



## Planning and Development

595 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue East, Owen Sound Ontario N4K 3E3  
519-372-0219 / 1-800-567-GREY / Fax: 519-376-7970

December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Jenn Burnett  
Township of Georgian Bluffs  
177964 Grey Road 18  
Owen Sound, ON  
N4K 5H5

**RE: Consent Application B-24-22 and B-25-2022**  
**Part Lots 23 and 24, Concession 14 and Part Lot 24, Concession 15**  
**Township of Georgian Bluffs (Keppel)**  
**Roll: 420362000420200, 420362000418600, 420362000422903**  
**Owners: Estate of Murial McCrabb c/o Erma Speer/ Gary Aiken**  
**Applicant: Ron Davidson**

Dear Ms. Burnett,

This correspondence is in response to the above noted application. We have had an opportunity to review the application in relation to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the County of Grey Official Plan (OP). We offer the following comments.

The purpose and effect of the subject application is to sever a parcel with a lot area of 0.4013 hectares and a lot frontage of 55.8 metres. The other severed parcel will have a lot area of 6.78 hectares and a lot frontage of 141 metres plus 72 metres. The retained parcel will have a lot area of 40.94 hectares and a lot frontage of 404 metres. These proposed severances will recreate lots that merged when they were registered in the same name.

Schedule A of the County OP designates areas a smaller portion of the subject lands as 'Inland Lakes and Shoreline'. Section 3.7(3) states,

*Permitted uses in the Inland Lakes and Shoreline areas must be limited to low-density residential dwellings, bed and breakfast establishments, home occupations, marinas, resource based recreational uses, convenience commercial, and public uses. Any new development will need to address the requirements of the servicing section of this plan, Section 8.9.*

The proposed severed lot #1 is located entirely within the Inland Lakes and Shoreline land use type which would permit smaller residential lot creation. County Planning staff have no concerns.

Schedule A of the County OP designates the subject lands as 'Rural'. Section 5.4.3(1) states,

*All consents for new lot development shall be no smaller than 0.8 hectares in area, and the maximum lot density shall not be exceeded as outlined in Table 9 below. The lot density is determined based on the original Township lot fabric (i.e. as determined by the original crown survey) and shall be pro-rated up or down based on the size of the original Township lot. Any proposed increase to this maximum lot density will require an amendment to this Plan, and will require justification as to the need for additional Rural lot creation.*

**Table 9: Permitted Rural Severances based on Original Township Lot Size**

<b>Original Township Lot Size (in hectares)</b>	<b>Number of Severances Permitted</b>	<b>Total Lots Permitted including the Severed and the Retained</b>
20	1	2
40	3	4
60	4	5
80	5	6

*In order to avoid narrow linear parcels of land, the frontage-to-depth ratio for non-farm sized lots (see Diagram 1 below) shall be a maximum of 1:3 and the lot must conform to the appropriate zoning by-law in reference to minimum lot frontage and other applicable provisions. Justification to go beyond the 1:3 frontage-to-depth ratio shall be justified in a development application, but will not require an amendment to this Plan.*

Majority of the property is located within the Rural designation and straddles two original township lots. The proposed severance # 2 will occur along the township lot line therefore will not create an additional lot within Lot 23, Concession 14. The retained lands are located in an original 40-hectare lot and will not increase the density. Further, both the severed and retained lots will be greater than 0.8 hectares and the frontage-to-depth ratio for the lot is less than 1:3. Therefore, County Planning staff have no concerns.

Section 5.2.2(5) of the County OP states,

*New land uses, including the creation of lots, and new or expanding livestock facilities shall comply with the Provincial MDS formulae. Municipal comprehensive zoning by-laws shall incorporate Provincial MDS formulae.*

The applicant did not submit MDS calculations with the subject application. Provided MDS calculations are done and it is determined that the proposed dwelling can be sufficiently located away from any nearby livestock or manure storage facilities, County Planning staff have no concerns.

Section 8.9.1(4) of the County OP states,

*The following hierarchy of water or sanitary servicing options will be used to evaluate any development applications within the County, except where specific exclusions are made through this Plan or where more detailed policies have been developed in a local official plan or secondary plan. The feasibility of the options will be considered in the following order of priority which will be assessed through a Servicing Options Study in accordance with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) D-5-3 Series Guidelines, or any subsequent update to these Guidelines:*

- d) Individual on-site sewage services and individual on-site water services in accordance with the policies contained in Section 8.9.1.*

From a general planning perspective, it should be ensured that the subject site can safely provide on-site sewage and on-site water servicing.

Appendix A of the County OP indicates the subject lands contain 'Karst'. Section 7.5 states,

*In areas mapped as 'Karst Area' on Appendix A, it will be necessary for the proponent of any planning application to provide an assessment of the proposed area of development. Often, this can be accomplished by on-site test holes, however in some circumstances broader landscape features may indicate karst and may indicate the need for further assessment/confirmation. Depending on the site and the scale of the development, an environmental impact study, Hydrogeological or Karst Study, completed by a qualified individual may be required.*

A karst assessment was submitted with the application and concluded that there was no evidence of geologically historically active karst within the area of the proposed development. Further, the assessment also recommended that the bedrock/soil of the site be inspected at the time of construction, as potential issues may be uncovered, which would require adjustments be made to the foundation and that the onsite septic system not be built in an area with evident features of karst. As there were not findings of karst that would negatively impact the proposed development, County Planning staff have no concerns.

Appendix A of the County OP indicates the subject lands are near to 'Hazardous Forest Types for Wildland Fires'. Section 7.8(2) states,

*Development may however be permitted in lands with Hazardous Forest Types for Wildland Fire where the risk is mitigated in accordance with the 'Wildland Fire Assessment and Mitigation Standards'. Risk mitigation should be addressed as part of an environmental impact study or foresters study.*

An EIS was submitted with the application and provides the necessary mitigation measures. It is recommended that a clearance of 10 metres around all structures is applied, and that if located near a higher risk forest type, a larger setback clearance of 30 metres may be needed. The EIS also recommends that the vegetation within 30 metres of all structures is maintained. Further, the EIS also recommends that landscaping and the use of fire-resistant materials is implemented and that the amount of brush and trees are also managed in order to reduce the fire risk. Provided these mitigation measures are implemented, County Planning staff have no concerns.

Appendix B of the County OP indicates the subject lands contain 'Significant Woodlands'. Section 7.4(1) states,

*No development or site alteration may occur within Significant Woodlands or their adjacent lands unless it has been demonstrated through an environmental impact study, as per Section 7.11 of this Plan, that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions. Adjacent lands are defined in Section 7 and 9.18 of this Plan.*

The EIS states that the proposed development will not negatively impact the ecological function of the Significant Woodlands; therefore County Planning staff have no concerns in this regard. Should the applicant seek to injure or destruct trees on lands that extend more than 15 metres from the outer edge of which a Building Permit has been issued, staff recommend consulting the County's Forestry Management By-law <http://grey.ca/forests-trails>. An exemption to the by-law includes the injuring or destruction of trees required in order to install and provide utilities to the construction or use of the building, structure or thing in respect of which a Building Permit has been issued.

The EIS further notes that the site may contain species at risk, such as a maternity roosting habitat for endangered bat species, which it is recommended that consultation with the MECP occurs before any tree cutting occurs. The EIS also recommends that tree removal occurs outside of the breeding bird season and bat maternity roosting season. In addition, it is recommended that Northern Holly Ferns found on Parcel 2 are relocated to undeveloped areas of the property and that a botanist should survey the

site. Lastly, a raptor nest survey should be completed to determine that raptor nests are not located within the building envelopes.

Appendix E of the County OP indicates the subject lands contain 'Bedrock Drift Thickness Less than 1m' and 'Bedrock Drift Thickness 1m to 8m'. Section 5.6.6(2) states,

*Within Bedrock and Shale Resource Areas shown on Appendix E and on adjacent lands, development and activities which would preclude or hinder the establishment of new operations or access to the resources shall only be permitted if the resource use would not be feasible; or the proposed land use or development serves a greater long-term public interest; and issues of public health, public safety and environmental impact are addressed.*

The Opinion Letter, regarding the extraction of bedrock, submitted with the application states that the resource use is not feasible due to entire site being designated as Significant Woodlands and due to the nearby proximity of residential and recreational uses. Therefore, County Planning staff have no concerns.

County Forests and Trails have reviewed the subject application and have a comment stating *The subject lands directly abut Francis Lake County Forest. No drainage should be diverted toward the County forest. One consideration includes posting signage indicating County Forest lands boundary and that off-trail access is not permitted, in addition to marking trees to further delineate boundary. This is a multi-use forest that permits activities such as hiking, snowshoeing, skiing and hunting. Additionally, this is a working forest that is subject to harvesting.*

Provided that

1. MDS calculations are submitted,
2. Drainage is not directed towards the County forest and appropriate signage is put up regarding the boundary of the forest and that off-trail access is permitted, and
3. Mitigation measures regarding the Hazardous Forest Types for Wildland Fires and Species at Risk are put in place;

County Planning staff have no concerns with the subject application.

The County requests notice of any decision rendered with respect to this file.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Derek McMurdie". The script is cursive and fluid.

Derek McMurdie  
Planner  
(519) 372 0219 ext. 1239  
[Derek.McMurdie@grey.ca](mailto:Derek.McMurdie@grey.ca)  
[www.grey.ca](http://www.grey.ca)