

<b>To:</b>	Warden Matrosovs and Members of Grey County Council
<b>Committee Date:</b>	March 27, 2025
<b>Subject / Report No:</b>	PDR-CW-20-25
<b>Title:</b>	Official Plan Amendment 23 Final Report
<b>Prepared by:</b>	County Planning Staff
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	Randy Scherzer
<b>Lower Tier(s) Affected:</b>	Township of Chatsworth, Township of Georgian Bluffs, Municipality of Grey Highlands, Municipality of Meaford, Township of Southgate, Town of The Blue Mountains, and Municipality of West Grey

## Recommendation

1. That report PDR-CW-20-25 be received; and
2. That all written and oral submissions on Official Plan Amendment number 23 were considered and helped to make an informed recommendation and decision; and
3. That proposed County Official Plan Amendment number 23 to amend the County's Rural designation permitted uses and development policies be supported, and a by-law to adopt the County Official Plan Amendment be prepared for consideration by County Council.

## Executive Summary

The County initiated Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 23 as a result of changes to the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) 2024, and to clarify interpretation issues with respect to the Rural land use designation policies. OPA 23 is not meant to be the County's PPS 2024 consistency exercise, further amendments to the County Plan will be required in the future to achieve that goal. Staff have undertaken the public and agency review process for OPA 23, including a public meeting on November 7, 2024. Changes have been made to the OPA based on the comments received, which have been outlined in this staff report. This report is recommending that OPA 23 be supported and that a by-law be prepared for consideration by County Council.

## Background and Discussion

OPA 23 was initiated in September 2024. Staff report PDR-CW-47-24 outlined the basis for OPA 23 and gave a summary of the changes proposed. The primary purpose of OPA 23 is to clarify existing policies in the County Official Plan's Rural designation that have been causing

interpretation issues. A link to this staff report has been included in the Attachments section of this report.

Since initiating OPA 23, staff have completed the agency and public review phase of OPA 23, including the public meeting. A summary of the comments received on this OPA, along with staff responses, has been included in the Policy and Agency Engagement section of this report. A link to the public meeting minutes can be found in the Attachments section of this report.

OPA 23 will not change any of the County's mapping, but is proposing the following:

- adjustments to the Rural permitted uses development policies,
- two small changes to the Agricultural development policies, and
- adding/amending some definitions in the Plan.

Based on the comments received on OPA 23, there have been some further proposed changes made to the amendment. OPA 23 does not impact any of the County's settlement area policies, and as such only applies to seven of the County's nine municipalities (i.e., OPA 23 does not apply to Hanover or Owen Sound, who are entirely designated Primary Settlement Area in the County Official Plan).

OPA 23 is not a consistency exercise with the entire PPS 2024. A more fulsome OPA will be required in the future to ensure the County Plan is consistent with the new PPS. The County is currently undertaking a Growth Management Strategy (GMS) update. Data gathered from the GMS update will help inform the County's growth outlook, including land availability and supply, as well as reviewing the lands needed to support future growth. This GMS update will also assess the Ministry of Finance's population projections for the County, as directed by PPS 2024. Following the GMS update, County staff anticipate a comprehensive PPS 2024 consistency exercise, including a larger County OPA will be completed.

## Public and Agency Engagement

Throughout the public and agency engagement process, as well as the public meeting, the County received comments from the following individuals/groups. Table 1 below provides a summary of the comments received, as well as a staff response to each comment.

Table 1: Comments Received on OPA 23 and County Staff Response

Commenter	Comment Summary	County Staff Response
Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA)	GRCA staff have noted that ‘dwellings not intended as permanent residences are still considered to be development, which should not be permitted in Hazard Lands. Any new sensitive uses should also be prohibited on lots that contain areas outside of, but would be rendered inaccessible due to, natural hazards (i.e., where there is no safe access). GRCA staff note sections 7.2, 7.3, and 7.5 of the County Plan which sufficiently cover development prohibitions in natural hazards.’	County staff concur with GRCA’s comments. There are no changes to the County’s Hazard Lands policies, or increased permissions for development in Hazard Lands. Staff are satisfied that OPA 23 provides due protection for new Rural development as it pertains to areas of natural hazard.
Nottawasaga Conservation Authority (NVCA)	NVCA staff have noted that they have reviewed OPA 23 based on their mandate under the <i>Conservation Authorities Act</i> and have no objection to its approval.	Acknowledged – no changes needed.
Bell Canada	Bell Canada noted that they do not have any comments or concerns at this time, but ask that Bell continue to be circulated on any future materials and/or decisions related to this matter.	Acknowledged – no changes needed.
Enbridge Gas	No objections to proposed OPA 23.	Acknowledged – no changes needed.
Municipality of West Grey	<p>West Grey staff provided detailed comments on OPA 23, a summary of those comments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) ‘Recommended clarifying the term ‘trades’ as it pertains to ‘buildings and yards associated with trades’ and adding a ‘small scale’ qualifier to these permitted uses.</li> <li>2) With respect to institutional uses, two of the locational criteria listed for siting institutional uses in OPA 23 are subjective or impossible to meet.</li> <li>3) Regarding Rural special event venues, similar locational criteria concerns were flagged, as well as concerns which spoke to large scale events, number of attendees, and frequency of events.’</li> </ol>	<p>County staff offer the following responses to West Grey’s comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Staff have added the ‘small scale’ criterion to the ‘buildings and yards associated with trades’ permitted use. Staff have also researched the terminology as it applies to the Ontario context of skilled and licensed trades. The wording has been adjusted to use the term ‘skilled trades’ to be more precise than just trades. Policies around on-site service delivery have also been added.</li> <li>2) Staff have removed these two locational criteria, and instead added a criterion addressing the locational reasons considered by the proponent in siting the proposed use(s) relative to the users of the proposed institutional use.</li> <li>3) Staff have removed the locational criteria in question. Staff have also amended the scale, frequency, and number of attendee policies, while adding a ‘small scale’ criterion. Small scale is a defined term in the County Plan, and aligns with the scale of an on-farm diversified use. As such, any event venue which meets that criterion would not need an OPA, whereas event venues which go beyond the small scale definition, would require an OPA.</li> </ol>
MHBC Planning on behalf of Thornbury Acres Holdings Inc. (TAHI)	<p>The MHBC comments note the TAHI development applications currently under appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal. MHBC further states the following:</p> <p><i>“It appears that COPA23 appears in part to be directly aimed at our client’s application for a Residential Farm-Co-operative by imposing more restrictive language that the County’s Official Plan would currently permit. While our client believes the increased criteria / requirements to establish a Residential Farm Co-operative are draconian and in many instances undermines the original policy initiative to provide “innovative forms of rural development”, our client’s main principle concern is the application to COPA 23 to the Subject Lands and ensuring that whatever future policies may be</i></p>	<p>In response to the MHBC comments, County staff have added the following exception to OPA 23 for the TAHI lands:</p> <p><i>“Notwithstanding the policies of section 5.4.2(8) of this Plan, for those lands described as Part of Lot 27, Concession 8, geographic Township of Collingwood, now in the Town of The Blue Mountains, the policies of this section shall apply as they read prior to County Official Plan Amendment # 23, for the proposed residential farm cooperative development on these lands.”</i></p> <p>With respect to the comments on PPS 2024, staff have a different interpretation of the PPS regarding <i>“the expectation that the Rural lands will be the primary focus for growth within the</i></p>

	<p><i>adopted do not detract from the availability of this innovative form of rural development. While the notice does state that COPA 23 would not apply to existing applications, TAHI is concerned that should the Ontario Land Tribunal approve the Applications, that subsequent implementation applications (i.e. Site Plan Approval) may be interpreted as being subject to COPA 23.</i></p> <p><i>To avoid a conflict, we request that the acknowledgement that COPA 23 does not apply to lands with existing applications be specifically enunciated in the COPA 23. This has occurred in other instances to provide clarity to the regime which is applicable to ongoing applications. A similar policy introduced to COPA 23, written in a similar manner for the TAHI lands is therefore requested.</i></p> <p><i>Aside from the site-specific applications our client believes that the policies which would effectively seek to make it unfeasible to establish and Residential Farm Co-operative are not in line with the PPS 2024 and the expectation that the Rural lands will be the primary focus for growth within the rural areas of a municipality and that the current policies should not be replaced in favour of those that would take away this key opportunity to see appropriate rural forms of development proceed and be established.”</i></p>	<p><i>rural areas of a municipality.” Staff would note that sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 of the PPS 2024 state the following:</i></p> <p><i>“2.5.2 – In rural areas, rural settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted.</i></p> <p><i>2.5.3 – When directing development in rural settlement areas in accordance with policy 2.3, planning authorities shall give consideration to locally appropriate rural characteristics, the scale of development and the provision of appropriate service levels.</i></p> <p><i>Growth and development may be directed to rural lands in accordance with policy 2.6, including where a municipality does not have a settlement area.”</i></p> <p>The County Plan, as proposed to be amended by OPA 23, would still permit some development in the County’s Rural land use designation. However, the County Plan would continue to direct most new non-farm development to the County’s settlement areas, including rural settlement areas, where there is the infrastructure and amenities to support growth. Staff would further note that all nine of Grey’s member municipalities have one or more designated settlement areas in which to direct their growth.</p>
Cobide Engineering Inc.*	<p>Cobide Engineering expressed concerns with OPA 23, both in writing, and through comments at the public meeting. A summary of their concerns is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) ‘The Grey County Official Plan should include a policy permitting modular home parks in the Rural designation to take advantage of their planning, economic and environmental benefits.</li> <li>2) The policies on resource-based recreational uses are too restrictive and that these uses should be permitted year-round and include permanent residences.</li> <li>3) Resource based recreational use residential lot creation should be permitted if the area can be adequately serviced.</li> <li>4) Does not agree with a blanket ban on subdivisions and condominiums in Rural designated areas, which are permitted under the new Provincial Planning Statement.</li> <li>5) The proposed policy requiring 75% of land for recreational use would be impractical due to expensive and lengthy studies, limiting developable land to 25% will make developments unattractive and economically unfeasible.’</li> </ol>	<p>County staff offer the following responses to Cobide’s comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The County Plan would allow modular home parks in designated settlement areas. OPA is not contemplating modular home parks in the Rural designation at this time. As noted in the Background section of this report, the County is currently undertaking a GMS update. As part of that study, and the subsequent OPA to follow the GMS update, staff will be further assessing the County’s comprehensive growth needs, both within its current settlement areas and beyond.</li> <li>2) The County’s Rural policies still permit a wide array of permanent residences and additional residential units both on existing lots, and newly created lots via severance. The proposed OPA 23 policies do limit permanent residential development associated with resource based recreational uses, in order to (a) still allow for some recreational cottages or accommodations, and (b) to direct most new permanent residential growth to settlement areas where supports and infrastructure are in place to service such developments.</li> <li>3) As per the response above, Rural severances are still permitted in accordance with the County’s Rural lot density policies. Lot creation beyond those limits should otherwise be directed to settlement areas, or would require an OPA to justify additional lot creation in the Rural areas. This is consistent with the existing section 5.4.2(10) of the County Plan (pre OPA 23) which states: <i>“Residential lot creation associated with resource based recreational uses, which exceeds the Rural lot density provisions of Table 9, under Section 5.4.3 of this Plan, shall require an amendment to this Plan...”</i> OPA 23 is not intended to be a ‘radical re-think’ of the County’s Rural policies, but rather a targeted OPA to clarify some existing interpretation issues. Further changes may or may not be needed to the Rural policies following the completion of the GMS update.</li> </ol>

		<p>4) The current County Official Plan, prior to the consideration of OPA 23, already includes a restriction on Rural plans of subdivision/condominium, beyond agri-miniums (see 5.4.2(10) quoted above). Similar to the above response to the MHBC comments, County staff see such development types as better suited to designated settlement areas, in accordance with sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 of the PPS.</p> <p>5) County staff have reduced the 75% criterion to 70%. Staff see merit in continuing to limit residential uses associated with resource based recreational uses in scale, such that they do not become de facto settlement areas. The County Plan strives to direct most new growth to its settlement areas, to maximize existing infrastructure investments, to create complete communities, and to limit inefficient municipal service delivery requests in the County's countryside areas.</p>
--	--	---

\*The above-noted Cobide Engineering comments also included an email exchange with Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) staff. Within that email MMAH staff noted the following:

*“On October 20, 2023, the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 (PPS 2024) would come into effect and revise policies regarding land use permissions on rural lands. The changes to the 2024 PPS are not intended to limit permissions for resource-based recreation uses on rural lands to cottages (i.e., recreational dwellings not intended as permanent residences). Notably, PPS 2024 policy 2.6.1 c) would permit residential development on rural lands subject to suitable site conditions for water and wastewater services.”*

MMAH was circulated on OPA 23, and MMAH has not chosen to comment on the amendment. County staff did follow-up with MMAH staff in relation to Cobide's letter, and the above-quoted interpretation, and had a conversation with Ministry staff. County staff understand that the PPS 2024 permits some residential development in rural lands and rural areas. County staff also understand that the PPS is to be read as a whole, as stated in the 'How to Read the Provincial Planning Statement' section of the document. The County Plan does permit some residential development and lot creation in the Rural designation. The County Plan also directs most new residential growth to the County's settlement areas, as directed by the PPS. County staff would further note that neither 'resource-based recreation uses' nor the scale of residential development on rural lands are defined terms in PPS 2024. As such, County staff believe that the County Plan, as proposed to be amended by OPA 23, strikes a balance between recreational development, rural residential development, and focusing development in settlement areas in a manner that is consistent with PPS 2024, and the goals and objectives of the County Plan.

## Analysis of Planning Issues

When rendering a land use planning decision, planning authorities must have regard to matters of provincial interest under the *Planning Act*, be consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) 2024, and conform to any provincial plans, such as the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP). The County Plan generally defers to the policies of the NEP. However, OPA 23 is not proposing to amend any policies in the lands covered by the NEP. When considering an OPA, alignment with the goals and objectives of the County Official Plan also need to be considered.

### *Planning Act*

Section 2 of the *Planning Act* outlines matters of provincial interest which planning authorities must have regard for. The most relevant matters of provincial interest pertaining to OPA 23 are quoted below in italics, along with a staff comment.

*(a) The protection of ecological systems, including natural areas, features and functions*

Staff Comment: OPA 23 is not proposing to change any of the County's natural environment policies under section 7 of the County.

*(b) The protection of the agricultural resources of the Province*

Staff Comment: OPA 23 primarily impacts lands in the County's Rural designation. While there are two minor policy changes in the development criteria of the Agricultural designation, these do not impair the County's ability to protect its agricultural resources. Some of the definition changes in OPA 23 will also apply to uses permitted in the Agricultural land use designation, such as the definition for 'agri-tourism uses'. Changes to the definitions clarify existing terminology, and do not represent a significant policy departure from the current County Plan.

It is further worth noting that much of the County's Rural designation is also productive farmland. By limiting new non-farm growth in the Rural designation, it also has the effect of helping protect farmland and minimize land use conflict across the County.

*(c) the conservation and management of natural resources and the mineral resource base*

Staff Comment: OPA 23 proposes to clarify one existing conflict at section 5.2.2(7) of the Plan. This policy direction is already provided elsewhere in the Plan, but the OPA 23 revision would ensure these two sections of the County Plan are consistent with one another.

As per above, limiting some forms of non-farm Rural development, also helps mitigate future land use conflicts between rural residents and resource use such as aggregate or bedrock extraction.

*(d) The adequate provision and efficient use of communication, transportation, sewage and water services and waste management systems*

Staff Comment: The County's Rural designation is generally not equipped with the same level of infrastructure as the County's settlement areas. It is not feasible for the County or member municipalities to provide these same service levels throughout the countryside. As such, the County Plan prioritizes new non-farm and non-resource use development in settlement areas,

where significant investments in infrastructure have already been made. OPA 23 reinforces this vision, by striking a balance between Rural development, and those forms of development which are better suited in settlement areas.

*(h) the orderly development of safe and healthy communities; and (p) The appropriate location of growth and development*

Staff Comment: As per above, new residential development is promoted in settlement areas where both services and amenities exist to support the new growth. Retaining the County's Rural designated lands primarily for farming and resource use both preserves the lands for these purposes, but also negates some inefficient sprawling development types across the countryside. Land use conflicts in siting new resource uses are also minimized when development is directed primarily to settlement areas. A central tenant of both the current PPS, and the County Plan is to direct most new growth to settlement areas. OPA 23 is not a radical shift in direction for the County, but rather aims to clarify existing County policies as they pertain to PPS 2024 and some existing interpretation issues.

*(q) the promotion of development that is designed to be sustainable, to support public transit and to be oriented to pedestrians*

Staff Comment: Development in the County's Rural designation is not conducive to supporting public transit or oriented to pedestrians, based on the service levels and the density of these forms of development.

*(s) the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and adaptation to a changing climate*

Staff Comment: Limiting new auto-oriented growth in the countryside is one small manner in which the County has agency to mitigate the creation of new greenhouse gas emissions.

Staff are satisfied that proposed OPA 23 has regard for matters of provincial interest under the *Planning Act*.

## ***Provincial Planning Statement 2024***

Some commentary on the PPS has already been provided above in Public and Agency Engagement section of this report. As noted earlier in the report, the PPS is required to read as a whole. However, for the sake of brevity this policy review will focus on some of the most pertinent PPS policies applicable to OPA 23.

As per the Background section of this report, a fulsome County OPA will be required in the future to ensure the County Plan is consistent with PPS 2024. It is anticipated that this future OPA will be informed in part by the current GMS update, which is currently underway. As such, County staff have focused both OPA 23, and the associated policy review on key sections of the PPS, as they pertain to OPA 23 and its purpose of clarifying current County Official Plan interpretation issues.

Section 2.3 of the PPS notes that "Settlement Areas shall be the focus of growth and development." This section goes on to speak to the efficient use of land and resources, as well as supporting intensification and redevelopment for the achievement of complete communities. The current County Plan mimics those same policy objectives and provides a balance between new development in the County's designated settlement areas, versus development across the

countryside. OPA 23 follows a similar approach by clarifying some of the development criteria and permitted uses in the Rural designation.

Sections 2.5 and 2.6 of the PPS provide a policy basis for Rural Areas and Rural lands respectively. Given OPA 23's focus on the County's Rural designation, these two sections of the PPS will be reproduced in their entirety below, along with some brief staff comments.

### ***"2.5 Rural Areas in Municipalities***

1. *Healthy, integrated and viable rural areas should be supported by:*
  - a) *building upon rural character, and leveraging rural amenities and assets;*
  - b) *promoting regeneration, including the redevelopment of brownfield sites;*
  - c) *accommodating an appropriate range and mix of housing in rural settlement areas;*
  - d) *using rural infrastructure and public service facilities efficiently;*
  - e) *promoting diversification of the economic base and employment opportunities through goods and services, including value-added products and the sustainable management or use of resources;*
  - f) *providing opportunities for sustainable and diversified tourism, including leveraging historical, cultural, and natural assets;*
  - g) *conserving biodiversity and considering the ecological benefits provided by nature; and*
  - h) *providing opportunities for economic activities in prime agricultural areas, in accordance with policy 4.3.*
2. *In rural areas, rural settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted.*
3. *When directing development in rural settlement areas in accordance with policy 2.3, planning authorities shall give consideration to locally appropriate rural characteristics, the scale of development and the provision of appropriate service levels.*

*Growth and development may be directed to rural lands in accordance with policy 2.6, including where a municipality does not have a settlement area."*

Rural Areas PPS definition: *"Rural areas: means a system of lands within municipalities that may include rural settlement areas, rural lands, prime agricultural areas, natural heritage features and areas, and resource areas."*

Staff Comment: Based on the above-quoted definition, Grey County's rural areas include not only the County's Rural designation, but also the Agricultural, Special Agricultural, Mineral Resource Extraction, Hazard Lands, Wetlands, Core Areas & Linkages, Secondary Settlement Areas, and Inland Lands and Shoreline Settlement Area designations.

Within the County's Rural designation, there are significant amounts of land used for resource uses such as farming, forestry, and aggregate/bedrock extraction. Many of these resource uses would be incompatible with new residential development. As a result, the County strives to direct most new residential development to its settlement areas, including Secondary Settlement Areas and Inland Lands and Shoreline Settlement Areas. Allowing for widespread residential development in the Rural designation, would not only result in an inefficient use of land, but could also create land use conflicts with resource uses, and limit the County's ability to promote



the vitality and regeneration of its Rural settlement areas. For example, if plans of subdivision were permitted across the Rural designation, there could be less incentive for development within existing Secondary Settlement Areas, where the County is looking to direct such growth.

Although the County limits development in the Rural designation, there are still plenty of development types permitted which help sustain a thriving rural economy. Some of the development types contemplated through OPA 23, include but are not limited to the following:

- Agricultural uses,
- Agricultural-related uses,
- On-farm diversified uses,
- Aggregate extraction,
- Resource based recreational uses, including recreational dwellings not intended as permanent residences,
- Small scale transport terminals,
- Buildings and yards associated with skilled trades,
- Residential farm cooperatives,
- Agri-miniums,
- Institutional uses including but not limited to cemeteries, places of worship, or schools,
- Recreational or tourist-based rural clusters (e.g. cottages, yurts, or a similar form of development under common ownership on a single property), and
- Small scale special event venues.

It's worth noting that most of the above-noted permitted uses are already permitted in the current County Official Plan. In some cases, the uses have had additional policy clarification added through proposed OPA 23.

As noted earlier in this report, the PPS is written in a sufficiently broad fashion to apply to all of Ontario's municipalities. Section 2.5.3 of the PPS is a good example of this, in that some municipalities in Ontario do not have any designated settlement areas. This is not the case in Grey County, where each of the nine member municipalities have one or more designated settlement areas. This same section also speaks to giving consideration to locally appropriate rural characteristics. Policies like this, provide latitude to permitting some forms of development in the County's Rural designation, while directing other forms of development to settlement areas based on Rural service levels.

Focusing development in settlement areas also helps maintain significant natural environmental areas across the countryside.

## ***"2.6 Rural Lands in Municipalities***

1. *On rural lands located in municipalities, permitted uses are:*
  - a) *the management or use of resources;*
  - b) *resource-based recreational uses (including recreational dwellings not intended as permanent residences);*
  - c) *residential development, including lot creation, where site conditions are suitable for the provision of appropriate sewage and water services;*
  - d) *agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses and normal farm practices, in accordance with provincial standards;*

- e) *home occupations and home industries;*
  - f) *cemeteries; and*
  - g) *other rural land uses.*
2. *Development that can be sustained by rural service levels should be promoted.*
  3. *Development shall be appropriate to the infrastructure which is planned or available, and avoid the need for the uneconomical expansion of this infrastructure.*
  4. *Planning authorities should support a diversified rural economy by protecting agricultural and other resource-related uses and directing non-related development to areas where it will minimize constraints on these uses.*
  5. *New land uses, including the creation of lots, and new or expanding livestock facilities, shall comply with the minimum distance separation formulae.”*

Rural Lands PPS definition: *“Rural lands: means lands which are located outside settlement areas and which are outside prime agricultural areas.”*

Staff Comment: OPA 23 would permit items (a) – (g) from section 2.6.1 of the PPS. The County Plan, as proposed to be modified by OPA 23, continues to place some limitations on Rural lot creation, but this is not new to OPA 23, and said limitations already exist in the current County Plan. The County’s limitations on said forms of Rural lot creation are created in the spirit of sections 2.6.2, 2.6.3, and 2.6.5 of the PPS. The current County Official Plan, and the post OPA 23 County Plan (if approved), would still permit some Rural lot creation via the consent process, based on the Rural lot density provisions. These Rural consent policies are not proposing to change via OPA 23. With respect to section 2.6.4, the County Plan protects farmland, but also significant environmental features, and resource areas such as aggregate, bedrock, and shale mapping across the rural lands.

Staff are satisfied that proposed OPA 23 is consistent with the PPS 2024.

## *County of Grey Official Plan 2019*

OPA 23 does not propose any significant new policy directions in the County Plan. Rather OPA 23 attempts to clarify existing policies in the Rural designation which have led to questions or misinterpretation of policies.

The current County Official Plan already limits new Rural plans of subdivision, except via amendment to the Plan associated with a resource based recreational use. OPA 23 is not proposing to amend the County’s Rural consent or lot density policies.

OPA 23 proposes to add some additional definitions and new criteria for agri-miniums, residential farm cooperatives, resource based recreational uses, recreation or tourist-based rural clusters, buildings and yards associated with skilled trades, institutional uses, and special event venues. The newly proposed criteria are based on having worked with the County Official Plan since 2019, and having seen how these policies have been interpreted in different ways by planners and the public.

As it pertains to specifically resource based recreational uses, County staff were seeing proposals for large numbers of new residential uses, with very little connection to recreation (or

creation of recreational uses based on the landscape of the sites), beyond the creation of trails. While staff are supportive of new residential development, the forms of development being proposed through some of these potential developments is better suited to settlement areas, where services and amenities are in place to support such growth. The added criteria in OPA 23, still allows for resource based recreational uses, but limits the type of associated residential development to avoid the creation of new de facto settlement areas, under the guise of a resource based recreational use.

Similarly, the added criteria for agri-miniums and residential farm cooperatives make it clear that such developments are to be agriculturally focused with limited residential development, rather than supporting the creation of new estate-lot Rural plans of subdivision/condominium.

The direction of OPA 23 also aligns with section 7.13 of the Official Plan, and Going Green in Grey, the County's Climate Change Action Plan. Focusing development in settlement areas, while preserving natural areas and resource uses in the countryside, conforms to the policy direction in both these plans.

Proposed OPA 23 conforms to the goals and objectives of the County Official Plan, which as stated earlier direct most new residential and development growth to settlement areas, while supporting a diversified rural economy.

## Legislated Requirements

OPA 23 was processed in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning Act*.

## Financial and Resource Implications

The processing of OPA 23 was completed using existing staff and financial resources in the 2024 and 2025 approved budgets. Should OPA 23 be appealed there could be additional

## Relevant Consultation

- ☒ Internal: Planning and Planning Ecology
  - ☒ Contribution to Climate Change Action Plan Targets: See commentary throughout the report
- ☒ External: the public, member municipalities in Grey, neighbouring municipalities, and agencies/bodies as required under the *Planning Act*

## Appendices and Attachments

[PDR-CW-47-24 – County Official Plan Amendment 23 – Rural Permitted Uses and Development Policies](#)

[November 7, 2024 Official Plan Amendment 23 Public Meeting Minutes](#)

[Draft Official Plan Amendment 23 By-law](#)

Appendix 1: Document Compare Current County Official Plan Policy vs. Proposed Official Plan

## Amendment 23 Policies

Appendix 1: Document Compare Current County Official Plan Policy vs. Proposed Official Plan Amendment 23 Policies

Section #	Current Official Plan Policies	Proposed Official Plan Amendment 23 Policies
5.2.2(7)	<p>In Aggregate Resource Areas shown on Schedule B, new non-agricultural uses that require a zoning by-law amendment on existing lots of record, which would significantly prevent or hinder new extraction operations, compatible and may only be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The extraction of the aggregate resource is not feasible due to the quality or quantity of material or the existence of incompatible development patterns. The quality and quantity of the material will be determined by having a qualified individual dig test pits within the area proposed for the non-agricultural development as well as the lands within 300 metres of the aggregate operation; or that</li> <li>b) The proposed land use or development serves a greater long term interest of the general public than does aggregate extraction; and</li> <li>c) Issues of public health, public safety, and environmental impact are addressed.</li> </ul>	<p>In <i>Aggregate Resource Areas</i> shown on Schedule B, new <i>non-agricultural uses</i> may be considered on existing lots of record, where they are a permitted use in the <i>Agricultural, Special Agricultural, or Rural</i> land use types. Where such <i>non-agricultural uses</i> are not permitted by those land use types, and an official plan amendment is required, new <i>non-agricultural uses</i> may only be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The extraction of the aggregate resource is not feasible due to the quality or quantity of material or the existence of incompatible <i>development</i> patterns. The quality and quantity of the material will be determined by having a <i>qualified individual</i> dig test pits within the area proposed for the non-agricultural <i>development</i> as well as the lands within 300 metres of the aggregate operation; or that</li> <li>a) The proposed land use or <i>development</i> serves a greater long term interest of the general public than does aggregate extraction; and</li> <li>b) Issues of public health, public safety, and environmental impact are addressed.</li> </ul> <p>Notwithstanding the foregoing, a proposed land use that conforms with the Official Plan and Zoning By-law, but requires Site Plan approval pursuant to Section 41 of the Planning Act, shall not be required to address the above criteria.</p>
5.2.2(19)	<p>Prior to considering a new on-farm diversified use, it shall be demonstrated that the following criteria can be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The use or activity does not interfere with, or generate off-site adverse impacts, and is compatible with surrounding uses,</li> <li>b) The use or activity can be sustained by local service levels and infrastructure,</li> <li>c) The buildings to be used meet all Building Code requirements for the type of use being proposed,</li> <li>d) The scale of the operation is secondary to the active agricultural use on the farm property, and appropriate to the site and the surrounding area,</li> <li>e) The timing and duration of activities does not hinder agricultural operations on site or in the area,</li> <li>f) For special events, the use or activity represents an occasional activity and is not a regular occurring activity and does not have permanent structures, and</li> <li>g) On-site parking can be accommodated without impacting the agricultural operation.</li> </ul>	<p>Prior to considering a new on-farm diversified use, it shall be demonstrated that the following criteria can be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The use or activity does not interfere with, or generate off-site adverse impacts, and is compatible with surrounding uses,</li> <li>b) The use or activity can be sustained by local service levels and infrastructure,</li> <li>c) The buildings to be used meet all Building Code requirements for the type of use being proposed,</li> <li>d) The scale of the operation is secondary to the active agricultural use on the farm property, and appropriate to the site and the surrounding area,</li> <li>e) The timing and duration of activities does not hinder agricultural operations on site or in the area,</li> <li>f) For special events, the use or activity represents an occasional activity and is not a regular occurring activity and does not have permanent structures, and</li> <li>g) On-site parking can be accommodated without impacting the agricultural operation.</li> </ul> <p>Notwithstanding this section of the Plan, where special event space is being proposed via 5.2.2(19)(f) above, the criteria of section 5.4.2(13) shall also be considered.</p>
5.4.1(2)	<p>In addition to the uses listed in Section 5.2.1, the following additional uses will be permitted in the Rural land use type:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Resource based recreational uses,</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to the uses listed in Section 5.2.1, the following additional uses will be permitted in the <i>Rural land use type</i>, subject to the Development Policies in Section 5.4.2. The following uses are not subject to the <i>on-farm diversified use</i> sizing limitations of this Plan, except where identified as '<i>small scale</i>':</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Small scale transport terminals,</li> <li>c) Buildings and yards associated with trades, including contractors yards, plumbing, electrical, heating/cooling shops, etc.,</li> <li>d) Residential farm cooperatives</li> <li>e) Agri-miniums,</li> <li>f) Institutional uses including cemeteries, churches, or schools,</li> <li>g) Recreational or tourist-based rural clusters (e.g. cottages, yurts, or a similar form of development under common ownership)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>Resource based recreational uses</i>, including recreational dwellings not intended as permanent residences,</li> <li>b) <i>Small scale</i> transport terminals,</li> <li>c) <i>Small scale</i> buildings and yards associated with skilled trades,</li> <li>d) <i>Residential farm cooperatives</i>,</li> <li>e) <i>Agri-miniums</i>,</li> <li>f) Institutional uses including but not limited to cemeteries, places of worship, or schools,</li> <li>g) Recreational or tourist-based rural clusters (e.g. cottages, yurts, or a similar form of development under common ownership on a single property),</li> <li>h) <i>Small scale</i> special event venues.</li> </ul> <p>Notwithstanding subsection 5.4.1(2)(c) above, buildings and yards associated with skilled trades are limited to those uses without direct on-site retail or service delivery, where the primary trade being practiced is occurring off-site, and the on-site uses include storage, parking of vehicles / equipment, receiving/preparing materials for off-site usage, or office/administration space. Examples of such permitted buildings and yards include contractors' yards, plumbing, electrical and heating/cooling shops.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the permitted uses listed in 5.4.1(2) above, these uses are not meant to be combined with other commercial or industrial uses permitted via an <i>on-farm diversified use</i>, except where explicitly stated by other sections of this Plan. For example, a <i>residential farm cooperative</i> can be combined with an <i>on-farm diversified use</i>, as per 5.4.2(8) of this Plan. However, a building and yard associated with a skilled trade cannot be added to an <i>on-farm diversified use</i> where the total land area of the two uses would exceed the size limitations of an <i>on-farm diversified use</i>.</p>
5.4.2(8)	<p>Campgrounds shall only be considered under the Rural land use type as per policy 5.4.2(9).</p> <p>Innovative forms of Rural development including, residential farm cooperatives, agri-miniums, resource based recreational uses, recreation or tourist-based rural clusters (e.g. cottages, campgrounds, or a similar form of development under common ownership) on large lots, which meet the Ontario Building Code and servicing requirements, may be considered for approval, subject to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A minimum of 60% of the original land holding will remain available for the active primary agricultural or recreational use;</li> <li>b) Encroachment of actively farmed agricultural lands shall be limited;</li> <li>c) Maintains the agricultural/rural character of the area. The character of development must be low density and compatible with the surrounding land uses;</li> <li>d) The development will comply with the Provincial MDS formulae;</li> <li>e) Ensuring surrounding agricultural operations can pursue their agricultural practices without impairment or inconvenience. Consideration should also be given to any potential development constraints (setback requirements)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Campgrounds</i> shall only be considered under the <i>Rural land use type</i> as a <i>resource based recreational use</i>, and shall not be considered as an <i>on-farm diversified use</i>.</p> <p><i>Residential farm cooperatives, agri-miniums, resource based recreational uses, recreation or tourist-based rural clusters</i> (e.g. cottages, yurts, <i>campgrounds</i>, or a similar form of development under common ownership on a single property) on large lots, which meet the Ontario Building Code and servicing requirements, may be considered for approval, subject to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A minimum of 70% of the property will be used for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) agricultural uses, as it applies to <i>residential farm cooperatives</i> and <i>agri-miniums</i>, or</li> <li>ii) recreational use, as it applies to <i>resource based recreational uses</i> and recreation or tourist-based rural clusters;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>In calculating the above-noted 70% threshold, this Plan requires 70% of the land to be used for agricultural uses as it applies to <i>residential farm cooperatives</i> and <i>agri-miniums</i>. As it applies to <i>agricultural uses</i>, the County may consider a reduction in the 70% threshold with appropriate justification, e.g., protection of a watercourse, provided the majority of the land is still being used for <i>agricultural uses</i>. <i>On-farm diversified or agricultural-related uses</i> can be considered as a part of the 70% threshold, subject to the policies of Section 5.2.2 of this Plan. Lands in the <i>Agricultural</i> or <i>Special Agricultural land use types</i> cannot be included as part of the 70% threshold, as such land use types do not permit <i>residential farm cooperatives</i> or <i>agri-miniums</i>.</p>

<p>affecting future agricultural use on adjacent lands. This can be determined through the application of the Provincial MDS formulae (i.e., as per implementation guideline #6, all existing livestock facilities or anaerobic digesters within a 750 m distance of a proposed Type A land use and within a 1,500 m distance of a proposed Type B land use shall be investigated and MDS I setback calculations undertaken where warranted). The inverse shall be considered, such that should the proposed Type B land use be developed, review shall be completed identifying lands on adjacent properties that may be limited for a future livestock facility or anaerobic digester. When situating the new use, it would be encouraged to identify a location that would have limited future impact to the surrounding agricultural land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f) Technical studies are likely to be required for these application types to ensure limited impact. Some of the key areas of concern that will need to be addressed include (but not limited to), planning justification report, noise assessment, visual impact assessment (i.e. how is the rural landscape aesthetic being maintained and/or how is the historic character being supported), traffic impact study, functional servicing report, MDS calculation, and/or an environmental impact study. Depending on the nature of development, comments may be required from the local health unit. Further details of what typically entails a complete application can be found under section 9.17 of this Plan;</li> <li>g) For recreation-based developments, is viewed as compatible recreation, meaning the use(s) will not negatively impact the natural features or function of the Core Areas or Linkages and other identified natural heritage features as per Section 7;</li> <li>h) That a zoning by-law amendment be approved by the local municipality;</li> <li>i) Public road access and internal private roads, provide suitable access for users and emergency services,</li> <li>j) All Building Code requirements can be met, and</li> <li>k) Water, septic, and stormwater management facilities can be provided in compliance with applicable regulations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Where viable, integrating low-impact development techniques for the land use planning, urban design, and engineering approaches to manage stormwater, through site arrangement and design, green infrastructure, and on-site natural features;</li> <li>ii) Efforts should be made to limit large-scale servicing demands for these development types, through considering the application of off-grid, low-impact, non-polluting energy sources (e.g. rainwater harvesting, compost toilets, passive heating and cooling systems, solar, etc.).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>For <i>resource based recreational uses</i> and recreation or tourist-based rural clusters, 70% of the land is required for recreational uses. In assessing the recreational uses on-site, this 70% threshold can include portions of natural heritage features that contribute to the recreational use, e.g., a watercourse or <i>Significant Woodlands</i>.</p> <p>The County will not consider a mixture of <i>agricultural uses</i> and recreational uses for the purpose of meeting the 70% threshold. Where the 70% threshold has been met for either agricultural or recreational uses, there can be a mix of accessory agricultural or recreational uses within the remaining 30% of the lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) <i>Residential farm cooperatives</i> and <i>agri-miniums</i> shall permit the following; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) A maximum of four principle dwellings per 40 hectares. The maximum residential density of <i>residential farm cooperatives</i> and <i>agri-miniums</i> shall be pro-rated up or down based on the original township lot size, similar to the Rural Consent policies in Section 5.4.3(1) and Table 9 of this Plan. For the purposes of calculating lot density for an <i>agri-minium</i> or a <i>residential farm cooperative</i>, the lot density shall be calculated using the subject lands only, and does not need to factor in separate parcels of land in the original township lot and concession owned by other landowners. Table 9 shall be applied only as it pertains to the total size of the subject lands within the <i>Rural land use type</i> and therefore how many residential units the <i>agri-minium</i> or <i>residential farm cooperative</i> is eligible for. For the purposes of this policy, Hazard Lands or significant natural heritage features can be included in the density calculation, but the density calculation cannot include any lands in the <i>Agricultural</i> or <i>Special Agricultural land use types</i>.</li> <li>ii) A single additional residential unit in a principle dwelling or in a non-agricultural accessory structure (i.e., each principle dwelling is entitled to an additional residential unit either within the principle dwelling or in a non-agricultural accessory structure),</li> <li>iii) Seasonal farm labour housing units in the form of trailers, or bunkhouses, and</li> <li>iv) <i>On-farm diversified uses</i> and/or <i>agricultural-related uses</i>.</li> </ul> </li> <li>c) Residential units, including principle dwellings, seasonal farm labour accommodation, or additional residential units within <i>residential farm cooperatives</i> or <i>agri-miniums</i> are encouraged to be clustered, so as to facilitate the use of communal services (where feasible), minimize the removal of land from agricultural uses, and impacts on neighbouring agricultural operations.</li> <li>d) Encroachment into actively farmed agricultural lands shall be limited.</li> <li>e) The use maintains the agricultural/rural character of the area. The character of development must be low density and compatible with the surrounding land uses. For the purposes of this policy, low density refers to not exceeding the maximum lot density in section 5.4.3(1) of this Plan.</li> <li>f) The development will comply with the Provincial MDS formulae.</li> <li>g) It is ensured that surrounding agricultural operations can pursue their agricultural practices without impairment or inconvenience. Consideration should also be given to any potential development constraints (setback requirements) affecting future agricultural use on adjacent lands. This can be determined through the application of the Provincial MDS formulae (i.e., as per implementation guideline #6, all existing livestock facilities or anaerobic digesters within a 750 m distance of a proposed Type A land use and within a 1,500 m distance of a proposed Type B land use shall be investigated and MDS I setback calculations undertaken where warranted). The inverse shall be considered, such that should the proposed Type B land use be developed, review shall be completed identifying lands on adjacent properties that may be limited for a future livestock facility or anaerobic digester. When situating the new</li> </ul>
---	--

	<p>l) Other considerations for recreation or tourist-based cluster development types include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) A mix of land uses that support a diversity of uses and opportunities such as residential and commercial activities;</li> <li>ii) A built form that integrates and/or establishes lifestyle and/or cultural elements for the public within the development; and</li> <li>iii) When practical, contributing to existing trails, cultural landscapes, cultural events, or outdoor activity within the County;</li> <li>iv) A built environment that provides meaningful visual and physical access to nature throughout the site; and,</li> <li>v) Onsite public educational/interpretive information about the location's unique natural resource.</li> </ul>	<p>use, it would be encouraged to identify a location that would have limited future impact to the surrounding agricultural land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>h) Technical studies will be required for these application types to ensure limited impact. Some technical studies that may be needed include (but are not limited to); planning justification report, agricultural viability assessment, agricultural impact assessment, <i>farm business plan</i>, noise assessment, visual impact assessment (i.e., how is the rural landscape aesthetic being maintained and/or how is the historic character being supported), traffic impact study, functional servicing report, hydrogeological/nitrate study, <i>Minimum Distance Separation formulae</i> calculations, and/or an environmental impact study. Depending on the nature of development, comments may be required from the local health unit. Further details of what typically entails a complete application can be found under section 9.17 of this Plan.</li> <li>i) For recreation-based developments in <i>natural heritage features and areas</i>, the use shall be <i>compatible recreation</i>, meaning the use(s) will not negatively impact the natural features or function of the <i>natural heritage features and areas</i> as per Section 7 of this Plan. An environmental impact study may be required to assess the impacts on the <i>natural heritage features and areas</i>.</li> <li>j) That a site-specific zoning by-law amendment is approved by the <i>local municipality</i>, for any uses not permitted as of right.</li> <li>k) Public road access and internal private roads shall provide suitable access for users and emergency services.</li> <li>l) All Building Code requirements can be met.</li> <li>m) Water, septic, and stormwater management facilities can be provided in compliance with applicable regulations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Where viable, integrating low-impact development techniques for the land use planning, design, and engineering approaches to manage stormwater, through site arrangement and design, green infrastructure, and on-site natural features;</li> <li>ii) Efforts should be made to limit large-scale servicing demands for these development types, through considering the application of off-grid, low impact, non-polluting energy sources (e.g. rainwater harvesting, compost toilets, passive heating and cooling systems, solar, etc.).</li> </ul> </li> <li>n) Other considerations for recreation or tourist-based cluster development types include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Accessory uses that support recreation or tourism on-site, which may include limited commercial or cultural activities,</li> <li>ii) A built form that integrates natural and/or cultural elements for the public within the development,</li> <li>iii) When practical, contributing to existing trails, cultural landscapes, cultural events, or outdoor activity within the County,</li> <li>iv) How the amount of seasonal residential and/or commercial accommodation uses are commiserate with the <i>resource based recreational uses</i> on-site,</li> <li>v) How phasing of the new development will ensure the establishment of the <i>resource based recreational use</i> either in advance or at the same time as the seasonal residential components,</li> <li>vi) How the use will provide for effective stewardship of <i>natural features and areas</i> to ensure these features are a continued benefit for generations to come,</li> <li>vii) A built environment that provides meaningful access to nature and is sympathetic in design to the natural setting of the site, and/or,</li> <li>viii) Onsite public educational/interpretive information about the location's unique natural resource.</li> </ul> </li> <li>o) Notwithstanding the policies of section 5.4.2(8) of this Plan, for those lands described as Part of Lot 27, Concession 8, geographic Township of Collingwood, now in the Town of The Blue Mountains, the</li> </ul>
--	--	---



		policies of this section shall apply as they read prior to County Official Plan Amendment # 23, for the proposed <i>residential farm cooperative</i> development on these lands.
5.4.2(9)	Except for residential development associated with resource based recreational uses, new lot creation shall only be permitted via consent applications in accordance with the conditions of the general consent policies of Sections 8 and 9, in addition to the policies of Section 5.4.3.	Except for <i>agri-miniums</i> , which are permitted via a plan of condominium, new lot/unit creation in the <i>Rural land use type</i> shall only be permitted via consent applications in accordance with the conditions of the general consent policies of Sections 8 and 9 of this Plan, in addition to the policies of Section 5.4.3. Further residential lot/unit creation via plan of subdivision, plan of condominium, or life/land lease arrangements will not be permitted for permanent residential development in the <i>Rural land use type</i> and is encouraged to locate in the County's <i>settlement areas</i> .
5.4.2(10)	<p>Residential lot creation associated with resource based recreational uses, which exceeds the Rural lot density provisions of Table 9, under Section 5.4.3 of this Plan, shall require an amendment to this Plan. This type of lot creation may only take place via plan of subdivision/condominium, or life/land lease arrangements. Amendments to permit residential development associated with resource based recreational uses need to be supported by a planning justification report, by a registered professional planner, that addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) How the policies of this Plan, the Provincial Policy Statement, and the local municipal official plan are met;</li> <li>b) How the location is necessary to support the proposed uses;</li> <li>c) How the need for the proposed uses cannot be met by approved development in other locations in the County;</li> <li>d) How the new development is to be serviced in accordance with Section 8 of this Plan;</li> <li>e) How the design of the development will maximize the benefit of the site's natural resources, or form features;</li> <li>f) How phasing of the new development will ensure the establishment of the resource based recreational use either in advance or at the same time as the residential component;</li> <li>g) How the development will enhance public access to the natural resources upon which the resource based recreational uses are based; and</li> <li>h) How the use will provide for effective stewardship to ensure these features are a continued benefit for generations to come.</li> </ul> <p>For the purposes of this section resource based recreational uses are required to have recreational elements directly linked to the resource (e.g. skiing, boating, etc.). The availability of large amounts of Rural land, or scenic views of the surrounding countryside does not constitute a recreational land use in and of itself, and therefore does not qualify for new residential development via plan or subdivision or condominium in the Rural land use type.</p>	Residential lot/unit creation associated with <i>resource based recreational uses</i> , which exceeds the Rural lot density provisions of Table 9, under Section 5.4.3 of this Plan, will require an amendment to the Plan.

	Reasoning shall be provided demonstrating that the scale of the residential use is appropriate and desirable in relation to the resource based recreational use.	
5.4.2(11)	Not applicable – new subsection proposed to be added through Official Plan Amendment 23	Seasonal recreational dwellings, not intended as permanent residences, or other on-site commercial accommodation uses and on a single lot, associated with <i>resource based recreational uses</i> need to be supported by a planning justification report, by a <i>qualified individual</i> . For the purposes of this section, <i>resource based recreational uses</i> are required to have recreational elements directly linked to the resource (e.g. skiing, boating, etc.). The availability of large amounts of Rural land or scenic views of the surrounding countryside does not constitute a recreational land use in and of itself. Trails alone do not constitute a <i>resource based recreational use</i> , but may be permitted accessory to a <i>resource based recreational use</i> , e.g., a <i>campground</i> which also includes trails. The design of the development needs to integrate with the site's natural resources and demonstrate how the location is necessary to support the proposed uses. Reasoning shall be provided demonstrating that the scale of the seasonal recreational dwellings or on-site accommodations is appropriate and desirable in relation to the <i>resource based recreational use</i> .
5.4.2(12)	Not applicable – new subsection proposed to be added through Official Plan Amendment 23	<p>New Institutional uses may be considered for approval in the <i>Rural land use type</i>, where supported by a planning justification report, by a <i>qualified individual</i>, which addresses the following criteria;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) How the use will be serviced in accordance with Section 8 of this Plan,</li> <li>b) How the size and scale of the use are compatible with neighbouring land uses,</li> <li>c) The locational reasons considered by the proponent in siting the proposed use(s) relative to the users of the proposed institutional use,</li> <li>d) How the local road network will serve the traffic demands of the proposed use,</li> <li>e) The impact on on-site or neighbouring agricultural, aggregate, or bedrock resources, and</li> <li>f) Whether the use can be clustered with an existing or newly proposed Institutional use i.e., clustering a place of worship and a cemetery.</li> </ul> <p>Notwithstanding the provisions of 5.4.2(11)(c) above, where Institutional uses serve those segments of the population whose primary means of transportation is via horse and buggy and <i>active transportation</i>; further locational and needs analysis can be appropriately scoped, based on the needs of the population served.</p>
5.4.2(13)	Not applicable – new subsection proposed to be added through Official Plan Amendment 23	<p><i>Small scale</i> special event venues, such as dedicated wedding, concert, or performance venues, may be considered subject to a site-specific amendment to the municipal zoning by-law which addresses the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A description of the proposed facility, including the proposed indoor and outdoor event uses proposed,</li> <li>b) How the size and scale of the use are compatible with neighbouring land uses,</li> <li>c) How noise and light impacts will be mitigated to neighbouring land uses,</li> <li>d) A description of the frequency and size of proposed events,</li> <li>e) How the use will minimize the removal of land from active agricultural production and minimize impacts to future resource uses such as aggregate extraction,</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f) How the use will be serviced in accordance with Section 8 of this Plan, and whether the servicing will be permanent or seasonal/portable in nature,</li> <li>g) How the local road network will serve the traffic demands of the proposed use,</li> <li>h) How parking or shuttle transportation needs will be addressed,</li> <li>i) Whether the use is co-located with other complimentary permitted uses, and</li> <li>j) How the use will minimize impact on surrounding natural heritage features as per Section 7 of this Plan and how these impacts will be mitigated.</li> </ul> <p><i>Small scale</i> special event venues are encouraged to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Limit amplified noise or performance spaces to indoor or enclosed sections of the site to minimize impacts on neighbours,</li> <li>b) Adaptively reuse existing buildings or structures on-site, provided the reuse does not significantly limit <i>agricultural uses</i> or other types of resource use on-site,</li> <li>c) Consider which buildings and structures are permanently sited, versus which buildings and structures maybe temporary or seasonal in nature (e.g., tents, porta-potties, etc.), and</li> <li>d) Co-locate with <i>agricultural uses</i> or <i>agricultural-related uses</i>, which provide added <i>agri-tourism</i> opportunities on-site, such as wineries or cideries.</li> </ul> <p>Notwithstanding this section of the Plan, the following uses shall not be considered a <i>small scale</i> special event venue, and therefore are not subject to this section of the Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Infrequent agriculturally focused events (i.e., annual or bi-annual), such as but not limited to; harvest festivals, maple syrup festivals, farm education events, or farm equipment demonstrations, etc., or</li> <li>2) Small event spaces co-located within an agricultural-related use (e.g., a tasting room within a winery or cidery), which are not intended for weddings, concerts, or large performances, but may hold short-term tours, tastings, or meetings, or</li> <li>3) One-off special events such as a single wedding or a family reunion in a temporary facility (e.g., a tent), and shall be permitted subject to any municipal policies or by-laws in place for such special events.</li> </ul>
9.18	<p>AGRI-MINIUMS are a form of collective ownership that can be established under the Condominium Act whereby a farm could be divided into plots where each farmer owns a plot of land with some parts under collective ownership including shared buildings, livestock barns, storage sheds which the group of farmers divides up the costs and maintenance of the shared buildings/areas.</p>	<p>AGRI-MINIUMS are a form of collective ownership that can be established under the <i>Condominium Act</i> whereby a farm could be divided into plots where each farmer owns a plot of land with some parts under collective ownership including shared buildings, livestock barns, storage sheds which the group of farmers divides up the costs and maintenance of the shared buildings/areas. <i>Agri-miniums</i> are intended to support agricultural production, by allowing new farmers the ability to access land and accommodations for the purposes of farming, and are intended to be farmed by those living on-site. <i>Agri-miniums</i> are only permitted in the <i>Rural land use type</i>, subject to the policies of 5.4 of this Plan.</p>
9.18	<p>AGRI-TOURISM USES means those farm-related tourism uses, including limited accommodation such as a bed and breakfast, that promote the enjoyment, education or activities related to the farm operation; such uses may also include farm vacation suites, hay rides, petting zoos, farm-themed playgrounds, horse trail rides, corn mazes, seasonal events, equine events, or wine tasting.</p>	<p>AGRI-TOURISM USES means those farm-related tourism uses, including limited accommodation such as a bed and breakfast, that promote the enjoyment, education or activities related to the farm operation; such uses may also include farm vacation suites, hay rides, petting zoos, farm-themed playgrounds, horse trail rides, corn mazes, seasonal events, <i>small scale</i> special event venues, equine events, or wine/cider tasting.</p>

9.18	Not applicable – new definition proposed to be added through Official Plan Amendment 23	<i>RESIDENTIAL FARM COOPERATIVES</i> means a cooperative as per the <i>Co-operative Corporations Act</i> , where buildings and land are cooperatively owned and operated. Within a <i>residential farm cooperative</i> , lands are not to be subdivided and conveyed independently of one another. <i>Residential farm co-operatives</i> are intended to support agricultural production, by allowing new farmers the ability access land and accommodations for the purposes of farming, and are intended to be farmed by those living on-site. <i>Residential farm cooperatives</i> are only permitted in the <i>Rural land use type</i> , subject to the policies of 5.4 of this Plan.
9.18	RESOURCE BASED RECREATIONAL USES must mean those recreational uses where the prime reason for location by their very nature, require certain natural attributes for their location including the availability of large lots or land areas. Uses permitted may include passive and active recreational facilities and associated commercial and residential uses. Such uses can include water based recreation, campgrounds, lodges/resorts and skiing/snowboarding facilities.	<i>RESOURCE BASED RECREATIONAL USES</i> mean those recreational uses where the prime reason for location requires certain natural attributes including the availability of large lots or land areas. Uses permitted may include passive and active recreational facilities, and associated commercial uses including recreational dwellings not intended as permanent residences. Such uses can include water-based recreation, <i>campgrounds</i> , lodges/resorts, seasonal trailer parks, and skiing/snowboarding facilities. Trails alone do not constitute a <i>resource based recreational use</i> , but may be permitted accessory to a <i>resource based recreational use</i> , e.g., a <i>campground</i> which also includes trails.
9.18	Not applicable – new definition proposed to be added through Official Plan Amendment 23	<i>PLACES OF WORSHIP</i> means a building used for the practice of religion and faith-based spiritual purposes wherein people assemble for religious worship, faith-based teaching, fellowship, and community social outreach.