

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Coreena Smith](#)  
**Subject:** Zoning Comments  
**Date:** Thursday, July 18, 2024 4:08:08 PM

---

**\*\* [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.**

Removed the reference to confidential in subject line.. sorry I missed that

Stuart Doyle, C.E.T.  
Barry's Construction

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Good Morning,

See below comments,

## **Official Plan**

Item #9

- Low Density
  - Residential buildings containing 4 units or less. For Clarity, does this mean low density will include singles, townhouses and semis as long as they don't have more than 4 units per lot?
  - **A target of 30 units per ha will be essentially impossible to achieve when only including low density units.** A few examples,
    - Bluewater Development was at 20 units per ha and included a mix of Apartment buildings, Townhouses, Semi-detached and singles. The only way the development achieved 20 units/ha was by incorporating the high density apartment buildings.
    - Northport Meadows Development was at 28.8 units per ha and included 249 apartment units. Again the only way the development achieved 28.8 units/ha is by including the high density apartment buildings.
      - Keep in mind for the proposed low density calculation it appears the high density component would not contribute. There will be a huge gap here...
  - When reviewing a new subdivision how would this be applied? Will the development be sectioned apart to determine the densities levels off the different housing types? Generally this has always be applied to the development as a whole.

Please note we are definitely not opposed to higher density and have generally advocated and applied for higher densities. This was the case recently for our Northport Apartment development. However the targets need to be achievable, practical and viable as a product...

-

## **Zoning By-Law**

### **Bicycle Parking Items #6, #25 and #26**

Item #6

- Definition for Long term bicycle parking includes,
  - Accessible
  - Secure
  - Weather protected
- Definition for Short Term bicycle parking
  - Dedicated area with bike racks

As per Item #25 we would need 0.28 spaces per dwelling unit. In the case of an 83 unit apartment building this would require 24 long terms spaces and 7 Short term spaces as defined in Item #26.

Question/Comment:

- For long term spaces, what does weather protected mean? How will this be interpreted?
- This will take up significant space. Would landscape open space be reduced to accommodate? Only so much room on a property, especially with higher density targets...
- Will both long term and short term parking be required on each site?

### **Electrical Charging Items #7, #9, and #27**

-

As per Item #27, 10% of the spaces would require to be prepped for Level 2 Charging stations.

Question/Comment:

- This requirement may be very difficult to achieve and maintain an acceptable level of service for the charger users (speed of charge). The load required for this amount of chargers is significant and would very difficult to accommodate.
- Has any consultation with suppliers or electrical consultants been conducted for this?
- What does '*designed to permit the future installation*' mean? In item #27. How will this be interpreted?

### **H Symbol For Archeology Item #33**

-

Question/Comment:

- Is this a retroactive clause?
- How will this be applied?

-

## Residential Zones

-  
Question/Comment:

- With parking requirements being lowered will there be an opportunity to reduce the min lot area for apartment buildings?
- For single family, semi-detached etc., interior side yard setbacks could go to 0.9m and exterior side yards could go to 3.0m (this is done in Owen Sound). This would help with increased density and land use. Practically it works well...
- Generally with higher density targets other regulations need to be reviewed/changed. Setbacks, coverage, open space/landscape area, parking etc. **This all needs to work together.** Most of the subdivision applications already seek relief from many of these regulations. This will only be more obvious with higher density targets.
- Height restrictions (R3 and R4) for apartment buildings should be changed to 20.0m. currently R3 and R4 only permit 3 storeys.. based on costs it is unlikely a 3 story apartment building will be constructed. This is very limiting for high density development and makes it unlikely the OP target of 90 units/ha could be achieved.

## ARU Item #1, #18, and #28 to #30

Question/Comment:

- I'm having a bit of difficulty with what is being proposed or permitted for ARUs. An overview would be appreciated
- In Item #18 it defines parking requirement for ARU in a non-commercial zone. For clarity does this mean that if a property with a SFD had 4 ARU's that it would require 4 parking spaces + 1 visitor .

## Summary

- Changes to the bicycles parking and EV charges are significant and should be reviewed with a practical lens.
- The notes in the amendment tracker indicate a review of other municipal regulations from both large and small jurisdictions. In a quick glance at a ZBL in the tri-city area there are significant differences with respect to zoning regulations,
  - 55% coverage
  - 60% of driveway width for townhouses
  - Smaller setbacks, and lot sizes
  - Etc....
- Although we agree with the direction of the updates towards higher density and more efficient land use, the implementation may be difficult if other areas of the by-laws are not reviewed and changed in order to accommodate the additional units.
- Targets need to be reasonable, flexible and recognize a local perspective.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and please feel free to reach out if there would be a benefit for further discussion.

Regards,

Stuart Doyle, C.E.T.  
Barry's Construction

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



July 22, 2024

Coreena Smith  
Senior Planner  
Planning and Development  
Corporation of the County of Bruce  
30 Park St., PO BOX 70  
Walkerton, Ontario N0G 2V0

Dear Ms. Smith,

**RE: Local Official Plan Amendment L-2024-007 and Zoning By-law Amendment Z-2024-025 (Saugeen Shores 2024 Amendment)  
Comments regarding Southampton Landing Subdivision  
OUR FILE: 23165A**

---

We act on behalf of Seaton Southampton Ltd. and Castle Village Developments Inc. with respect to Phase III of the Southampton Landing Subdivision.

The Southampton Landing Subdivision (the "subdivision") is located to the south of the Southampton downtown along Railway Street (Highway 21). The subdivision includes a total of 87 lots, a townhouse block, a commercial block (Block 92) and blocks for parkland, stormwater management facilities and environmental protection.

On behalf of our client, we have reviewed the draft Local Official Plan Amendment (L-2024-007) and Zoning By-law Amendment (Z-2024-025) and have prepared the following comments regarding the changes proposed to encourage greater housing diversity and intensification.

**Four Residential Units**

The Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment seeks to allow up to four residential units per serviced residential lot and establish appropriate regulations. We have reviewed and support the proposed Official Plan policies related to the provision of Additional Dwelling Units.

The draft Zoning By-law proposes new definitions and regulations for the R1 zone to allow up to four residential units on a lot. Generally, we support the proposed regulations for the R1 zone as they will allow for opportunities for intensification within residential neighbourhoods and allow for a greater variety of housing within the community.

In reviewing the proposed zoning regulations, we have the following specific comments:

### *Terminology*

The Staff Report contains a table titled *Proposed Amendments to the Zoning By-law*. Within this table, revised or new definitions are provided for: 'multi-unit building', 'triplex', and 'fourplex'. The definition of Multi-Unit includes triplex and fourplex.

This table also includes revision to the Residential First Density ("R1") zone. Within the list of permitted uses, multi-unit building is included but triplex and fourplex are not. However, in the proposed regulations, references are made to fourplex buildings.

We recommend consistently applying the term multi-unit building or triplex and fourplex in order to provide clarity in interpretation.

### *Building Height*

The maximum building height for the R1 zone is proposed to be maintained at 10 metres. We request consideration that a maximum building height of 11 metres be applied for multi-unit buildings in the R1 zone.

A maximum building height of 11 metres is considered to be appropriate as will allow for the establishing a usable third level within a multi-unit (fourplex) buildings. The proposed 11 metre height will be similar to and compatible with single detached and duplex dwellings, which have a maximum building height of 10 storeys. A height increase of one metre for multi-unit buildings is a minor increase to the maximum permitted height.

### *Parking*

The proposed parking requirements for triplex and fourplexes are: 2 spaces per residential unit. Therefore, a triplex would require six parking spaces and a fourplex would require eight parking spaces. The rate proposed for a triplex and fourplex is the same rate per unit as required for a single detached dwelling, despite that occupancy will be less on a per unit basis. No parking rate is provided for multi-unit buildings.

In our view, the parking rate for a triplex, fourplex or a multi-unit building should be consistent with the parking rate for a townhouse which requires one parking space per unit plus one visitor parking space for every four units. The proposed rate would require five spaces for a building containing four units.

Fourplexes and triplexes represent a multiple residential form of development that efficiently use a site through shared driveway access, walkways and landscaped areas, etc. As a result of the design, visitor parking areas can also be shared between the units. The proposed zoning regulations ensure that one parking space per unit and a dedicated visitor parking space is provided.

Further, it is noted that the minimum required lot area is 450m<sup>2</sup> and lot frontage is 12m<sup>2</sup> for multi-unit buildings in the R1 zone. The minimum lot frontage and lot area regulations are sufficient to accommodate a triplex or fourplex dwelling, however, they do not support the provision of eight parking spaces.

## Highway Commercial Lands

The staff report indicates that through the proposed OPA it is intended that medium and high density residential uses are to be permitted within the Highway Commercial designation and zone. Specifically, Rows 14 and 15 of the table titled *Proposed Amendments to the Official Plan* includes proposed implementing official plan policies that state:

*"3.12.1.5 Medium and High-density residential uses shall be permitted on commercial lands as an integral part of a commercial establishment provided, they do not constitute a safety hazard and off-street parking is provided."*

*3.12.2.1 To encourage Highway Commercial developments that do not adversely affect the commercial activities contained in the Core Commercial designation and encourage residential expansion where applicable.*

The reasoning for these policies provide that:

*This policy change is intended to allow compatible medium and high density residential uses in the Highway Commercial zone.*

and

*Additional wording to encourage compatible and appropriate medium to high residential uses in the Highway Commercial Zone.*

Although the proposed Official Plan policies and rationale provide that the policies are to encourage medium and high residential uses in the Highway Commercial Zone, an implementing zoning regulation is not included. Therefore, the Highway Commercial Zone would not permit high or medium density residential uses.

We respectfully request that the companion zoning by-law amendment be revised to allow for medium and high density residential uses in the Highway Commercial zone, and that regulations for residential uses be established.

We further request consideration that Section 13.4.3 of the zoning by-law not apply to mixed use developments. Section 13.4.3 establishes a minimum gross floor area for stand-alone retail, office and food store uses in the HC zone. Removing this provision allows for flexibility for lands to develop as mixed use buildings, containing retail at grade, or as a mixed-use site with commercial and stand alone residential buildings. This change further allows for flexibility in site and/or building design and facilitates a greater range in commercial uses.

Allowing for multiple residential uses in the Highway Commercial Zone would facilitate the development of Block 92 and also serve to expand the range of dwelling unit types permitted within the draft approved Plan of Subdivision and the broader community. Expanding the range of dwelling unit types permitted on the subject lands is consistent with the direction from the Town's Attainable Housing Task Force Final Report, February 2, 2021.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We would be pleased to discuss with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Yours truly,



**Emily Elliott, BES, MCIP, RPP**

Partner

cc. Jeremy Grant, Jordan Grant, Harry Marshall, Jay Pausner, Candace Hamm, Julie Steeper



**From:** Emily Elliott [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2024 3:26 PM  
**To:** Coreena Smith <CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] Candace Hamm <candace.hamm@saugeenshores.ca>; Julie Steeper <JSteeper@brucecounty.on.ca>  
**Subject:** Local Official Plan Amendment L-2024-007 and Zoning By-law Amendment Z-2024-025

---

**\*\* [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 Coreena,

Thanks for the reply. I tried to give you a call around 2:15 but wasn't able to reach you. I'll try again at 4:00.

As you know, we act on behalf of Seaton Southampton Ltd. and Castle Village Developments Inc. with respect to Phase III of the Southampton Landing Subdivision. I previously provided a letter with comments on L-2024-007 and Z-2024-025, dated July 22, 2024.

I have reviewed the draft OPA and ZBA that is scheduled to be considered by Council at its meeting this evening. I appreciate that the definitions and permitted uses have been revised and that the parking rates for various forms of multiple residential development have been adjusted.

However, I note that new regulations for triplexes and fourplexes have been established. These regulations were not put forward in the proposed zoning issued in the spring and considered at the Public Meeting. I am concerned with the zoning regulations proposed for triplexes and fourplexes in the R1 and R2 zones. **The draft By-law proposes a minimum lot area is 250m<sup>2</sup> per unit and a minimum lot frontage is 10 metres per unit for a triplex and fourplex. For a fourplex, this would result in a minimum lot area of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> per unit and a minimum lot frontage of 40 metres. In our view, this is significantly greater than what is required to accommodate a fourplex on a lot and we request consideration of a reduction to these minimum requirements.**

As you know, we submitted a Zoning By-law Amendment for the Southampton Landing Subdivision, which sought permission to allow for fourplexes on lots with a frontage of 19 metres and a minimum lot area of 700 square metres. Our request was based on a well-designed building that fit comfortably on a lot and was consistent with the lotting of the surrounding subdivision. A fourplex or triplex design is an efficient built form as dwelling units can be configured side by side and/or stacked, thereby minimizing the building footprint. Through the pre-consultation process, staff did not express concerns with the proposal, specifically with the lot area or frontage proposed. However, through this municipally initiated review, fourplex lot areas and frontages that are more than twice what is proposed for Southampton Landing are being put forward.

Requiring a lot area of 1,000 square metres and frontage of 40 square metres will result in excessively large lots that are not representative of the overall lot fabric of the community. Further, it will limit the ability to provide fourplex dwellings on many properties in the community, including within the Southampton Landing Subdivision. This will have the effect of impacting the ability to provide housing choice and affordability options in existing and emerging neighbourhoods. I would also note that the lot area and frontage requirements for triplexes and fourplexes in the R1 and R2 zones exceed the minimum requirements for apartment buildings in higher density residential zones.

We are also disappointed that the draft zoning by-law did not include provision for stand-alone residential in the HC zone. In our view, stand-alone residential can support a mixed-use site or a mixed-use area.

**We understand that Council is considering the OPA and ZBA at the meeting this evening. We request that Council consider reduced lot frontage and area provisions in the R1 and R2 zone for fourplexes and triplexes and suggest:**

- **Minimum lot frontage: 4.75m per unit**
- **Minimum lot area: 175 square metres per unit**

**Alternatively, we request Council defer this application to allow further analysis of the zoning regulations for fourplexes and triplexes.**

Thank you for consideration of our comments.

Regards,  
Emily

**EMILY ELLIOTT, BES, MCIP, RPP**  
Partner

**MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture**



**From:** Froese, Amanda  
**Sent:** Friday, July 19, 2024 3:50 PM  
**To:** Coreena Smith  
**Subject:** RE: L-2024-007, Z-2024-025 Saugeen Shores Housekeeping Application

---

\*\* [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.

Coreena,

After submitted I thought of something else. With the density target of 30 units per hectare, I think that the minimum lot areas should be removed from the Zoning bylaw altogether. It's counter productive to make the developers have larger/deeper lots. I also think that the setbacks should be reviewed. The distance from the house to the street, maybe the driveway is a minimum 6m to property line, but the house could be as close as 3m, and porches 1.5m. This would enable a longer living space. Side yard setback at 1.2m I think is adequate and shouldn't be reduced because of access to the ARUs. A 1m sidewalk and landing is what is needed for building code I believe, and then there is some room for the side-yard swale with the 1.2m (not much but some way to at least accommodate flow between dwellings (combined is 0.4m). The rear yards too, in condos you don't get 7.5m back yards, in Kitchener for example they only need to provide something like 11m<sup>2</sup> per unit of private amenity space. Maybe [REDACTED] and drainage easements a minimum width of 5-6m is required (including a 3m easement for access/drainage) and everywhere else a 4-5m rear yard. Clarity on how easements get registered, included shared access easement for driveways, I would hate to see that every time this is needed after draft plan that a consent application is needed, maybe they can be tied into the driveway permit and the Zoning Compliance Person could be delegated the authority to approve for the shared access one. Finally lot coverage should be reviewed and eliminated. If density is what the Town desires, then we can't have the greenspace on the lots remain the same. If a house meets the setbacks, that should be enough since they are designed to set the look and feel of the subdivision.

Amanda Froese, P. Eng. FEC  
Senior Project Manager, Owen Sound Branch Manager

GEI



**From:** Coreena Smith  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 17, 2024 9:12 AM  
**To:** Froese, Amanda: Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub  
**Cc:** Candace Hamm Jay Pausner Kristen Sears  
**Subject:** [EXT] RE: L-2024-007, Z-2024-025 Saugeen Shores Housekeeping Application

**EXTERNAL EMAIL**

Good morning,



Thank you for your email.

Your comments have been received and will be included in staff reports for consideration by the Town of Saugeen Shores and the County of Bruce. You will receive future notices related to Local Official Plan Amendment file L-2024-007 and Zoning By-law Amendment file Z-2024-025.

I am the Planner on this file and will review these with Town staff.

Sincerely,

**From:** Froese, Amanda

**Sent:** Thursday, July 11, 2024 10:19 AM

**To:** Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub

**Cc:** Candace Hamm Jay Pausner

**Subject:** L-2024-007, Z-2024-025 Saugeen Shores Housekeeping Application

You don't often get email from. [Learn why this is important](#)

**\*\* [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 morning,

I would like to start by saying that it is great to see the Town working towards getting policies in place to support intensification and a range of housing options. I think this really supports the ideal that has been in place for quite a while of having houses built in the existing settlement area, and where services already exist.

I could use some clarifications on the proposed changes, and some considerations for you:

Regulation	Amendment	Reasoning	Comments/Questions	Regulation
2.	1.2.1.2c) & <a href="#">3.3.3.2</a> To require a minimum of 30% of all new housing to be medium or high-density development.	1.2.1.2c) & <a href="#">3.3.3.2</a> To require a minimum of 35% of all new housing to be medium or high-density development.	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase minimum % of housing to be medium or high-density to encourage greater intensification/development of housing.	Is this overall in Saugeen Shores or 35% in each development?
11.	<a href="#">3.4.2.2</a> Maximum Density  3.4.2.2.1 The following maximum gross residential densities will be permitted when assessing applications for new Medium Density Residential.  Housing Type Maximum Density	<a href="#">3.4.2.2</a> Maximum Density  3.4.2.2.1 The following maximum gross residential densities will be permitted when assessing applications for new Medium Density Residential.  Housing Type Maximum Density  <u>Medium Density</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment to simplify housing type as well as to increase maximum density for medium-density housing development as a result of greater intensification permissions and housing types to be permitted in low density (R1 & R2). Proposed densities have been reviewed and compared to other municipalities both larger and smaller to ensure appropriate development.  <input type="checkbox"/> Definitions amended from dwelling to building.	What is the minimum density for Medium Density?

	<p>Medium Density</p> <p>Triplexes, 40 units</p> <p>fourplexes, per gross</p> <p>townhouses, hectare apartment</p> <p>buildings and other forms of multi-unit dwellings having 3 or more units.</p>	<p>Residential building 90 units per containing more gross hectare than 4 units</p>		
13.	<p><a href="#">3.8.3.1</a> Permitted uses shall include existing commercial recreational facilities such as: golf courses; private parks; campgrounds including recreational vehicles; outdoor or indoor sports facilities; existing trailer parks; and accessory residences and offices to a permitted recreational use; and accessory uses such as restaurants, snack bars, parking areas and auxiliary buildings.</p>	<p>1 Permitted uses shall include existing commercial recreational facilities such as: golf courses; private parks; campgrounds including recreational vehicles; outdoor or indoor sports facilities; existing trailer parks; and accessory residences and offices to a permitted recreational use; and accessory uses such as restaurants, snack bars, parking areas and auxiliary buildings.</p> <p>Low-density residential uses shall also be permitted where full municipal services are provided to promote diversification of housing and efficiently use the current recreational land, resources, infrastructure, and public service facilities, and support the use of active transportation.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> This policy change is intended to allow the Town to expand its current housing inventory all while continuing to protect current recreational land.</p>	<p>For this, it may be appropriate not to be on full services, most of the trailer parks or golf courses are not in areas with full services, and partial services or private services could be appropriate to facilitate the development.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stormwater Management Plan;</li> <li>Tree Preservation Report and Plan;</li> <li>Hydrogeological Assessment;</li> <li>Watershed or Sub-watershed Study;</li> <li>Floodline Delineation Report;</li> <li>Architectural/Urban Design Study;</li> <li>Environmental Site Assessment;</li> <li>Planning Justification Report;</li> <li>Ministry of the Environment (MOE) Record of Site Condition (RSC);</li> <li>Contaminant Management Plan;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stormwater Management Plan;</li> <li>Tree Preservation Report and Plan;</li> <li>Hydrogeological Assessment;</li> <li>Watershed or Sub-watershed Study;</li> <li>Floodline Delineation Report;</li> <li>Architectural/Urban Design Study;</li> <li>Environmental Site Assessment;</li> <li>Planning Justification Report;</li> <li>Ministry of the Environment (MOE) Record of Site Condition (RSC);</li> <li>Contaminant Management Plan;</li> </ul>		<p>MECP Record of Site Condition is written twice, and is only required in the Planning Act when down zoning correct?</p> <p>Erosion and Sediment Control Plans are quite detailed and should be covered in the Stormwater Management Report</p> <p>Having TOR for these studies in the development manual would be good, like the TMP has for Traffic Impact Studies.</p>

	<p>Environmental Impact Statement;  Archaeological Assessment;  Heritage Impact Assessment;  Wind Study;  Noise Study;  Vibration Study;  Geotechnical Study;  Slope Stability Study;  Market/Retail Impact Study or Analysis;  Fiscal Impact Assessment;  Health Impact Assessment;  Conceptual Site Plan and Building Elevations;  Erosion and Sediment Control Plans;  Record of Site Condition; or,  Copy of the property deed.</p>	<p>Environmental Impact Statement;  Archaeological Assessment;  Heritage Impact Assessment;  Wind Study;  Noise Study;  Vibration Study;  Geotechnical Study;  Slope Stability Study;  Market/Retail Impact Study or Analysis;  Fiscal Impact Assessment;  Health Impact Assessment;  Conceptual Site Plan and Building Elevations;  Erosion and Sediment Control Plans;  Record of Site Condition; or,  Copy of the property deed.</p> <p>Town staff may require additional documents as deemed necessary.</p>		
19.	<p>6.11.1 In accordance with the Planning Act, Council may pass a By-law incorporating the use of the Holding symbol (H) in conjunction with any zone of a Zoning By-law. Where such Holding (H) symbols are indicated, no new use may be provided, or building or structure erected on the site unless an application is made to remove the (H) symbol and such application is approved.</p> <p>6.11.2 It is intended that the Holding (H) symbol be used where the ultimate or desired use for specific lands is known, but it is appropriate to delay the actual development until such time as certain objectives are met. The objective of utilizing a Holding Provision is to ensure that:</p>	<p>6.11.1 In accordance with the Planning Act, Council may pass a By-law applying the use of a Holding symbol (H) in conjunction with any zoning category in the Zoning By-law. Where such Holding (H) symbols are applied, no development or new use shall be permitted on such lands unless otherwise permitted in the Zoning By-law or until such (H) symbol is removed by amendment.</p> <p>6.11.2 The Holding (H) symbol shall be applied to the specific lands where such lands are zoned for their future intended use until such time as certain objectives are met. The objective of applying a Holding Provision is to the identified lands is ensure that:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Refinements to language to align with County Implementation Amendment which provides more specific language around holding removals</p>	<p>It would be very helpful to have a good description in the bylaw as to what the hold is there for and what is needed for it to be lifted. i.e. the old ones in Southampton just say for servicing, but it isn't clear what the issue is in some areas by the time the land goes to be developed.</p> <p>Can the hold be lifted by the Town if the issue is resolved automatically without the developer's involvement? Such as capacity restrictions at the treatment facility or in downstream sewers?</p>

	a) the appropriate phasing of development or redevelopment occurs;	a) the appropriate phasing of development or redevelopment occurs;		
23.	<p>The Secondary Plan Process establishes a more detailed planning framework for a particular area in support of the general policy framework established in this Plan.</p> <p>Secondary Plans shall be prepared by the Town, in consultation with and at the expense of the affected landowners within the Secondary Plan Area, or may be funded as growth related studies through the Development Charges Act.</p> <p>Secondary Plans shall incorporate the following:</p> <p>Overall development concept for the area, including principles, objectives and assumptions for the development of the area;</p> <p>Population and household targets for the Secondary Plan area;</p>	<p>Secondary Plans establish a detailed planning framework applied to a specific area in support of the general policy framework established in this Plan.</p> <p>Secondary Plans shall be prepared by the Town, in consultation with and at the expense of the affected landowners within the Secondary Plan Area, or may be funded as growth related studies through the Development Charges Act.</p> <p>Secondary Plans shall incorporate the following:</p> <p>Overall development concept for the area, including principles, objectives and assumptions for the development of the area;</p> <p>Population and household targets for the Secondary Plan area;</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Small reduction in word count	<p>Could the Town initiate one for the south end of Port Elgin, to try to get the MTO and County involved with the multiple land owners in that area, potential reconfiguration of BR25 and 33, connecting link and adding a municipal road at the airport, connecting the Ens Property and Snyder's pit lands to the Innovation Park.</p>
	<p>conformity with the goals and strategic objectives of this Plan.</p> <p>6.25.2 Site Plan Control and agreements shall be utilized by the Town to ensure:</p> <p>safe, orderly and functional development;</p> <p>safety and efficiency of vehicular and pedestrian access;</p> <p>land use compatibility between new and existing development;</p> <p>the location, massing and conceptual design of any buildings and structures;</p> <p>the provision of functional and attractive on-site amenities and facilities such as landscaping,</p>	<p>conformity with the goals and strategic objectives of this Plan.</p> <p>6.25.2 Site Plan Control and agreements shall be utilized by the Town to ensure:</p> <p>safe, orderly and functional development;</p> <p>safety and efficiency of vehicular and pedestrian access;</p> <p>land use compatibility between new and existing development;</p> <p>the location, massing and conceptual design of any buildings and structures;</p> <p>the provision of functional and attractive on-site amenities and facilities such as landscaping, fencing</p>		<p>Is there a place that defines "Development". I.e. If a property owner decided to increase parking does that constitute development and require a Site Plan Agreement (assuming one does not existing to be modified)? This could affect the ARUs in R1 or home occupations, if the definition loosely applies.</p>

	<p>fencing and low impact lighting to enhance the urban design policies of this Plan;</p> <p>the provision, appropriate placement, and construction elements of required services such as driveways, parking, loading facilities and garbage storage, snow storage and garbage collection;</p> <p>the preservation and enhancement of vegetative areas;</p> <p>the provision of easements or grading and site alterations necessary to provide for public utilities and site drainage;</p> <p>exterior design including character, scale, appearance, and design features of buildings and their sustainable design;</p> <p>sustainable design elements on any adjoining roadway owned by the Town of Saugeen Shores, including without</p>	<p>and low impact lighting to enhance the urban design policies of this Plan;</p> <p>the provision, appropriate placement, and construction elements of required services such as driveways, parking, loading facilities and garbage storage, snow storage and garbage collection;</p> <p>the preservation and enhancement of vegetative areas;</p> <p>the provision of easements or grading and site alterations necessary to provide for public utilities and site drainage; i) exterior design including character, scale, appearance, and design features of buildings and their sustainable design;</p> <p>i) sustainable design elements on any adjoining roadway owned by the Town of Saugeen Shores, including without</p>		
		<p>bylaws to a committee or an authorized municipal officer, provided that all notice and public meeting requirements are met and in accordance with the following:</p> <p>Delegated authority is limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. applying or removing Holding ""H"" symbols;</li> <li>ii. temporary use by-laws; and</li> <li>iii. minor administrative amendments, such as zoning amendments to reflect minor lot boundary adjustments.</li> </ul> <p>Council may apply conditions to its delegation of authority.</p>		<p>This would be good for infrastructure holds, like when the treatment plant is upgraded and the development was on hold for capacity reasons. If these hold could be lifted automatically and by staff, then the developer wouldn't have to pay to have it lifted even, or wait. They could go straight to building permits for example if the development was already registered.</p>
4.	NEW DEFINITION	<p>“ON-FARM DIVERSIFIED USE”</p> <p>means uses that are secondary to the principal agricultural use of the property and are limited in area. On-farm diversified uses include, but are not limited to:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Refining of Agriculture definitions (as per PPS) due to addition of additional agriculture related definitions. Permits additional on- farm/agriculture related uses.</p>	<p>I think that this should include seasonal trailer sites (transient) banquet halls, restaurants, outdoor storage, contractor yards, repair shops and retail. This would help support the agricultural industry by allowing for diversification. In the details, it could limit size,</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ home occupations, see Section 2;</li> <li>□ home industries, refer to Section see Section 2 and Section 3.11;</li> <li>□ value-added uses meaning the process of agricultural commodities into new forms that enhance their value (including uses that use feedstock from outside the surrounding agricultural area such as a bakery, café, winery, cheese factory, abattoir);</li> <li>□ agri-tourism meaning farm-related tourism uses (including limited accommodation such as a bed and breakfast); and</li> <li>□ recreation uses meaning leisure time activity undertaken in built or natural settings (including, hay rides, petting zoo, farm-themed playground, horse trail rides, corn maze and seasonal events).</li> </ul> <p>Excludes equipment or vehicle dealerships, hotels, manufacturing plants, trucking yards, golf courses, soccer fields, ball diamonds or arena, churches, schools, nursing homes, cemeteries, large food processors,</p>		scale or have a required lot area to accommodate instead.
8.	NEW DEFINITION	<p>“FOURPLEX BUILDING” means a building consisting of a maximum of four (4) residential units, each with an independent entrance either directly from the outside, or through a common vestibule or common halls.</p>	<p>□ New fourplex definition to allow up to a maximum of four (4) residential units on a low-density residential lot.</p>	<p>This is different than a residence with 3 ARUs though, so how is that differentiated? - Multi-Unit also has a maximum of 4 units. (note that it is confusing that this definition has a max of 4-units. Why would a building with 3 units be called a fourplex?) how does this relate to townhouses?</p>
10.	<p>“MULTI-UNIT BUILDING” means buildings located on a lot that collectively consist of three (3) or more residential units, and may include one or more of the following buildings: single-detached building, semi-detached building, duplex building or townhouse building.</p>	<p>“MULTI-UNIT BUILDING” means buildings located on a lot that collectively consists of a maximum of (4) residential units, and may include one or more of the following buildings: single-detached building, semi-detached building, duplex building, townhouse building, triplex building or fourplex building.</p>	<p>□ Addition of triplex and fourplex to existing definition as per proposed changes.</p>	<p>Is this within one building or within one lot? Wording implies that all the buildings on the lot add up to a maximum of 4 units. So a house with a carriage house rented out is “a multi-unit building” however it is two buildings.</p>

13.	NEW DEFINITION	"TRIPLEX BUILDING" means a building consisting of a maximum of three (3) residential units, each with an independent entrance either directly from the outside, or through a common vestibule or common halls.	<input type="checkbox"/> New triplex definition to allow up to a maximum of three (3) residential units on a low-density residential lot. Created in alignment with Bill 23.	Question Maximum 3 – units, should just be 3 units does this exclude townhouses?
14.	"TOWNHOUSE BUILDING" means a building that is divided vertically into between a minimum of three (3) residential units and a maximum of six (6) residential units by common walls extending from the base of the foundation to the roof line, each with an independent entrance to a yard immediately abutting the unit.	"TOWNHOUSE BUILDING" means a building that is divided vertically into between a minimum of three (3) residential units by common walls extending from the base of the foundation to the roof line, each with an independent entrance to a yard immediately abutting the unit.	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase maximum residential units to allow for additional housing	Clarity is needed on the differences between townhouses, triplexes and fourplexes.
16.	<p>3.11 HOME INDUSTRY</p> <p>Where a Home Industry is permitted the following provisions shall apply:</p> <p>(a) Permitted Home Industry Uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. A carpenter’s shop;</li> <li>. A contractors shop;</li> <li>i. An electrician’s shop;</li> <li>v. A farm animal breeding establishment;</li> <li>. A farm implement and equipment service establishment;</li> <li>i. A farm related tourist establishment;</li> <li>ii. A farrier;</li> <li>iii. A pet grooming shop;</li> <li>x. A pest control establishment</li> <li>. A plumber’s shop;</li> <li>i. The sale and storage of grains, feeds, fertilizers and related agricultural products;</li> </ul> <p>A small engines repair shop;</p>	<p>3.11 HOME INDUSTRY</p> <p>Where a Home Industry is permitted the following provisions shall apply:</p> <p>(a) Permitted Home Industry Uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. A carpenter’s shop;</li> <li>. A contractors shop;</li> <li>i. An electrician’s shop;</li> <li>v. A farm animal breeding establishment;</li> <li>. A farm implement and equipment service establishment;</li> <li>i. A farm related tourist establishment;</li> <li>ii. A farrier;</li> <li>iii. A pet grooming shop;</li> <li>x. A pest control establishment</li> <li>. A plumber’s shop;</li> <li>i. The sale and storage of grains, feeds, fertilizers and related agricultural products;</li> <li>ii. A small engines repair shop;</li> <li>iii. A tack shop, including the sale and storage of equine products;</li> </ul> <p>A welder’s shop;</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Addition of landscape business and veterinarian clinic under home industry to permit use in additional Agricultural Zones while regulating the use and size. Home Industry regulations are more restrictive than that of an on-farm diversified use	Should farm breeding and implements, ferrier, etc be restricted to the Ag zone like the Vet one is?

19.	<p>3.24.3 Accessible Parking</p> <p>Included in the number of parking spaces required herein for all uses, save and except for Residential uses, shall be parking spaces designed for persons with a physical disability, in accordance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act and its regulations.</p>	<p>3.24.3 Accessible Parking</p> <p>Accessible parking spaces shall be included in the number of parking spaces required herein for all uses, and designed for persons with a physical disability in accordance with the provisions of this section:</p> <p>Accessible Parking Rates</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Requiring a minimum number of accessible parking spaces to be provided based on the total parking requirements of the proposal. This includes minimum design/dimension requirements to ensure accessibility of such stalls.</p>	<p>For ARUs that need 5 spaces (4-units), does one of those 5 need to be designated accessible?</p>
22.	<p>j) Each required parking space shall be readily accessible at all times for the parking or removal of a vehicle and vehicular access to any such parking space shall not be impeded by any obstruction. This provision shall not apply to prevent the use as a parking space of any part of a</p>	<p>j) Each required parking space shall be readily accessible at all times for the parking or removal of a vehicle and vehicular access to any such parking space shall not be impeded by any obstruction. This provision shall not apply to prevent the use as a parking space of any part of a driveway accessory to a single building,</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Change in language as a result of revisions to previous definitions and addition of new definitions.</p>	<p>To confirm:</p> <p>You can have tandem parking spaces as long as they are for the same unit in a house with ARUs, but no parking can obstruct parking to another unit?</p> <p>I think a simple wording is “Each required parking space shall be readily accessible at all times for the parking or removal of a vehicle and vehicular access to any such parking space shall not be impeded by any obstruction, except where the obstruction is for the same unit as the parking space. i.e. tandem parking is allowed for each unit, but cannot be used for different units.</p>
23.	<p>NEW REGULATION</p>	<p>m) The minimum entrance separation shall be 22.5 metres</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Currently permit 1 additional driveway for each additional 30m of frontage but do not regulate the distance required between driveways.</p>	<p>Is this on a single property? Or for commercial sites only? Does it apply to residences with ARUs – because lot sizes (12m) are small and could not apply, for ARUs, with parking spaces side by side, is this considered one driveway?</p>

I think considerations from this bylaw also need to be reviewed in terms of impact on engineering. The minimum water size for a 4-plex for example is a 50mm diameter service, whereas for single family (R1) it is 20mm. if someone was to build a house with 3 ARUs, would they need to dig up and replace the water service?

Thank you for taking the time to consider my thoughts and once again I applaud your efforts.

GEI | Amanda Froese, P. Eng. FEC  
Senior Project Manager, Owen Sound Branch Manager



**Coreena Smith**  
**Senior Planner**  
Planning and Development  
Corporation of the County of Bruce

**Office: 226-909-1601**  
**Direct: 1-226-909-6305**  
[www.brucecounty.on.ca](http://www.brucecounty.on.ca)

Individuals who submit letters and other information to Council and its Committees should be aware that any personal information contained within their communications may become part of the public record and may be made available through the agenda process which includes publication on the County's website.

If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies (electronic or otherwise). Thank you for your cooperation.

If you feel that this email was commercial in nature and you do not wish to receive further electronic messages from the County of Bruce, please click on the following link to unsubscribe: [Unsubscribe](#). Please be advised that this may restrict our ability to send messages to you in the future.

**From:** [Coreena Smith](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [Kristen Sears](#); [Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Dasa - 4 unit buildings  
**Date:** Thursday, August 22, 2024 12:46:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.jpg](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)

---

Thanks Derek,

Because the agenda is being posted today, I will either forward these comments to Council separately or include them verbally in my presentation to Council at the meeting on Monday evening.  
Sincerely,

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2024 12:08 PM  
**To:** Coreena Smith <[CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca](mailto:CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca)>  
**Cc:** Kristen Sears <[kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)>; Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub <[bcplpe@brucecounty.on.ca](mailto:bcplpe@brucecounty.on.ca)>  
**Subject:** Re: Dasa - 4 unit buildings

**\*\* [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.

Hey Coreena

Thank you for the email! Do you think the comments are of any help?

Please use if you think it will help out

Talk soon

---

**From:** Coreena Smith <[CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca](mailto:CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2024 12:55:28 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Kristen Sears <[kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)>; Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub <[bcplpe@brucecounty.on.ca](mailto:bcplpe@brucecounty.on.ca)>  
**Subject:** FW: Dasa - 4 unit buildings

Derek,

Kristen forwarded your comments to me. Could you please let me know if you would like these comments included in the agenda for the Council meeting next week?

Thanks,

---

**From:** Kristen Sears <[kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)>

**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2024 11:09 AM

**To:** Coreena Smith <[CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca](mailto:CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca)>

**Subject:** FW: Dasa - 4 unit buildings

**\*\* [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 Coreena,

Jay and I had met with Derek to review some of the proposed amendments. Derek was in support of the revisions and wanted to reiterate that through his comments as provided below and as it relates to specifically allowing four residential units per lot and reduced parking rates for ARU's.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Happy to chat further later today.

Kristen

## Kristen Sears

### Planning Policy Coordinator

Town of Saugeen Shores

600 Tomlinson Drive, Box 820, Port Elgin ON N0H 2C0

T 519-832-2008 ext 157

E [kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** August 19, 2024 9:44 AM

**To:** Kristen Sears <[kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)>

**Subject:** Re: Dasa - 4 unit buildings

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Sounds great yes please forward thank you

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Kristen Sears <[kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)>

**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2024 9:33:37 AM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Dasa - 4 unit buildings

Hi Derek,

It was also nice to meet you. Thank you for your comments.

I apologize for the delay in my response as I was away on vacation and just trying to get caught up on my emails.

Please let me know if you would like me to forward your comments to Coreena who is the planner on file.

The Housing amendment is currently tentatively scheduled for August 26<sup>th</sup>.

Thank you and all the best,

Kristen

## Kristen Sears

### Planning Policy Coordinator

Town of Saugeen Shores

600 Tomlinson Drive, Box 820, Port Elgin ON N0H 2C0

T 519-832-2008 ext 157

E [kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)



The information contained in this message is directed in confidence solely to the person(s) named above and may not be otherwise distributed, copied or disclosed. The message may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection and Privacy Act. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately advising of the error and delete the message without making a copy. Thank You

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** August 7, 2024 1:43 PM  
**To:** Kristen Sears <[kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)>  
**Subject:** Dasa - 4 unit buildings

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Kristen

Derek here from Dasa properties. Nice to meet you last week.

For what its worth, allowing 4 units on R1 lots would allow our group to move ahead with a handful of builds that we will not be able to move ahead with if we can only do 3 units per an R1 Lot. The financials and loan amounts will not work with only 3 units.

Also for parking it is very difficult to have 1.25 spaces for every 1 unit due to set backs and green space requirements. We are also hoping for 1 parking space per rental unit.

If this is allowed, we will be able to build more rentals.

Talk soon

Derek

**Coreena Smith**  
Senior Planner  
Planning and Development  
Corporation of the County of Bruce

Office: 226-909-1601  
Direct: 1-226-909-6305  
[www.brucecounty.on.ca](http://www.brucecounty.on.ca)



Individuals who submit letters and other information to Council and its Committees should be aware that any personal information contained within their communications may become part of the public record and may be made available through the agenda process which includes publication on the County's website.

If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies (electronic or otherwise). Thank you for your cooperation.

If you feel that this email was commercial in nature and you do not wish to receive further electronic messages from the County of Bruce, please click on the following link to unsubscribe: [Unsubscribe](#). Please be advised that this may restrict our ability to send messages to you in the future.



**From:** [Coreena Smith](#)  
**To:** [Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Housekeeping Amendments to the Saugeen Shores Official Plan and Zoning By-law  
**Date:** Monday, October 28, 2024 10:19:43 AM

---

**From:** Emily Elliott [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 16, 2024 1:44 PM  
**To:** Coreena Smith <[CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca](mailto:CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca)>  
**Cc:** Kristen Sears <[kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)>; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Housekeeping Amendments to the Saugeen Shores Official Plan and Zoning By-law

**\*\* [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 Correena,

Thanks for sending this through. We have reviewed and have no concerns with the proposed revisions to the R1 and R2 zones as they relate to triplex and fourplexes.

Look forward to continuing to work with you.

Emily

**EMILY ELLIOTT, BES, MCIP, RPP | Partner**  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Coreena Smith <[CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca](mailto:CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca)>  
**Sent:** October 11, 2024 1:43 PM  
**To:** Coreena Smith <[CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca](mailto:CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca)>  
**Cc:** Kristen Sears <[kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)>  
**Subject:** Housekeeping Amendments to the Saugeen Shores Official Plan and Zoning By-law

Good afternoon,

Thank you for providing comments on the proposed amendments to the Town of Saugeen Shores Official Plan and Zoning By-law. The Public Meeting was held on June 17, 2024 and the file returned to Council on August 26, 2024 with some revisions to the proposed amendments. Council deferred its decision on the matter so that staff could review and take further action.

In response to feedback received at the Council meetings on June 17, 2024 and August 26, 2024, staff are looking to return to Council on October 21, 2024 with the following:

- All previously proposed amendments to the local Official Plan, except for the policy which would enable a Committee or an Authorized Municipal Officer to pass minor by-laws. This amendment was removed based on Council's direction.
- Only those amendments to the Zoning By-law that would:
  - Allow for up to 4 residential units per residential lot;
  - Change the term "dwelling" to "building";
  - Introduce new or updated residential building definitions;
  - Allow the use of a standard holding provision for archaeological assessment purposes; and
  - Other amendments related to the above, as summarized in the revised Amendment Tracker.

The list of proposed amendments is attached to this email. The most recent changes are highlighted in yellow.

The remaining Zoning By-law amendments that were previously recommended for approval will be further reviewed by staff and brought back to Council at a later date. These amendments included, but are not limited to:

- Changes to parking provisions other than those needed to allow up to 4 residential units per residential lot;
- Introduction of definitions and provisions relating to on-farm diversification; and
- Inclusion of additional residential building types in the Commercial Recreation (CR) zone.

We thank you for submitting comments on the proposed amendments, which have been considered by staff. Some comments have been incorporated into the proposed final amendments while others will be considered through future updates to the Town's Official Plan and Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Note that I have recommended that staff consider a further review of the R3 and R4 zone provisions specifically.

If you have further comments or questions on the attached document, please do not hesitate to reach out. Any feedback would be appreciated by October 17, 2024.

Sincerely,

**Coreena Smith**  
Senior Planner  
Planning and Development  
Corporation of the County of Bruce

Office: 226-909-1601  
Direct: 1-226-909-6305  
[www.brucecounty.on.ca](http://www.brucecounty.on.ca)

**From:** [Coreena Smith](#)  
**To:** [Bruce County Planning - Lakeshore Hub](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Housekeeping Amendments to the Saugeen Shores Official Plan and Zoning By-law  
**Date:** Monday, October 28, 2024 10:20:08 AM

---

**From:** Stuart Doyle [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2024 4:32 PM  
**To:** Coreena Smith <CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca>  
**Cc:** Kristen Sears <kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca>  
**Subject:** RE: Housekeeping Amendments to the Saugeen Shores Official Plan and Zoning By-law

**\*\* [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.**

Thanks for the update !

No comments on the proposed changes as attached...

Stuart Doyle, C.E.T.  
Barry's Construction

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Coreena Smith [<mailto:CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca>]  
**Sent:** October-11-24 1:43 PM  
**To:** Coreena Smith <[CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca](mailto:CJSmith@brucecounty.on.ca)>  
**Cc:** Kristen Sears <[kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca](mailto:kristen.sears@saugeenshores.ca)>  
**Subject:** Housekeeping Amendments to the Saugeen Shores Official Plan and Zoning By-law

Good afternoon,

Thank you for providing comments on the proposed amendments to the Town of Saugeen Shores Official Plan and Zoning By-law. The Public Meeting was held on June 17, 2024 and the file returned to Council on August 26, 2024 with some revisions to the proposed amendments. Council deferred its decision on the matter so that staff could review and take further action.

In response to feedback received at the Council meetings on June 17, 2024 and August 26, 2024, staff are looking to return to Council on October 21, 2024 with the following:

- All previously proposed amendments to the local Official Plan, except for the policy which would enable a Committee or an Authorized Municipal Officer to pass minor by-laws. This amendment was removed based on Council's direction.
- Only those amendments to the Zoning By-law that would:

- Allow for up to 4 residential units per residential lot;
- Change the term “dwelling” to “building”;
- Introduce new or updated residential building definitions;
- Allow the use of a standard holding provision for archaeological assessment purposes; and
- Other amendments related to the above, as summarized in the revised Amendment Tracker.

The list of proposed amendments is attached to this email. The most recent changes are highlighted in yellow.

The remaining Zoning By-law amendments that were previously recommended for approval will be further reviewed by staff and brought back to Council at a later date. These amendments included, but are not limited to:

- Changes to parking provisions other than those needed to allow up to 4 residential units per residential lot;
- Introduction of definitions and provisions relating to on-farm diversification; and
- Inclusion of additional residential building types in the Commercial Recreation (CR) zone.

We thank you for submitting comments on the proposed amendments, which have been considered by staff. Some comments have been incorporated into the proposed final amendments while others will be considered through future updates to the Town’s Official Plan and Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Note that I have recommended that staff consider a further review of the R3 and R4 zone provisions specifically.

If you have further comments or questions on the attached document, please do not hesitate to reach out. Any feedback would be appreciated by October 17, 2024.

Sincerely,

**Coreena Smith**  
Senior Planner  
Planning and Development  
Corporation of the County of Bruce

Office: 226-909-1601  
Direct: 1-226-909-6305  
[www.brucecounty.on.ca](http://www.brucecounty.on.ca)