

## Public Comments

---

**Subject:** FW: 5.5.6.2

-----Original Message-----

From: Sandy Bunker [REDACTED]  
Sent: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:01 PM  
To: Bruce County Planning - Inland Hub <bcplwa@brucecounty.on.ca>  
Subject: 5.5.6.2

**\*\* [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.

Hi Monica,

Thanks for the chat and clarification regarding the purpose or intent of the "within a 50 km radius" in this section yesterday. As we discussed, I really stumble over the criteria seeming to be limited to a comparable size, which may be construed a negative planning factor? However, your explanations diminished the negative tone. Thanks.

To put a more positive spin perhaps:

".lots of a similar size to those proposed, with similar significant features, for the severed and retained lots are not available for the intended use."

This may put more focus on the unique aspects of the property and less reliance on a hypothetical business plan. Such significant features may include, but certainly not limited to, gas, electrical, water, or other municipal services, proximity to complementary businesses, proximity and immediacy to anticipated markets, as well as special physical attributes of the property or properties.

I support a business plan, but wonder if the merits of a severance may be more readily obvious to planners and committees if the subject property advantages are encouraged to be showcased as well?

Just so my comments don't seem too abstract or busy-body, this may help: I had an acreage of Highway Commercial property which I severed and sold over twenty years. I gained an appreciation for the wording of Official Plans and By-laws. Experiences with Committees of Adjustment gave me insight into "Intent", as well as the challenges facing Planners.

I'd never seen a defined distance before and it caught my attention.

Wish you success,  
Sandy Bunker

January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2021

County of Bruce  
Planning and Development Department  
30 Park Street, Box 848  
Walkerton, ON N0G 2V0

Attention: Monica Walker Bolton, Senior Planner

RE: File Number C-2021-025

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed amendment, I hope that the following comments will be helpful. I would appreciate confirmation that these comments have been received and further notice of a public meetings.

As I understand the County undertook the Plan the Bruce exercise and an Interim Report in regard to Agriculture was prepared. The County is undertaking the preparation of a new Official Plan, however in light of the results of the Agriculture Interim Report and comments from the community the County has chosen to proceed with a separate amendment to the current official plan to change a number of the existing policies.

I have taken the opportunity to review the proposed amendments contained in the table circulated with the notice dated December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2021. Generally, in light of the length of time it takes to develop a new official plan, the need recognized through the Plan the Bruce process and changes to the Planning Act in 2020, proceeding with this amendment seems a wise decision. The following comments are provided for your consideration.

**Section 6.5.3.3.1** - In summary, even if there are multiple lots already off the farm, a surplus farm dwelling may be severed, lot additions and a lot for an industrial use may be created (5.5.2). The remnant must still be identified/zoned for 'for agricultural purposes only' (6.5.3.3.3). **Comment:** Often there are two dwellings to accommodate multiple generations. Could you clarify whether both may be surplus, and severed, or how that would be applied.

**Section 6.5.3.3.3** – In summary, a surplus farm dwelling severance does not have to meet MDS. Given likelihood that the dwelling is close to existing barns on the original parcel, the setback of this new lot from a livestock or manure facility could be significantly less for a separate transferable lot than would normally be applied. The MDS setback from existing barns on separate parcels would also not apply new iv) last sentence. Was there not some discussion at the province about including barns on severed parcels so they would not be dismantled, allowing a hobby farm use? **Comment:** The effect of this would seem to be that severances are not held up or that viable barns are not dismantled. The reason for setbacks however has been to avoid conflicts. This seems to allow lots to be created even if MDS is not met from barns on neighbouring properties. Isn't that creating potential conflict for the future and

limiting the ability of those barns to expand. Clarification would be appreciated. Should Section 5.5.11 be considered.

The change to vi) would also eliminate the need for OP or zoning amendments on lots less than 40 ha.

**Comment:** This makes sense.

**Section 5.5.6.2** – Agriculture, in 5.5.4, includes farm-related commercial and industrial, this change seems to allow these to be located on separate lots, rather than accessory to a farm (specific to crop or livestock production). **Comment:** The idea of a business plan is good but the policy seems to allow more industrial uses and may be difficult to regulate. Would feed storage/elevators, parts manufacturing, feedlot, auction site qualify?

**Section 5.5.2 iv)** – Allows farm-related industrial uses in prime ag areas rather than rural or settlement areas. **Comment:** Proximity to ag could be beneficial. Policies generally encourage industrial development to be in settlement areas (vi), but what about evaluating rural areas first before allowing in ag areas. The business plan criteria could include this as a hierarchy.

**Section 5.5.4** – Good idea to separate uses, addresses 5.5.2 iv) comments above, and require recognition in zoning bylaw. **Comment:** Suggest 5.5.4.3 include ...accessory to the 'primary' agricultural operation.... And will all zoning bylaws be amendment or are site specific amendments anticipated?

**Section 5.5.4.1** – Allows agriculture related. **Comment:** Perhaps include need for business plan as per 5.5.6.2 in criteria of this section.


**Section 5.6.4** – Allows non-farm residential uses in keeping with 4.4.4.1 xi and 5.5.2. **Comment:** Does it matter if it is for family, employee or whomever, simply an apartment or second dwelling is allowed, any renovations or changes subject to the Building Code. The key here would seem to be that it is not severable or to be considered as a surplus farm dwelling in the future.

**Section 6.5.3.3** – So lot additions to an existing lot, to ensure proper servicing and/or include accessory structure, would not need further zoning on either enlarged parcel or remnant. **Comment:** Makes sense. Other policies address when a new lot for surplus farm dwelling is being created, then remnant is zoned for ag purposes only.

If you have any questions in regard to these comments please feel free to contact me.

Very truly,  
Bev Nicolson

B.A. Nicolson Planning Services  
415 D Line,  
Sauble Beach NOH 2G0

  
519-374-4670

---

**Subject:** FW: Request for Agency Comments C25 Agriculture

---

**From:** Michelle Stein <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 20, 2022 1:46 PM  
**To:** Monica Walker Bolton <MWalkerBolton@brucecounty.on.ca>  
**Subject:** Re: Request for Agency Comments C25 Agriculture

**\*\* [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.

Good Afternoon Monica,

I am trying to locate the land zoning map for the municipality of South Bruce and I am having issues getting the map to show the zoning. I would really like to see if there have been any changes to the zoning as we requested. Several properties that were zoned rural should actually be prime agricultural. I would like to see if the changes have been made before the comments deadline has passed.

Thank you,

Michelle Stein

---

**From:** Monica Walker Bolton <MWalkerBolton@brucecounty.on.ca>  
**Sent:** January 18, 2022 8:51 AM  
**To:** Michelle Stein <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RE: Request for Agency Comments C25 Agriculture

Hi Michelle,  
The amendment that I am working on is separate from the work being done on a new Official Plan for Bruce County. I can look into your question about the Agriculture and Rural designations and get back to you. Is there a particular property address that you are interested in?  
-Monica

---

For the most up-to-date information on our continued services as we monitor and adapt to the health conditions of COVID-19, please visit the Bruce County website:  
<https://brucecounty.on.ca/covid19>

Help prevent the spread of COVID-19 by avoiding crowds and following the 3 W's: wear a face covering, watch your distance (2 metres), and wash your hands.

---

**From:** Michelle Stein <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 17, 2022 4:48 PM  
**To:** Monica Walker Bolton <MWalkerBolton@brucecounty.on.ca>  
**Subject:** Re: Request for Agency Comments C25 Agriculture

**\*\* [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.

Good Afternoon Monica,

Were there any changes made to agriculture zoning from the draft map?

One of our concerns was that several properties in our area were zoned as rural and we feel they should be considered prime agriculture.

Can you share the map that is being considered as the final draft?

Thank you,  
Michelle Stein

---

File Number: C-2021-025

Agency: Bill + Pam Birnondy

No Comment: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: PROPERTY OWNER Signature: W. Birnondy

Comments:

*No comments at this time.*

From: [REDACTED]  
To: [Bruce County Planning - Inland Hub](#)  
Subject: Response to Request for Comments re File C-2021-025 Amendment to Agriculture  
Date: Friday, January 14, 2022 10:45:06 AM

---

**\*\* [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.**

Plan the Bruce Agriculture - next steps  
Attention: Monica Walker Bolton

We had hoped to speak with you regarding this file but, unfortunately, there has been no follow up to our phone call during the first week of January.

As we read and try to understand the file, we would like to raise the following points:

1. We are still concerned that the number of farm families who know about this whole process - "Plan the Bruce" is rather limited. It certainly is difficult to get the information out during Covid times but any farmers that we have talked to know nothing about the "Plan the Bruce" process.
2. 6.5.3.3.1 The proposed wording is incredibly difficult to understand (and we are university graduates).
3. 6.5.3.3.3 Definition of a "bona fide farmer" states that if lands are rented out to others and not farmed by the owners, the owners do not qualify as a "bona fide farmer". In trying to understand this section, does this section only apply to severing off an existing residence or does it also include severing a new lot to build a new residence? In our case does this mean that since we do not farm our land ourselves (since we retired from active farming) and there is no existing residence or buildings on the land (over 100 acres), can a lot be severed and a new residence be built for us to live in? If this situation contravenes the amendment, then we are opposed to this. Similarly, can this be done on a farm under 100 acres?
4. 5.5.6.2 Would like an example of this situation. Maybe this is for the Amish community?
5. 5.5.4 Portable asphalt plants should never be allowed on or adjacent to agricultural lands. We know first hand that PORTABLE asphalt plants can easily become a PERMANENT facility. All that needs to be done is park the portable asphalt plant where it best suits the construction company, construct a road and permanent power to it and

it is now a permanent facility. (This happened in *Georgian Bluffs* adjacent to our farm and our objections were taken to the OMB but we lost). Also, the Ministry of the Environment does not have the person-power to adequately monitor these plants so the environmental impact on nearby farmlands will never be adequately monitored. We would hate to see the municipalities of Bruce County be subjected to a similar situation.

Submitted by *Garry and Joy Johnson*  
Owners of farmland in South Bruce Peninsula





---

**Subject:** FW: Request for Agency Comments C25 Agriculture

---

**From:** P Binn [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 3:13 PM  
**To:** Monica Walker Bolton <[MWalkerBolton@brucecounty.on.ca](mailto:MWalkerBolton@brucecounty.on.ca)>  
**Subject:** Re: Request for Agency Comments C25 Agriculture

**\*\* [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.

Dear Monica Walker Bolton,  
My husband and myself have studied the attachments you've sent us and are very interested in the Appendix A and potential solutions to our future plans. Our property, located at 526 Sideroad 18/19 Port Elgin would be affected by Directions 3, 5, 6 and 7. After our attempt to sever our existing home and rebuild on remaining acreage in 2021, we were made aware by county and municipal planners that it may be an easier process if we waited for the new Official Plan. We have a 48 acre Managed Woodlot. Also an irregular triangular property with the Blindline on one border, the Railtrail on another boundary and Sideroad 18/19 on the remaining boundary.

Could you please notify us of the potential meeting in January 2022 in the hopes it is open to the public?  
Thank you for keeping us in the loop of the changing Official Plan.  
Pam & Bill Binnendyk