

From: arlene kennedy < >

Sent: Thursday, July 8, 2021 5:12 PM

To: Public Meeting Comments <PMeetingComments@brucecounty.on.ca>

Cc: [ ]

Subject: Bruce County Official Plan revisions comments

**\*\* [CAUTION]:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

In advance of the July 15th public meeting please accept the following observations for consideration:

In view of limited housing choices, downsizing to age-in-place dwellings suggests unmarried co-owners be permitted to buy property together or be permitted co-living affordable housing as well as the development of new housing innovations such as 'pods' that exceed the proposed number of accessory dwelling units in the revised Bruce County Official Plan.

That housing be intertwined with climate change such that policies and practices reflect a climate lens for environmental, social, health and wellbeing considerations.

--

Arlene Kennedy

[ ]

Tobermory

Ontario

N0H 2R0

From: planning@grey.ca <planning@grey.ca>  
Sent: Friday, July 9, 2021 4:37 PM  
To: Jack Van Dorp <JVanDorp@brucecounty.on.ca>  
Subject: County comments for C-2021-05 Bruce County- Add. Res. Units

\*\* [CAUTION]: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

County comments for C-2021-05 Bruce County- Add. Res. Units

County comments for C-2021-05 Bruce County- Add. Res. Units

Hello Mr. Van Dorp,

County staff have reviewed Local Official Plan Amendment Application application C-2021-05 Bruce County- Add. Res. Units - Bruce County and offer the following comments.

Section 4.4.4.1(1)(xi)(c) - In the Agricultural designation, only one Additional Residential Unit is permitted whether in the building or containing the primary residential dwelling or in a detached building.

The wording of the highlighted section is a bit unclear and staff wonder whether it was meant to read something like: whether in the building containing the primary residential dwelling... etc.

Staff are generally curious as to how duplex units are viewed through this policy lens. As a duplex would have two total units, would there be consideration for one ARU? There appears to be emphasis through the Planning Act to recognize ARU's alongside detached , semi-detached, and row-house homes. But there may be flexibility to also consider them alongside duplex units provided the overall unit count per lot remains at 3.

Let us know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Stephanie Lacey-Avon

Planning & Development, Grey County, Owen Sound ON

From: Kevin Doyle

Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 8:04 PM

To: Public Meeting Comments <PMeetingComments@brucecounty.on.ca>

Subject: File Number(s): C-2021-015 - Comments

**\*\* [CAUTION]:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sirs,

Good ideas!

A few comments where things are unclear or unnecessarily restrictive,

Additional Residential Units-

- Seasonal uses are permitted. Also Bed and breakfast establishments. Short term accommodation should be permitted as well (and if not then no bed and breakfasts – to be fair to the two groups.)
- Re agricultural. Can't be used as a basis for severance – good idea. However this idea of being “close to main cluster of buildings” is not necessary and will cause hardship. We are not our grandparents generation living on top of each other. If I even move out of the farmhouse I want to be a fair ways (few hundred feet at least) from the main farmhouse and driveway that hauls big equipment, and cars and general noise all day and half the night. This criterion adds no real purpose. (Similarly we shouldn't be restricted from putting in a separate driveway...I have 200 acre farms that have up to over 6 entrances installed over the years.)

Garden suites-

- Must be removable? What is that defined as? In the next line it says no mobile homes or trailers.
- What is wrong with a nice mobile --- let's get off our high horses and drop this better than thou attitude toward mobile homes! I don't like them as the interior is too small if you are much over 200 pounds. That said, it's elitist to not permit people to have them as required – mostly do to financial reasons.

Regards,

Kevin Doyle

MEMORANDUM

TO: Teslyn Heron, Applications Technician, County of Bruce, via email

CC: Brandi Walter, Environmental Planning Coordinator – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority, via email

FROM: Patrick Huber-Kidby, Environmental Planner/Regulations Officer, MVCA

DATE: July 2, 2021

SUBJECT: Bruce County Official Plan Amendment: C-2021-015

All lands with the County of Bruce

---

The Maitland Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) has reviewed the above-noted proposal with respect to natural hazards in accordance with our Memorandum of Understanding with County of Bruce, and in addition to our delegated responsibility for representing the “Provincial Interest” for natural hazards; and relative to MVCA policies made under Ontario Regulation 164/06 (Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation). Based on our review, we offer the following comments.

It is our understanding the purpose of this amendment is to update policies relating to ‘Additional Residential Units’ across the County of Bruce.

**Natural Hazards & Regulated Lands**

The County of Bruce features numerous sections of hazard land, including floodplain, and numerous areas regulated under Ontario Regulation 164/06 – primarily in the Township of Huron-Kinloss.

**Recommendations**

MVCA is generally supportive of the proposed amendments but would recommend wording be adopted within the redefinitions to restrict the creation/use of additional residential units where insurmountable issues are present with respect to Natural Hazards. These issues could include impracticability of floodproofing, unsafe access, issues of erosion or unstable soils, etc.

With having regard for generally directing new residential units to areas outside hazard lands MVCA finds the amendment otherwise consistent with Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020. We would be happy to further discuss the details of the amendments with County staff at their convenience.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment at this time. Feel free to contact this office should there be any questions.