Lorablue requests that its appeal be adjourned given its primarily site-specific scope and its need for four seasons of ecological studies. The Town opposes the sought adjournment because Lorablue's appeal continues to include broad OP policy issues, being the intended subject of the scheduled Hearing.

[4] Having considered the Parties' submissions, the Tribunal ruled that Lorablue's appeal will be included in the PO for the scheduled Hearing. This appeal includes issues that are framed broadly (e.g., the scope of required ecological buffers) which place it within the ambit and focus of the scheduled Hearing. Through continued discussions, the Parties may agree to defer Lorablue's issues if they are reworded to relate solely to its lands.

[5] In the event of continued disagreement of the Parties, the Tribunal will not prevent Lorablue from filing a procedural Motion well in advance of the scheduled Hearing, but emphasized that, at this stage, the Tribunal finds that, for a fair, efficient and effective process, all Town-wide policy issues should be advanced at the scheduled Hearing.

Revised Hearing Dates

[6] At the Parties' request, the 17-day Hearing will commence on **Wednesday, May 6, 2026** at **10 a.m.** through to, and including, **May 29, 2026**, by video conference. No further Notice will be issued.

[7] Parties are asked to log into the video hearing at least 15 minutes before the start of the event to test their video and audio connections:

GoTo Meeting: **https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/719383509;**

Access Code: **719-383-509**

[8] Parties are asked to access and set up the application well in advance of the event to avoid unnecessary delay. The desktop application can be downloaded at GoToMeeting or a web application is available: https://app.gotomeeting.com/home.html.

[9] Persons who experience technical difficulties accessing the GoToMeeting application or who only wish to listen to the event can connect to the event by calling into an audio-only telephone line: **+1-647-497-9373** or (Toll Free) **1-888-299-1889**. The Access Code is as indicated above.

[10] Individuals are directed to connect to the event on the assigned date at the correct time. It is the responsibility of the persons participating in the hearing by video to ensure that they are properly connected to the event at the correct time. Questions

prior to the hearing event may be directed to the Tribunal's Case Coordinator having carriage of this case.

ORDER

[11] **The Tribunal Orders** that the Procedural Order is approved as contained in Schedule 1.

"S. Tousaw"

S. TOUSAW
VICE-CHAIR

The Conservation Review Board, the Environmental Review Tribunal, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal and the Mining and Lands Tribunal are amalgamated and continued as the Ontario Land Tribunal ("Tribunal"). Any reference to the preceding tribunals or the former Ontario Municipal Board is deemed to be a reference to the Tribunal.

Schedule 1

Ontario Land Tribunals

Local Planning Appeal Tribunal

655 Bay Street, Suite 1500
Toronto ON M5G 1E5
Telephone: (416) 212-6349
Toll free: 1-866-448-2248
Website: olt.gov.on.ca

Tribunaux de l'aménagement du territoire Ontario

Tribunal d'appel de l'aménagement local
655 rue Bay, bureau 1500
Toronto ON M5G 1E5
Téléphone: (416) 212-6349
Sans Frais: 1-866-448-2248
Site Web : olt.gov.on.ca

Ontario

ISSUE DATE:
CASE NO.: OLT-24-001113

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER section 17(36) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended*

Appellant:	Adventurous Holding Limited
Appellant:	Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc. (Bridgewater on Georgian Bay)
Appellant:	DNRN Holdings Inc.
Appellant:	Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd.; and others
Subject:	Proposed Official Plan Amendment
Description:	To institute a new official plan for Collingwood
Reference Number:	CW-OP-2301
Property Address:	Township-wide
Municipality/UT:	Collingwood/Simcoe
OLT Case No:	OLT-21-001113
OLT Lead Case No:	OLT-21-001113
OLT Case Name:	Maffei v. Simcoe (County)

PROCEDURAL ORDER

1. The Tribunal may vary or add to the directions in this procedural order at any time by an oral ruling or by another written order, either on the parties' request or its own motion.

Organization of the Hearing

2. The hearing for issues identified under Group A on Attachment 2 ("**Group A**") will begin on **Wednesday, May 6, 2026.** Other issues are to be scheduled for

hearing at the next scheduled case management conference or as otherwise directed by the Tribunal.

3. The parties' initial estimation for the length of the Group A hearing is **17 days**. The parties are expected to cooperate to reduce the length of the hearing by eliminating redundant evidence and attempting to reach settlements on issues where possible.

4. The parties and participants identified at the latest case management conference are set out in **Attachment 1** (see the sample procedural order for the meaning of these terms).

5. The order of evidence shall be as set out in **Attachment 3** to this Order. The Tribunal may limit the amount of time allocated for opening statements, evidence in chief (including the qualification of witnesses), cross-examination, evidence in reply and final argument. The length of written argument, if any, may be limited either on the parties' consent, subject to the Tribunal's approval, or by Order of the Tribunal.

6. The issues are set out in the Issues List attached as **Attachment 4**. There will be no changes to this list unless the Tribunal permits, and a party who asks for changes may have costs awarded against it.

7. Any person intending to participate in the hearing should provide a mailing address, email address and a telephone number to the Tribunal as soon as possible – ideally before the case management conference. Any person who will be retaining a representative should advise the other parties and the Tribunal of the representative's name, address, email address and the phone number as soon as possible.

8. Any person who intends to participate in the hearing, including parties, counsel and witnesses, is expected to review the Tribunal's Video Hearing Guide, available on the Tribunal's website.

Requirements Before the Group A Hearing

9. Interim deadlines for the hearing of issues outside of Group A will be imposed by further Procedural Order.

10. For the Group A hearing, a party who intends to call witnesses, whether by summons or not, shall provide to the Tribunal and the other parties a list of the witnesses and the order in which they will be called. This list must be delivered on or before **Friday, October 3, 2025**. A party who intends to call an expert witness must include a copy

of the witness' Curriculum Vitae and the area of expertise in which the witness is prepared to be qualified.

11. For the Group A hearing, after lists of witnesses have been provided as referenced in the preceding paragraph, expert witnesses in the same field shall have a meeting on or before **Friday, February 6, 2026** and use best efforts to try to resolve or reduce the issues for the hearing. Following the experts' meeting the parties must prepare and file a Statement of Agreed Facts and Issues with the OLT case co-ordinator on or before **Friday, February 13, 2026**.

12. An expert witness shall prepare an expert witness statement, which shall list any reports prepared by the expert, or any other reports or documents to be relied on at the hearing. Copies of this must be provided as in paragraph 14 below. Instead of a witness statement, the expert may file his or her entire report if it contains the required information. If this is not done, the Tribunal may refuse to hear the expert's testimony.

13. Expert witnesses who are under summons but not paid to produce a report do not have to file an expert witness statement; but the party calling them must file a brief outline of the expert's evidence. A party who intends to call a witness who is not an expert must file a brief outline of the witness' evidence.

14. For the Group A hearing, on or before **Friday, February 27, 2026**, the appellants and non-appellant parties shall provide copies of their witness and expert witness statements and visual evidence to the Town and County and to the OLT case co-ordinator.

15. For the Group A hearing, on or before **Friday, April 3, 2026**, the Town and County shall provide copies of their witness and expert witness statements and visual evidence to the other parties and to the OLT case co-ordinator.

16. For the Group A hearing, on or before **Friday, April 3, 2026**, a participant shall provide copies of their written participant statement to the other parties. A participant cannot present oral submissions at the hearing on the content of their written statement, unless ordered by the Tribunal.

17. For the Group A hearing, on or before **Friday, April 17, 2026,** the parties shall confirm with the Tribunal if all the reserved hearing dates are still required.

18. For the Group A hearing, if the appellants and/or non-appellant parties wish to reply to any issues raised in the witness statements of the Town or County, they shall

deliver reply witness and expert witness statements, and reply visual evidence, to the Town and County and to the OLT case co-ordinator on or before **Friday, April 17, 2026**.

19. For the Group A hearing, the parties shall cooperate to prepare a joint document book which shall be shared with the OLT case co-ordinator on or before **Wednesday, April 29, 2026**.

20. A person wishing to change written evidence, including witness statements, must make a written motion to the Tribunal. *See Rule 10 of the Tribunal's Rules with respect to Motions, which requires that the moving party provide copies of the motion to all other parties 15 days before the Tribunal hears the motion.*

21. A party who provides written evidence of a witness to the other parties must have the witness attend the hearing to give oral evidence, unless the party notifies the Tribunal at least 7 days before the hearing that the written evidence is not part of their record.

22. For the Group A hearing, the parties shall prepare and file a preliminary hearing plan with the Tribunal on or before **Wednesday, April 29, 2026,** with a proposed schedule for the hearing that identifies, as a minimum, the parties participating in the hearing, the preliminary matters (if any to be addressed), the anticipated order of evidence, the date each witness is expected to attend, the anticipated length of time for evidence to be presented by each witness in chief, cross-examination and re-examination (if any) and the expected length of time for final submissions. The parties are expected to ensure that the hearing proceeds in an efficient manner and in accordance with the hearing plan. The Tribunal may, at its discretion, change or alter the hearing plan at any time in the course of the hearing.

23. All filings shall be submitted electronically subject to other direction from the Tribunal. Electronic copies may be filed by email, an electronic file sharing service for documents that exceed 10MB in size, or as otherwise directed by the Tribunal. The delivery of documents by email shall be governed by the *Rule* 7.

24. No adjournments or delays will be granted before or during the hearing except for serious hardship or illness. The Tribunal's Rule 17 applies to such requests.

This Member is [not] seized.

So orders the Tribunal.

BEFORE:

Name of Member:

Date:

_____

TRIBUNAL REGISTRAR

Key Dates: Group A Hearing

Task:	**Group A Parties**
Witness List	October 3, 2025 (completed)
Expert Witness Meeting	February 6, 2026
Statement of Agreed Facts and Issues	February 13, 2026
Witness Statements - Appellant and Non-Appellant Party	February 27, 2026
Witness Statements – Town and County; Participant Statements	April 3, 2026
Reply Witness Statements Confirmation of Hearing Dates to OLT	April 17, 2026
File Joint Document Book with OLT	April 29, 2026
Hearing Plan to OLT	April 29, 2026

ATTACHMENT "1"

List of Parties and Participants

PARTIES		COUNSEL
1.	2322254 Ontario Inc. *Applicant/Appellant*	GOODMANS LLP 333 Bay St, Unit 3400 Toronto ON M5H 2S7 **Max Laskin** Email: mlaskin@goodmans.ca Tel: 416.849.6938 **Cristin Hunt** Email: mlaskin@goodmans.ca
2a.	12123045 Canada Inc. *Applicant/Appellant*	BUILT LEGAL PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 357 Bay Street Toronto, ON M5H 4A6 **Sobiga Kamalakaran** Email: sobiga@builtlegal.com Tel: 647.327.2572
2b.	Adventurous Holdings Limited *Applicant/Appellant*	BUILT LEGAL PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 357 Bay Street Toronto, ON M5H 4A6 **Sobiga Kamalakaran** Email: sobiga@builtlegal.com Tel: 647.327.2572
3.	Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc. *Applicant/Appellant*	TMA LAW 25 Main Street West, Suite 2010 Hamilton, ON L8P 1H1 **Scott Snider** Email: ssnider@tmalaw.ca Tel: 905.529.3476 **Shelley Kaufman** Email: skaufman@tmalaw.ca Tel: 905.529.3476

5.	2182890 Ontario Inc. c/o EDEV Inc. *Applicant/Appellant*	STEPHEN WATT BARRISTER & SOLICITOR 23 Mississauga Street W. Orillia, ON L3V 3A5 **Stephen Watt** Email: swatt@municipal-law.ca Tel: 416.977.9874
6.	1549003 Ontario Inc. *Applicant/Appellant*	VANDERGUST, VICTOR L., PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 11 Hurontario Street Collingwood, ON L9Y 3Z4 **Victor Vandergust** Email: vic@vandergustlaw.com Tel: 705.445.4544
7.	Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd. *Applicant/Appellant*	DAVIES HOWE LLP The Tenth Floor, 425 Adelaide Street West Toronto, ON M5V 3C1 **Kyle Gossen** Email: kyleg@davieshowe.com Tel: 416.263.4519 **Liam Valgardson** Email: liamv@davieshowe.com Tel: 416.263.4517
8.	Lorablue Developments Inc. *Applicant/Appellant*	THOMSON ROGERS 390 Bay Street, Suite 3100 Toronto, ON M5H 1W2 **Al Burton** Email: aburton@trlaw.com Tel: 416.868.3113
9.	MacPherson Builders (Cranberry) Limited *Applicant/Appellant*	TMA LAW 25 Main Street West, Suite 2010 Hamilton, ON L8P 1H1 **Scott Snider** Email: ssnider@tmalaw.ca Tel: 905.529.3476

		Shelley Kaufman Email: skaufman@tmalaw.ca Tel: 905.529.3476
10.	Mason Homes (Collingwood) Limited *Applicant/Appellant*	BARRISTON LAW 151 Ferris Lane, Suite 202 Barrie, ON L4M 6C1 **Matt Hodgson** Email: mhodgson@barristonlaw.com Tel: 705.445.1200 **Carly Emmett** Email: cemmett@barristonlaw.com Tel: 705.792.9200
11.	Vincent Maffei on behalf of the Estate of Grazia Maffei *Applicant/Appellant*	AMBER STEWART LAW 1570 Kipling Avenue, Suite 200 Etobicoke, ON M9R 2Y1 **Amber Stewart** Email: amber@amberstewartlaw.com Tel: 416.436.8355
13.	2204604 Ontario Inc. *Applicant/Appellant*	PHM LAW 121 King Street West, Suite 510 Toronto, ON M5H 3T9 **Alan Heisey** Email: heisey@phmlaw.com Tel: 416-601-2702
	Town of Collingwood *Approval Authority*	MILLER THOMSON LLP 115 King Street South, Suite 300 Waterloo ON N2J 5A3 **Steven J. O'Melia** Email: somelia@millerthomson.com Tel: 519.593.3289 **Thomas Sanderson** Email: tsanderson@millerthomson.com Tel: 519.593.2432

		Elizabeth Gaudet Email: egaudet@millerthomson.com Tel: 519.593.3369
	County of Simcoe *Approval Authority*	WILL THOMSON BARRISTER AND SOLICITOR P.O. Box 314, Collingwood PO Main Collingwood ON L9Y 3Z7 **Will Thomson** Email: will@willthomson.ca Tel: 705.441.0054

NON-APPELLANT PARTIES		**COUNSEL/CONTACT**
1.	Denis Martinek	David Finbow Email: dfinbow8@gmail.com Tel : 705.607.3620
2.	Di Poce Management Limited	**Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP** Suite 3200, Bay Adelaide Centre – North Tower 40 Temperance Street Toronto, ON M5H 0B4 **Signe Leisk** Email: sleisk@cassels.com Tel: 416.869.5411 **Marisa Keating** Email: mkeating@cassels.com Tel: 416.860.2978

PARTICIPANTS		**COUNSEL/CONTACT**
1.	2554281 Ontario Ltd.	Eric Palmer Email: epalmer@grnland.com Tel: 705.444.8805, ext. 302
2.	Sharon Carr	Sharon Carr Email: sharoncarr@rogers.com Tel: 705.888.4601

3.	Chris Mifflin	Chris Mifflin Email: chris.mifflin@rogers.com Tel : 647.988.43576
4.	Blue Mountain Watershed Trust Foundation	Duncan Bristow Email: duncanbristow@outlook.com Tel: 705.444.9708

PERSONS OF INTEREST		**COUNSEL/CONTACT**
5.	Rocky Pulera	Rocky Pulera Email: rprocco1@gmail.com Tel: 647.425.4612

Attachment 2: Hearing Timing				
Appeal	**Party**	**Issues**	**STATUS**	**Time Est.**
1	2322254 Ontario Inc.	12, 15-17, 19, 21(a), 22(a), 25(a), 42(a), 43(a), 44(a), 47-50	Adjourned *sine die*	**5 days**
2a	12123045 Canada Inc.	9, 13, 20, 23(a), 95-98	To be adjourned	4 days
2b	Adventurous Holdings Limited			
3	Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc.	1(b), 2(b), 27(a), 28(a), 29(a), 42(b), 43(b), 44(b), 45(a), 46(a), 51-54	To be adjourned	5 days
5	2182890 Ontario Inc. c/o EDEV Inc.	55-57	To be adjourned	4 days
6	1549003 Ontario Inc.	58-62	To be adjourned	**5 days**
7a	Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd.	General: 3(a), 4(a), 5(a), 6(a), 7(a), 8, 10, 24, 39, 40	**Group A: Spring 2026**	*
7b		Site-specific: 3(b), 4(b), 5(b), 6(b), 7(b), 11, 18, 33-39, 63-64	To be adjourned	5 days
8a	Lorablue Developments Inc.	26, 27(c), 30 - 32, 65	**Group A: Spring 2026**	*
8b		66-68	To be adjourned	**3 days**
9	MacPherson Builders (Cranberry) Limited	1(a), 2(a), 14, 27(b), 28(b), 29(b), 41, 42(c), 43(c), 44(c), 45(b), 46(b), 69-74	To be adjourned	5 days
10	Mason Homes (Collingwood) Limited	75-80	To be adjourned	5 days

11	Vincent Maffei on behalf of the Estate of Grazia Maffei	1(c), 2(c), 4-7 (underlined provisions in Issues List), 21(b), 22(b), 23(b), 24, 25(b), 26, 27(c), 29(c), 30-32, 42-44, 45(c), 46(c), 99-103	**Group A: Spring 2026**	
13	2204604 Ontario Inc.	81-94	To be adjourned	5 days
-	*Denis Martinek**	*2, 4-7, 27, 29-32, 42-46, 62-63, 68*	**Group A: *Spring 2026****	*
-	*Di Poce Management Limited**	*42-44*	**Group A: *Spring 2026****	*

* Sheltering parties will proceed in each Group covering applicable sheltering issues

ATTACHMENT "3"

Order of Evidence
(for each set of issues, to be further particularized in a Hearing Plan)

1. Applicant/Appellants

2. Any other Party or Participant (as permitted) in support of Applicants/Appellants

3. Respondent Municipality – The Township of Collingwood

4. Respondent County – The County of Simcoe

5. Any other Party or Participant (as permitted) in support of Respondent Municipality

6. Applicant/Appellant – Reply Case if required

Attachment 4: ISSUES LIST

#	ISSUES[1,2]	RAISED BY[3]
GENERAL[4]		
1.	In relation to (a) the MacPherson Phase 5/6 and 7 lands, (b) the Consulate lands[5] and (c) the Town generally: Does the Town of Collingwood Official Plan 2024, as approved by the County of Simcoe on September 24, 2024 ("**New OP**"), include adequate transition policies? If not, what changes are appropriate for the transition policies, in particular regarding existing approvals and amendments, extensions or revisions thereto, prior development processes and prior studies?	(a) MacPherson Builders (Cranberry) Limited ("**MacPherson**") (b) Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc. (Bridgewater on Georgian Bay) ("**Consulate**") (c) Vince Maffei on behalf of the Estate of Grazia Maffei ("**Maffei**")
2.	In regards to the issues in this hearing, does the New OP represent good planning and is it in the public interest, as it relates to (a) the MacPherson Phase 5/6 and 7 lands, (b) the Consulate lands, and (c) the Town generally?	(a) MacPherson (b) Consulate (c) Maffei Martinek*[6]
3.	(a) Do the following policies of the New OP represent good planning and are they in the public interest: - 1.2 i), j); - 3.5 b), g); - 4.3 j), m); - 5.1.2 b) i); 5.1.3 b); 5.1.5; 5.2.2.4; 5.6 a); 5.6.1.1 a); 5.6.1.2; 5.6.1.4 i); - 6.1.3 c); 6.1.9.3 a); 6.2.2 b);	Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd. ("**Huntingwood**")

[1] The identification of an issue does not mean that all parties agree that such issue, or the manner in which the issue is expressed, is appropriate or relevant to the determination of the Tribunal at the hearing. The extent to which these issues are appropriate or relevant to the determination of the Tribunal at the hearing will be a matter of evidence and argument at the hearing.

[2] Where an issue refers to a provision from the PPS or either of the Official Plans in addressing the issue, the planning document from which the provision is taken should be read in its entirety with all relevant provisions being considered. For greater certainty, the identification of a specific provision in an issue does not preclude the parties from referring to other provisions from the same planning document in addressing that issue.

[3] No party is prevented from presenting evidence on an issue raised by another party.
[4] As originally formulated, subject to recorded revisions scoping certain issues to particular lands.
[5] As defined in the Consulate Notice of Appeal and to include the Consulate West Lands and the East Lands.
[6] Sheltering parties are indicated by an asterisk.

	- 7.1.1 b); 7.1.2.3 d); 7.1.3.2 b); 7.1.4 c); 7.1.5.1; 7.1.5.2 c); 7.1.12.1 d) e); 7.1.12.2; 7.2.1 a) i) ii); 7.2.4 b)? (b) In their application to 5 Silver Creek Drive, do the following policies of the New OP represent good planning and are they in the public interest: - 3.7 g) iii); 3.7 k) - 4.3 o); - 5.1.5 b), c); 5.1.8.1 a); 5.2.2.3 b), c), d), e); 5.4.5; 5.6 b); 5.6.1.2; 5.6.1.3 b); 5.6.1.4 a) - c), m), n), q); 5.6.2; 5.6.3; 5.7.2.1; 5.7.2.2; - 6.1.9.3 a), j); 6.2.3 b) iv); - 7.1.2.4?	
4.	(a) Are the following policies overly restrictive and do they provide insufficient flexibility: - 1.2 i), j); - 3.5 b), g); - 5.1.2 b) i); 5.6 a); 5.6.1.2; - 6.2.2 b); - 7.1.1 b); 7.1.3.2 v); 7.1.5.1 i); 7.1.12.2 f) ii), g); 7.2.1 a) i), ii); 7.2.4 b) ? (b) In their application to 5 Silver Creek Drive, are the following policies overly restrictive and do they provide insufficient flexibility: - 5.4.5, 5.6.1.2 - 6.1.9.3 j); 6.2.3 b) iv)?	Huntingwood Maffei (underlined provisions) Martinek*
5.	(a) Are the following policies overly broad and do they provide insufficient detail and clarity: - 1.2 j); - 4.3 o); - 5.6.1.1 a); 5.6.1.3; 5.6.1.4 i); - 6.1.3 c); - 7.1.2.3 d); 7.1.3.2 b); 7.1.4 c); 7.1.5.1 d); 7.1.5.2 c); 7.1.12.2 g)? (b) In their application to 5 Silver Creek Drive, are the following policies overly broad and do they provide insufficient detail and clarity: - 5.4.5 a) ii); 5.6.1.4 a) - c), q); 5.6.3?	Huntingwood Maffei (underlined provisions) Martinek*
6.	(a) Are the following policies and appendix of the New OP consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 ("**PPS 2024**"), specifically the PPS 2024 policies identified below: - 3.3 (h)(ii) – PPS 2024 policy 2.3; - 4.3(j), (m) – PPS 2024 policy 3.6.1 d);	Huntingwood Maffei (underlined provisions) Martinek*

	- 5.1.3(b) – PPS 2024 policies 4.1.5, 4.1.8 and the definition of "negative impacts"; - 5.6(a) – PPS 2024 policies 4.1.2, 4.2.1, and 5.2; - 5.6.1.1(a) – PPS 2024 policy 4.1.2; - 5.6.1.2 – PPS 2024 policies 4.1.5, 4.1.8 and the definition of "development"; - 5.6.1.4 (i) – PPS 2024 policies 4.1.5 and 4.1.8; - 7.1.1(b) – PPS 2024 Chapter 1? (b) In their application to 5 Silver Creek Drive, are the following policies and appendix of the New OP consistent with PPS 2024, specifically the PPS 2024 policies identified below: - 3.7 (k) – PPS 2024 policy 4.1; - 4.3 (o) – PPS 2024 policy 3.6.1 d); - 5.6 (b) – PPS 2024 policy 4.1.8 and the definition of "adjacent lands"; - 5.6.1.2 – PPS 2024 policies 4.1.5, 4.1.8 and the definition of "development"; - 5.6.2; 5.6.3 – PPS 2024 policy 4.1.8 and the definition of "adjacent lands" ?	
7.	(a) Do the following policies and appendix conform to the Simcoe County Official Plan ("**County OP**"): - 3.3 (h)(ii) – County OP policy 3.5 - 4.3(j), (m),– County OP policy 4.7.9(d) - 5.1.3(b) – County OP policy 3.3.15 and the definition of "negative impacts" - 5.4.5 – County OP policy 4.9 - 5.6(a), (b) – County OP policy 3.3.15 - 5.6.1.1(a) – County OP policy 3.3.15 - 5.6.1.2 – County OP policy 3.3.15 and the definition of "development" - 5.6.1.4(i) - County OP policy 3.3.15 - 7.1.1(b) – County OP policy 4.12.4 - 7.1.2.3(d); 7.1.3.2(b); 7.1.4(c); 7.1.5.1(i); 7.1.5.2(c); 7.1.12.1(d), (e); 7.1.12.2 – County OP policy 4.12.18? (b) In their application to 5 Silver Creek Drive, do the following policies and appendix conform to the County OP: - 4.3 (o) – County OP policy 4.7.9(d); - 5.6.1.3 (b) – County OP policy 3.3.16; - 5.6.2, 5.6.3 – County OP policy 3.3.15; - 7.1.2.4 – County OP Policy 4.12.18	Huntingwood Maffei (underlined provisions) Martinek*

8.	Are the policies requiring consistency with the Town's Urban Design Manual ("**UDM**") appropriate and reasonable?	Huntingwood
3.7 ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND ADAPTING TO CLIMATE CHANGE		
9.	In its application to 59 Braeside and the Adventurous Lands, is policy 3.7 k) (Urban Forest) of the New OP consistent with PPS 2024, and in particular PPS 2024 policies 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.6, and 4.1?	12123045 Canada Inc. & Adventurous Holdings Ltd.
5 LAND USE DESIGNATIONS		
General		
10.	Should policy 5.1.3 b) be amended to be consistent with the test of "no negative impact" in the PPS 2024 and to permit "private roads" and "public/private utilities" in accordance with the current Town Official Plan?	Huntingwood
11.	In its application to 5 Silver Creek Drive, should the maximum building height in policy 5.1.8.1 a) be increased from 11 metres to 13 metres?	Huntingwood
12.	Is the policy direction in section 5.1.5 (Natural Heritage and Hazard Lands) appropriate and does it represent good planning in its application to 101 Mountain Road?	2322254 Ontario Inc.
13.	In its application to 59 Braeside and the Adventurous Lands: (a) Is policy 5.1.5 of the New OP consistent with PPS 2024, and in particular PPS 2024 policies 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.6, and 4.1? (b) Does it represent good planning?	12123045 Canada Inc. & Adventurous Holdings Ltd.
Residential Community Areas		
14.	Are the Parks and Open Space Designation policies, including but not limited to 5.2.5 and 5.2.5.3, appropriate or should they be modified, as they relate to the MacPherson Phase 5/6 and 7 Lands?	MacPherson
Employment Areas		
15.	Is the policy direction in sections 5.4, 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 appropriate and does it represent good planning: (a) in its application to 101 Mountain Road?	(a) 2322254 Ontario Inc.
16.	Is the policy direction in sections 5.4.4.4 and 5.4.5 appropriate and does it represent good planning in its application to 101 Mountain Road?	2322254 Ontario Inc.

17.	Is the meaning of "sensitive land uses" for the purpose of policy 5.4.4.4(a) sufficiently clear in its application to 101 Mountain Road?	2322254 Ontario Inc.
18.	In relation to Huntingwood's lands, should the requirement in policy 5.4.5 a) ii) to assess potential traffic impacts be removed to be consistent with the Ministry of the Environment's D-4 Guideline?	Huntingwood
19.	In their application to 101 Mountain Road, are the delineations of the Prestige Employment, General Employment, Greenlands System, and Environmental Protection designations on Schedules 1 and 2 of the New OP, appropriate and do they represent good planning?	2322254 Ontario Inc.
Future Community Area		
20.	In its application to 59 Braeside and the Adventurous Lands: (a) Is policy 5.5 and specifically, 5.5 a), 5.5.1 and 5.5.2 of the New OP consistent with PPS 2024, and in particular PPS 2024 policies 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.6, and 4.1? (b) Do they represent good planning?	12123045 Canada Inc. & Adventurous Holdings Ltd.
Natural Heritage System		
21.	Is the policy direction in section 5.6 (Natural Heritage System) appropriate and does it represent good planning: (a) in its application to 101 Mountain Road; and (b) in its application to 85 Toner Street?	(a) 2322254 Ontario Inc. (b) Maffei
22.	Is the meaning of "no negative impact" for the purposes of section 5.6.1.4 sufficiently clear: (a) in its application to 101 Mountain Road; and (b) in its application to 85 Toner Street?	(a) 2322254 Ontario Inc. (b) Maffei
23.	Is policy 5.6 of the New OP (i) consistent with PPS 2024, and in particular PPS 2024 policies 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.6, and 4.1, and (ii) representative of good planning: (a) in its application to 59 Braeside and the Adventurous Lands; and (b) in its application to 85 Toner Street?	(a) 12123045 Canada Inc. & Adventurous Holdings Ltd. (b) Maffei

24.	Should policy 5.6.1.2 be modified to permit "private roads" and "public/private utilities" within the Environmental Protection Designation?	Huntingwood Maffei
25.	Are the delineations of the Natural Heritage System and Adjacent Lands Overlay on Schedule 3 of the New OP, appropriate and do they represent good planning: (a) in their application to 101 Mountain Road; and (b) in their application to 85 Toner Street?	(a) 2322254 Ontario Inc. (b) Maffei
26.	Are the Natural Heritage policies sufficiently justified to require the negation of permitted uses and development rights?	Lorablue Developments Inc. Maffei
27.	In relation to (a) the Consulate Lands, (b) the MacPherson Phase 5/6 and 7 Lands, and (c) the Town generally: Is it appropriate for the Adjacent Lands Overlay, or any other related policy, to trigger an Environmental Impact Study ("**EIS**") requirement? Should these policies apply to lands that have already been studied? Should these policies apply to lands that already have planning approvals granted? Should the Adjacent Lands Overlay extend 90 m from the Environmental Protection Designation?	(a) Consulate (b) MacPherson (c) Lorablue Developments Inc.; Maffei Martinek*
28.	In relation to (a) the Consulate Lands, and (b) the MacPherson Lands: Are the Environmental Protection and Adjacent Lands policies that apply to existing approvals, including partial and subsequent approvals and extensions to approvals, in particular (but not limited to) as identified in policies 5.6.1.4(m) and (n) and 5.6.2.3(e) appropriate or should they be modified?	(a) Consulate (b) MacPherson
29.	In relation to (a) the Consulate Lands, (b) the MacPherson Lands, and (c) the Town generally: Are the Natural Heritage System, Environmental Protection Designation and Adjacent Lands Overlay policies, including but not limited to policies 5.1.2, 5.1.5, 5.6, 5.6.1, 5.6.1.4, 5.6.2, and 5.6.2.3 and Schedules 1, 2 and 3 appropriate or should they be modified?	(a) Consulate (b) MacPherson (c) Maffei Martinek*
30.	Is it appropriate and reasonable to designate all environmental features with the same level of protection which is required for Provincially Significant Wetlands?	Lorablue Developments Inc. Maffei Martinek*

31.	Is it appropriate and reasonable to include in the Environmental Protection Designation an associated 30 metre buffer?	Lorablue Developments Inc. Maffei Martinek*
32.	Has the Town demonstrated any public benefit of the proposed limits of the Environmental Protection designation and Adjacent Land overly which may result in a down zoning?	Lorablue Developments Inc. Maffei Martinek*
Area Specific Policies		
33.	Should policy 5.7.2.1 ("**Area-Specific Policy 5**"), paragraph a) be amended to permit vehicular access and servicing from the adjacent residential development to the east or from Development Area #2 to the west and through lands designated Environmental Protection?	Huntingwood
34.	Should policy 5.7.2.2 ("**Area-Specific Policy 6**") be revised to permit vehicular access "and servicing" through lands designated Environmental Protection?	Huntingwood
35.	Should the term "residential intensification uses" in Area-Specific Policies 5 and 6 be revised to "Additional Residential Units"?	Huntingwood
36.	Should Area-Specific Policies 5 and 6 permit all uses permitted as "public uses" in policies 4.3.2.5.3.3 and 4.3.2.6.3.5 of the current Town Official Plan?	Huntingwood
37.	Should policies 5.7.2.1 e) ii) and 5.7.2.2 e) ii) be modified by adding the words "which may include cut and fill" at the end of the sentence?	Huntingwood
38.	Should Area-Specific Policies 5 and 6 clarify that all "Low-Rise Buildings", as defined in the New OP, are also permitted?	Huntingwood
6 Transportation, Municipal Service Infrastructure, and Utilities		
A Multi-Modal Transportation System		
39.	Should other access alternatives be included in policy 6.1.9.3 a)?	Huntingwood
7 Implementation and Interpretation		
Implementation		
40.	Does policy 7.1.5.1 comply with the *Planning Act*?	Huntingwood

41.	Are the Pre-Consultation policies in 7.1.12 appropriate and in accordance with the authority under the *Planning Act* or should they be modified? Should these policies clarify their inapplicability to applications already deemed complete?	MacPherson
Section 2 of the *Planning Act*		
42.	Does the New OP have appropriate regard for the matters of provincial interest set out in section 2 of the *Planning Act*, including: a. ss. 2 (a), (k), (l) and (p) in regards to New OP Schedules 1, 2 and 3, Appendix II and Sections 5.1.5, 5.4, 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.4.4, 5.4.5 5.6 and 5.7, as they apply to 101 Mountain Road? b. ss. 2 (a), (f), (h), (j), (n), (p) and (r), in regards to the Consulate Lands? c. ss. 2 (a), (f), (h), (j), (n), (o), (p), (q), and (r) , in regards to the MacPherson Lands?	a. 2322254 Ontario Inc. b. Consulate c. MacPherson Maffei Martinek* Di Poce Management Limited*
Provincial Planning Statement (2024)		
43.	Is the New OP consistent with the PPS 2024, including: a. Chapter 1, policies 2.1.1-2.1.3 and 2.1.6(a), sections 2.3.1.1, 2.3.1.2 (excluding (c)), 2.8, 4.1, and policy 6.1.5 in regards to New OP Schedules 1, 2 and 3, Appendix II and Sections 5.1.5, 5.4, 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.4.4, 5.4.5 and 5.6 and 5.7, as they apply to 101 Mountain Road? b. policies 2.1, 2.1.3, 2.1.6(a), 2.2, 2.2.1(c), 2.3, 2.3.1.3, 2.3.1.2, 3.1, 3.1.1, 4.1, 4.1.3, 6.1.5 and 6.2.3 in regards to the Consulate Lands? c. policies 2.1.4, 2.2.1 and 2.3.1 , in regards to the MacPherson Lands? d. policies 4.1 and 5.1 in regards to the issues in this hearing?	a. 2322254 Ontario Inc. b. Consulate c. MacPherson d. Town Maffei Martinek* Di Poce Management Limited*
County of Simcoe Official Plan		
44.	Does the New OP conform with the County OP, including: a. sections 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, policies 3.3.15, 3.3.16, 3.3.17, 3.4.1, 3.5.1-3.5.10, policies 3.8.9-3.8.14, 4.11.1, 4.11.7, and policy 4.12.5 in	a. 2322254 Ontario Inc. b. Consulate

	regards to New OP Schedules 1, 2 and 3, Appendix II and Sections 5.1.5, 5.4, 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.4.4, 5.4.5 and 5.6 and 5.7, as they apply to 101 Mountain Road? b. policies 3.1.1, 3.2.3, 3.2.4 and Schedule 5.1.2 in regards to the Consulate Lands? c. policies 3.5.1 to 3.5.5, 3.5.7, 3.5.25 and Schedules 5.1 and 5.1.2 in regards to the MacPherson Lands? d. policies 4.1, 5.1 and 5.2 in regards to the issues in this hearing?	c. MacPherson d. Town Maffei Martinek* Di Poce Management Limited*
Appendix III		
45.	In relation to (a) the Consulate Lands, (b) the MacPherson Lands, and (c) the Town generally: Is it appropriate to rely on the Appendix III Natural Heritage System mapping, including for clarification, to establish the Natural Heritage System identified on Schedule 3? If not, how should this be modified?	(a) Consulate (b) MacPherson (c) Maffei Martinek*
46.	In relation to (a) the Consulate Lands, (b) the MacPherson Lands, and (c) the Town generally: Is it appropriate to include Appendix III: Natural Heritage System in the New OP? If so, are the policies in the New OP applicable to the Appendices appropriate or should they be modified to ensure the Appendices are not determinative or considered part of the New OP?	(a) Consulate (b) MacPherson (c) Maffei Martinek*
SITE-SPECIFIC		
2322254 Ontario Inc.		
47.	Is Appendix III of the New OP accurate as it pertains to 101 Mountain Road, and does it provide an appropriate basis for the Greenlands, Environmental Protection and Natural Heritage System designation, and the Adjacent Overlay on 101 Mountain Road in the New OP?	2322254 Ontario Inc.
48.	Do the delineations of the Greenlands System designation on 101 Mountain Road in Schedule 1, the Environmental Protection designation on 101 Mountain Road in Schedule 2, and the Natural Heritage System designation and Adjacent Lands Overlay on Schedule 3 of the New OP accurately reflect the significant natural heritage features on 101 Mountain Road? Do those delineations represent good planning? Is it appropriate to establish those designations based on a desktop	2322254 Ontario Inc.

	analysis, without any on-site assessment, when a site-specific study has been undertaken?	
49.	Should area-specific policies be added to section 5.7 of the New OP with respect to 101 Mountain Road? If so, what should those policies provide?	2322254 Ontario Inc.
50.	Does the Town's designation of 101 Mountain Road render it an area of employment for purposes of the Planning Act and an employment area for purpose of the PPS 2024?	Town
Consulate Developments (Ontario) Inc. (Bridgewater on Georgian Bay)		
51.	What is the legal status and what are the implications of the 2010 Minutes of Settlement ("**MOS**") with respect to the Consulate lands? Should the MOS be implemented through the New OP?[7]	Consulate
52.	Are the designations on the Consulate West lands appropriate or should changes to the designations in the Schedules be made, together with any other associated policy or Schedule changes: a) Schedule 1 – Growth Management Plan – 'Greenlands System'; b) Schedule 2 – Land Use Plan – 'Environmental Protection'; and c) Schedule 3 – Natural Heritage Plan – to remove 'Natural Heritage Systems' and 'Adjacent Lands Overlay'.	Consulate
53.	Should the policy and schedule concerns raised with respect to the Consulate West lands be addressed through a site specific policy and/or notes on a plan wide or site specific basis, including on Schedules or through Schedule changes?	Consulate
54.	Are revisions required to the Figures in Appendix III: Natural Heritage System that are applicable to the Consulate West lands, and in particular revisions to remove the identification of overlays and Natural Heritage System on Figures: 8 Wetlands; 9 ELC; 10 Woodlands; 15 Recommended NHS; 15a NHS/NVCA Floodplain Overlap, and:16 Linkage Enhancement Opportunities?	Consulate

[7] The remaining Consulate issues are provided out of an abundance of caution and without prejudice to Consulate's position that this issue is determinative.

2182890 Ontario Inc. c/o EDEV Inc.		
55.	Does proposed Schedule 1 – Growth Management Plan appropriately designate 11344 and 11352 Highway 26? Specifically: a) Should a larger portion of 11344 and 11352 Highway 26 be designated "Residential Community Areas" on Schedule 1? b) Further, should 11344 and 11352 Highway 26 be designated "Strategic Growth Area" instead of "Residential Community Areas" on Schedule 1?	2182890 Ontario Inc. c/o EDEV Inc.
56.	Does proposed "Schedule 2 – Land Use Plan" appropriately designate 11344 and 11352 Highway 26? Specifically: a) Should a larger portion of 11344 and 11352 Highway 26 be designated "Residential Community Areas" or "Mixed Use Corridor II" on Schedule 2?	2182890 Ontario Inc. c/o EDEV Inc.
57.	In relation to 11344 and 11352 Highway 26, is the proposed designation on Schedules 1 and 2 consistent with the PPS 2024, specifically sections 2.3.1 and 2.4?	2182890 Ontario Inc. c/o EDEV Inc.
1549003 Ontario Inc.		
58.	Does proposed Schedule 1 – Growth Management Plan appropriately designate 11555 Highway 26?	1549003 Ontario Inc.
59.	Should a larger portion of 11555 Highway 26 be designated "Strategic Growth Area" on Schedule 1?	1549003 Ontario Inc.
60.	Does proposed "Schedule 2 – Land Use Plan" appropriately designate 11555 Highway 26?	1549003 Ontario Inc.
61.	Should a larger portion of 11555 Highway 26 be designated "Mixed Use Corridor II" on Schedule 2?	1549003 Ontario Inc.
62.	In relation to 11555 Highway 26, is the proposed designation on Schedules 1 and 2 consistent with the PPS 2024, specifically sections 2.3.1 and 2.4?	1549003 Ontario Inc.
Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd.		
63.	Should Area-Specific Policies 5 and 6 be modified to clarify that they prevail over all other policies in the New OP that would otherwise apply to 5 Silver Creek Drive, including the following policies: - 3.7 g) iii), 3.7 k), - 4.3 j) m),	Huntingwood

	- 5.1.5 b), c), 5.2.2.3 b), c), d), e), 5.2.2.4, 5.6 b), 5.6.1.3 b), 5.6.1.4 a) - c), m), n), q), 5.6.2, 5.6.3; - 7.1.2.4?	
64.	Should Area-Specific Policies 5 and 6 exempt 5 Silver Creek Drive from the portion of policy 5.6.1.2 b) that prohibits municipal service infrastructure in a provincially significant wetland?	Huntingwood
Lorablue Developments Inc.		
65.	Has the Town adequately substantiated a valid planning rationale for ignoring the OMB Order of March 4 2014 ("**OMB Order**") wherein the minimum required yard to the Environmental Protection Zone was set at 3.0 metres? Has the Town acted in bad faith by ignoring the OMB Order?	Lorablue Developments Inc.
66.	In relation to 20 Balsam Street, does this potential down zoning outweigh the loss of permitted development rights to the land owner?	Lorablue Developments Inc.
67.	Do the limits of the Environmental Protection designation on 20 Balsam Street represent good planning?	Lorablue Developments Inc.
68.	Does the Natural Heritage System, which was established though an assessment of mapping, provide a more accurate delineation of environmental features than ground truthing by the 20 Balsam Street land owners' qualified biologist and the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority biologist which was mutually agreed and staked on site and subsequently surveyed by an Ontario Land Surveyor?	Lorablue Developments Inc.
MacPherson Builders (Cranberry) Limited		
69.	Does the New OP appropriately recognize the current approval status of the MacPherson Phase 5/6 and 7 lands, including studies completed as part of that approval process?	MacPherson
70.	Are the designations on the MacPherson Phase 5/6 and 7 lands appropriate or should changes to the Schedules be made as follows, together with any other associated policy or Schedule changes: a) Schedule 1 - Growth Management Plan – from 'Greenlands System' to 'Residential Community Areas'; b) Schedule 2 - Land Use Plan – from 'Environmental Protection' to 'Existing Neighbourhood'; and	MacPherson

	c) Schedule 3 - Natural Heritage Plan – to remove 'Adjacent Lands Overlay' and 'Natural Heritage Systems'	
71.	Are changes to any Schedules required to address future road alignment for Cranberry Trail?	MacPherson
72.	Are revisions required to the Figures in Appendix III: Natural Heritage System that are applicable to the MacPherson Phase 5/6 and 7 lands, and in particular revisions to remove the identification of overlays and Natural Heritage System on Figures: 8 Wetlands; 9 ELC; 10 Woodlands; 15 Recommended NHS; 15a NHS/NVCA Floodplain Overlay, and:16 Linkage Enhancement Opportunities?	MacPherson
73.	Should the policy and schedule concerns raised with respect to the MacPherson Phase 5/6 and 7 lands be addressed through a site specific policy and/or notes on a plan wide or site specific basis, including on Schedules or through Schedule changes?	MacPherson
74.	Should the New OP include a site specific policy for the Phase 7 MacPherson lands that the land be permitted for future residential uses, including single detached dwelling, semidetached dwellings, townhouse dwelling, apartment dwellings, and group or cluster dwellings? Does the Existing Neighbourhoods land use designation (Section 5.2.1) permit the desired residential land uses and unit types?	MacPherson
Mason Homes Ltd.		
75.	Does the proposed redesignation of 380-420 High Street on Schedules 1, 2, and 3 of the New OP have proper regard for the matters of provincial interest set out in section 2 of the *Planning Act*, specifically clauses (a), (f), (h), (j), (p), and (q)?	Mason Homes Ltd.
76.	Is the proposed redesignation of 380-420 High Street on Schedules 1, 2, and 3, of the New OP consistent with: a) "Chapter 2: Building Homes, Sustaining Strong and Competitive Communities" of the PPS 2024, specifically policies 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.6, and 2.2.1(c)? b) "Chapter 3: Infrastructure and Facilities" of the PPS 2024, specifically policies 3.1.1, 3.6.1, and 3.6.2? c) "Chapter 4: Wise Use and Management of Resources", of the PPS 2024, specifically policies, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, and 4.1.8	Mason Homes Ltd.

	d) "Chapter 6: Implementation and Interpretation" of the PPS 2024, including without limitation policy 6.1.5?	
77.	Does the proposed redesignation of 380-420 High Street on Schedules 1, 2, and 3, of the New OP conform with "Part 3: Growth Management Strategy" of the County OP, specifically policies 3.1, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, and 3.5.7?	Mason Homes Ltd.
78.	Is the proposed designation of 380-420 High Street on Schedule 3 of the New OP as "Natural Heritage" appropriate, based on the actual characteristics of the lands, and does it accurately reflect applicable environmental policies and constraints?	Mason Homes Ltd.
79.	Does the proposed redesignation of 380-420 High Street from "Residential," "Environmental Protection," and "Rural" under the Town's previous Official Plan to "Greenland System," "Environmental Protection," and "Natural Heritage System" under the New OP represent good planning and serve the public interest?	Mason Homes Ltd.
80.	Does the redesignation of 380-420 High Street result in an effective sterilization of the lands, preventing reasonable use or development?	Mason Homes Ltd.
2204604 Ontario Inc.		
81.	In relation to 20 High Street, does the Town have a sufficient supply of land to accommodate a range and mix of market-based housing, as contemplated by, among other policies, policy 1.4.1 of the PPS 2020 and policy 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 of the PPS 2024? If the answer is "no", should the permitted uses on lands within the Regional Commercial District Designation be expanded to achieve a range and mix of housing in the Town?	2204604 Ontario Inc.
82.	In relation to 20 High Street, should Section 5.3.4.2 a) of the New OP be modified to include Low-Rise/Mid-Rise/High-Rise Standalone Residential Buildings as a permitted use within the Regional Commercial District Designation in addition to Mid-Rise Residential Buildings and High-Rise Residential Buildings?	2204604 Ontario Inc.
83.	In relation to 20 High Street, does permitting Low-Rise/Mid-Rise/High-Rise Standalone Residential Buildings within the Regional Commercial District Designation represent good and appropriate land use planning with respect to the following:	2204604 Ontario Inc.

	a) Provincial Policy Statement (2020): Is expanding the permitted uses within the Regional Commercial District Designation to permit Low-Rise/Mid-Rise/High-Rise Standalone Residential Buildings consistent with the PPS 2020, including policies 1.1.1 a-b), 1.4.1 a), 1.4.3 b)2), 1.4.3 d), and 1.4.3 f). b) Growth Plan: Does expanding the permitted uses within the Regional Commercial District Designation to permit Low-Rise/Mid-Rise/High-Rise Standalone Residential Buildings conform to the Growth Plan, including Section 1.2.1, policy 2.2.1.4, policy 2.2.6.1 (a) and (e), and policy 2.2.6.2. c) New OP: Does expanding the permitted uses within the Regional Commercial District Designation to permit Low-Rise/Mid-Rise/High-Rise Standalone Residential Buildings conform to the Official Plan, as set out in Section 2.2, and policy 3.2a)? d) PPS 2024: Is expanding the permitted uses within the Regional Commercial District Designation ("**RCD Designation**") to permit Low-Rise/Mid-Rise/High-Rise Standalone Residential Buildings consistent with the PPS 2024, including policies 2.1.6 a), 2.2.1.b)2), 2.2.1c), 2.3.1.3 and 2.3.1.4.	
84.	In relation to 20 High Street, is restricting the residential uses in the RCD Designation to Mid-Rise Residential Buildings and High-Rise Residential Buildings inconsistent with the PPS 2024 including policies 2.1.6 a), 2.2.1.b)2), 2.2.1c), 2.3.1.3 and 2.3.1.4.	2204604 Ontario Inc.
85.	In relation to 20 High Street, will the RCD Designation of the lands with policies 5.1.8.2, 5.1.8.3, 5.3.4.2, 5.3.4.3 , 5.3.4.5, 5.7.6.3 and 5.7.6.4 of the New OP inhibit the redevelopment of the lands and their future use which is contrary to the intensification goals of the PPS 2024.	2204604 Ontario Inc.

86.	In relation to 20 High Street, are the following New OP policies, including but not limited to Sections 5.3.4.2 a-b, d, e, f), 5.3.4.3a, d-g), 5.7.6.3 consistent with the PPS, 2024, including but not limited to Sections: 2.1.4, 2.1.6, 2.2.1b)2), 2.2.c, 2.3.1.1-3, 2.4.1.1, 2.4.1.2, 2.4.1.3 b, c & e, 2.8.1.1 a-d)?	2204604 Ontario Inc.
87.	In relation to 20 High Street, are the following New OP policies, including but not limited to Sections 5.3.4.2a-b, d, e, f), 5.3.4.3a, d-g), 5.7.6.3 in conformity with the County OP, including but not limited to Sections: 3.5.1-3.5.5, 3.5.7, 3.5.26, 3.5.31' 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.10.3. 4.11.6?	2204604 Ontario Inc.
88.	If the lands develop as per the existing RCD permissions how much retail commercial space could be created?	2204604 Ontario Inc.
89.	Can retail commercial be achieved on a portion of the site in a single storey standalone format that results in a similar quantum of retail commercial space under the proposed policies of the RCD designation while permitting low rise/mid rise/high rise standalone residential on a portion of the RCD lands?	2204604 Ontario Inc.
90.	Is there demand for retail commercial uses in this location in Collingwood in the form permitted by the proposed policies of the RCD designation including requirements for: a) minimum building height of 2 storeys or 8 metres; b) minimum ceiling height of 4.25 metres; c) restricted retail commercial uses; d) minimum retail units sizes. (minimum ceiling heights) do they conflict) what does the combination create	2204604 Ontario Inc.
91.	Can the addition of single storey retail commercial standalone buildings as a use operate as an interim use of the land on 20 High Street that leaves open the possibility of redevelopment in the future for the more intense uses currently permitted by the RCD designation such as mid rise/high rise residential with retail on the ground floor if and when the demand for this form of mixed residential commercial arises in the future?	2204604 Ontario Inc.

92.	Will the modification of Policy 5.7.6.3 a) in relation to 20 High Street, which provides for a minimum gross leasable area of 370 square metres, result in negative impacts on the planned function of the Downtown Core?	2204604 Ontario Inc.
93.	Will the modification of Policy 5.7.6.3 b) in relation to 20 High Street, which prohibits certain retail commercial uses on RCD lands, result in negative impacts on the planned function of the Downtown Core?	2204604 Ontario Inc.
94.	Given that the RCD designation currently requires Mid-Rise and High-Rise Buildings, with non-residential uses comprising a minimum of 75% of the at-grade Gross Floor Area, restricted uses and a minimum unit size of 370 square metres, is it reasonable to expect that retail commercial uses in a mixed use format will be viable on the RCD lands?	2204604 Ontario Inc.
12123045 Canada Inc. & Adventurous Holdings Ltd.		
95.	Should Schedule 1 of the New OP be amended to remove 59 Braeside and the Adventurous Lands from the "Greenlands System" and place them in the "Greenfield Residential Community Areas"?	12123045 Canada Inc. & Adventurous Holdings Ltd.
96.	Should Schedule 2 of the New OP be amended to remove the proposed "Environmental Protection" designations 59 Braeside and the Adventurous Lands and place them in the Existing Neighbourhoods Designation?	12123045 Canada Inc. & Adventurous Holdings Ltd.
97.	In classifying 59 Braeside and the Adventurous Holdings lands as part of the Greenlands System on Schedule 1 and designating them Environmental Protection on Schedule 2 of the New OP, is the Town's decision (a) consistent with the PPS 2024, including sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.6 and 4.1? (b) representative of good planning?	12123045 Canada Inc. & Adventurous Holdings Ltd.
98.	Should Schedule 3 of the New OP be amended to remove 59 Braeside and the Adventurous Lands from the "Natural Heritage System" and place them in the "Adjacent Lands Overlay"?	12123045 Canada Inc. & Adventurous Holdings Ltd.

Vince Maffei on behalf of the Estate of Grazia Maffei		
99.	Does proposed Schedule '1' Growth Management Plan: a) Appropriately designate 85 Toner Street? Should a larger portion of 85 Toner Street be designated as Future Community Areas?	Maffei
100.	Does proposed Schedule '2' Land Use Plan: a) Appropriately designate 85 Toner Street? b) Should the entirety of 85 Toner Street be designated as Rural?	Maffei
101.	Does proposed Schedule '3' Natural Heritage System and Adjacent Lands: a) Appropriately designate 85 Toner Street? b) Should amended Schedule 3 be modified, including to remove or reduce the area of Natural Heritage System, and to remove the Adjacent Lands Overlay on 85 Toner Street?	Maffei
102.	Do Schedule '2' Land Use Plan, amended Schedule '3' Natural Heritage System, and Appendix III: a) Accurately reflect the natural heritage features on 85 Toner Street? b) Should they be modified to reflect the site-specific study that has been undertaken and peer-reviewed by the Town?	Maffei
103.	Should an area-specific policy be added to section 5.7 of the New OP with respect to 85 Toner Street to address the future development of the site?	Maffei