

Municipality or Agency	Summary of Comments	Response
Brockton	No comment.	
Bruce County Transportation & Environmental Services	No comment.	
Ministry of Transportation of Ontario	Offered information about development requirements in the areas subject to a Ministry of Transportation permit.	Suggested wording added to a “Did You Know” box.
Niagara Escarpment Commission	Minor wording changes.	All suggested changes incorporated.
South Bruce	No comment.	
South Bruce Peninsula	<p>Comments were provided by both Legislative Services Dept. and Building Dept.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Road access standards for new lot creation and legal non-conforming uses were requested to be at the discretion of the municipality.</li><li>2. Commented that the requirement for smaller-specialized farm lots to be used for agriculture and that no lots are available within a 25 kilometre radius is subjective and hard for someone to prove or disprove.</li><li>3. Request to remove bone-fide farmer requirement for surplus farm residence severances.</li><li>4. Questioned requirement that new lot creation in Rural Recreation and Inland Lakes areas for lots not fronting on the water that water access be available within 1 kilometre.</li><li>5. Commented that the requirement to preserve natural vegetation along the lakeshore is not fair to the landowner because removal might be required for drainage or other reasons.</li><li>6. Non-conforming uses have been allowed in some case law to increase in height and size.</li><li>7. Further questions were asked about determination of a habitable residence, development setbacks from the waterfront, the reason for naming specific settlement areas in the amended policy, and what constitutes excessive amounts of water or large volumes of wastewater.</li><li>8. Expressed disappointment that requirements for Nitrate Studies have not been changed.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The proposed amendment does not represent a change from the existing Official Plan policy. Because creation of lots creates new opportunities for development, it is important that road standards be met to address the appropriate level of servicing for the development.</li><li>2. The proposed amendment does not represent a change from the existing Official Plan policy. The policy wording is based on wording from the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and is intended to ensure that any smaller specialized lots will be used for agriculture.</li><li>3. The proposed amendment does not represent a change from the existing Official Plan policy. The policy is intended to address the PPS requirement that the surplus house arises from farm consolidation.</li><li>4. There is an existing requirement for “adequate public access” the 1km requirement provides more specificity regarding what is adequate.</li><li>5. This policy promotes the preservation of vegetation along shorelines. It uses the wording, “where possible”, to allow some flexibility in its implementation.</li><li>6. New policies have been added to allow increase in height and volume of non-conforming uses without a planning approval as long as natural hazard issues are adequately addressed.</li><li>7. Planning Department staff will follow up with Town of South Bruce Peninsula staff to discuss and clarify the questions outlined in their comments.</li><li>8. The Planning Department looks forward to further engagement on Nitrate policies as we advance the new County Official Plan.</li></ol>

Saugeen Shores	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Questioned the inclusion of a reference to local municipalities in the inclusionary zoning policies.</li> <li>2. Suggested that the policy should recognize that municipalities can provide their own more detailed policies for site plan control.</li> <li>3. Asked if the requirements of the applicant to extend draft plan approval need to include both extenuating circumstances and significant progress.</li> <li>4. Comments provided regarding land division policies, a new law that addresses merging of lots upon the death of an owner and policy for severances near mineral resource deposits.</li> <li>5. Questions regarding policies for minor lot adjustments.</li> <li>6. Questions regarding discretion of the approval authority for policy interpretation.</li> <li>7. Question the use of watercourses as a boundary for land use designations because they can move over time. Suggested that the new policy about minor boundary expansions could be used to make several lots over time.</li> <li>8. Question about time frame for interim servicing policies.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. These are new policies that will hopefully enable local municipalities to use inclusionary zoning for affordable housing. The reference to local municipalities is intentional to facilitate the ability of municipalities to use this tool if the Province makes it available.</li> <li>2. Suggested amendment has been incorporated.</li> <li>3. Yes, the intent of the policy is to encourage developers to make progress on draft plan conditions.</li> <li>4. New law about lots merging could be referenced in “Did you Know” text. More detail added to mineral resource policy to qualify that this applies “outside of settlement areas”.</li> <li>5. The proposed amendment does not represent a change from the existing Official Plan policy. There is less flexibility for lot adjustments in settlement areas due to the need to ensure efficient use of land.</li> <li>6. Removed language related to discretion of the committee because it is unnecessary.</li> <li>7. No proposed change to existing interpretation policy regarding watercourses. Added wording of “one lot” to clarify intent of new boundary expansion policy.</li> <li>8. The proposed amendment does not represent a change from the existing Official Plan policy. A general time frame is given to provide some direction about what is meant by “interim servicing”.</li> </ol>
Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority	Minor wording changes suggested.	Suggested changes were incorporated with minor adjustment to the changes recommended for increased height permission for legal non-conforming uses in hazard areas.
Bev Nicholson Planning Consultant	Comments were provided regarding formatting, non-conforming uses, holding provisions, community planning permit systems, site plan control, complete application requirements and severances of smaller specialized farm lots.	<p>Comments from Ms. Nicholson have been largely addressed in the recommended amendment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Formatting has been amended to ensure all sub-sections are enumerated.</li> <li>2. Wording changes were made for clarity in the non-conforming uses policies.</li> <li>3. Holding provisions policies were changed to reflect the ability of local municipalities to establish criteria for adding or removing holding.</li> <li>4. More language was added for information purposes was added to the “Did You Know” box for site plan control.</li> <li>5. Wording changes for clarification were made to the complete application requirements.</li> </ol>

Don Scott Cuesta Planning Consultants	Comments were related to topics such as Indigenous Consultation, protection of prime agricultural land, peer-review requirements, pre-submission consultation, severances for agriculture related uses, concern regarding severances of building lots in the Rural designation, and severances for Open Space. Full comments are provided as an attachment to the planning report.	<p>Comments from Mr. Scott were received after the public meeting. As such, the scope of changes made in response to the comments is limited to that considered to be a minor change to the proposed amendment. Mr. Scott’s further comments may be considered for the new County Official Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Terminology was amended to replace “pre-consultation” with “pre-submission requirements”.</li><li>2. Clarification was provided for the policies that allow a severance for an agriculture-related use to draw a clearer connection to provincial direction.</li><li>3. With regard to lot area requirements for Open Space uses, an exemption for public authority acquisitions that was included in the existing policy and was omitted from the draft amendment has been added back in.</li></ol>
Saugeen Ojibway Nation	Comments regarding Indigenous consultation policies, holding policies, and environmental protection were provided by the Saugeen Ojibway Nation.	<p>The comments from Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) have been addressed such that SON has indicated they have no further comments on the proposed amendment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The policies for Indigenous Consultation have been amended in response to the comments from Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON), while still continuing to recognize Indigenous people generally.</li><li>2. Information has been provided in a “Did You Know” box to provide background information on Saugeen Ojibway Nation.</li><li>3. Guideline document policies have been amended to include reference to guidelines for Indigenous consultation.</li><li>4. Holding policies have been updated to include reference to protection of archaeological resources and natural environment.</li><li>5. Saugeen Ojibway Nation added alongside conservation organizations as one of the groups that may acquire land for conservation purposes and the severance will be exempted from the minimum lot area requirements.</li></ol>