

Lisa Mulligan

From: Lorelie Spencer
Sent: August 3, 2022 5:05 PM
To: Lisa Mulligan
Subject: FW: ZA14.2022 - ANDERSON Revised County Comments

FYI

No need for an addendum in my opinion. We can likely email Council but I will leave that call to Laura.

L

From: Becky Hillyer <Becky.Hillyer@grey.ca>
Sent: August 3, 2022 3:27 PM
To: Lorelie Spencer <lspencer@westgrey.com>
Cc: Lisa Mulligan <lmulligan@westgrey.com>
Subject: RE: ZA14.2022 - ANDERSON Revised County Comments

Hi Lorelie,

My apologies for that – you are right, it was a typo. Please accept the revised comments below. Please note that I also realised I also made an error in saying “Topographical imaging does show an obvious building parcel” ... whereas it should read “does **not** show...”

Apologies for the confusion here.

Becky Hillyer

Hello West Grey,

Please note that County Staff have reviewed Zoning application ZA14.2022 - Doug Anderson.

The subject lands are designated 'Primary Settlement Area' in the County's Official Plan. Provided that any development on the subject lands would be serviced by full municipal servicing, the County has no concerns.

Per Appendix A, the lands are located within a Wellhead Protection Zone E. Should any non-residential use be proposed on the subject lands, it is recommended that further comments be received by the Risk Management Official.

Per Appendix B, the subject lands are entirely covered in Significant Woodlands. Section 7.4(1) of the OP 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.

Topographical imaging does **not** show an obvious building parcel on the subject property. County staff would tend to recommend that a scoped Environmental Impact Study be undertaken to identify a viable building

envelope, to avoid significant destruction of the wooded area. These comments have been provided without further input from the Conservation Authority, and it is recommended that further comments be provided by the CA regarding a Terms of Reference for any recommended study.

The subject lands front on an unopened portion of the Arthur Street road allowance, and the subject application proposes that a no-servicing agreement be established between the Municipality and Owner, prior to any development on the property. Section 8.3.4(4) of the County's OP notes that development on lands not fronting on an all-seasons public road may be considered subject to the following criteria:

d) The property owner, at his/her expense, enters into a site plan agreement with the local municipality, or an alternative binding agreement acceptable to the local municipality, that indicates that:

i.) The owner acknowledges and agrees that the lot in question does not front on an improved public road or a road that is maintained year round;

ii.) The owner acknowledges and agrees that the local municipality does not or is not required to maintain or snowplow the said road or street;

iii.) The owner acknowledges and agrees that the local municipality will not take over or assume an unopened, unassumed or private road or street as a local municipal road unless it has been built or upgraded to the local municipal standards then in force;

iv.) The owner acknowledges and agrees that the local municipality is not liable for any injuries, losses, or damages as a consequence of the local municipality issuing a building permit; and,

v.) The site plan agreement shall be registered against the lands at the expense of the owner.

Given that the subject lands are located within a Primary Settlement Area, staff would inquire if there may be opportunity to look at extending Arthur Street (perhaps through a shared cost agreement with the owner), rather than limiting services within a Primary Settlement Area. Staff would note that there may be further severance and infill potential for the lots towards the south end of Arthur Street, and it is recommended that this approach be considered in the Committee's decision.

In summary, staff would recommend that further comments be received by the Conservation Authority to determine further Terms of Reference for a scoped EIS on the subject lands. The Committee may also wish to consider the costs and benefits of extending Arthur Street, versus entering into a no-servicing agreement with the owner.

We kindly request notice of any decision taken in regard to this application.

Please note, a paper copy will not be provided unless requested.

Let us know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Becky Hillyer

Becky Hillyer

Intermediate Planner

Phone: +1 519-372-0219 ext. 1233



From: Lorelie Spencer <lspencer@westgrey.com>
Sent: August 3, 2022 3:18 PM
To: Becky Hillyer <Becky.Hillyer@grey.ca>
Cc: Lisa Mulligan <lmulligan@westgrey.com>
Subject: ZA14.2022 - ANDERSON

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hi Becky:

I apologize that I did not notice this before. Can you revise your comments for the above noted file? You reference Albert Street wherein the request for a NSA agreement actually relates to Arthur Street. I believe it is just a typo.

Please clarify at your convenience.

Kind regards,
Lorelie Spencer, Ba.U.R.Pl., MCIP, RPP
Manager of Planning and Development

The Municipality of West Grey
402813 Grey Rd 4, RR2, Durham, ON
N0G 1R0

Phone: 519-369-2200, extension 236
1-800-538-9647 Fax: 519-369-5962
lspencer@westgrey.com

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message and attachments, if any, are sent by a Third Party Administrator for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It may contain information that is privileged and/or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by reply email and destroy this communication. Thank you.