

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
ADVISORY COMMITTEES (2):		
Accessibility Advisory Committee April 14, 2009	Section 1.2: That a paragraph be inserted into Section 1.2 stating that the Township will ensure that they are in compliance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 and with the five standards legislated under the Act; Customer Service Standard, Employment Standard, Built Environment Standard, Information and Communication Standard and the Transportation Standard.	Text has been revised.
Heritage Scugog Committee February 2009 April 15, 2009	Encourage lowering cash in lieu fee charges for development in the Downtown core.	Policy recognizes reduced parking requirements in Downtown. Council's cash in lieu policies to be determined by By-law.
	Remove the wording "whenever practical" in Section 3.5 .	Text has been revised.
	Remove the word "encourage" from Section 2.5 a) Culture.	Text has been revised
	Add a Section c) to 2.5 Culture to recognize the role of Heritage Scugog.	Text has been revised
	Recommend that additional policies be included in Sections 3.5, 4.2.5 and 4.2.6.	Policies added.
	Include a paragraph in Section 3.5 Built Cultural Resources, that will state that the Township may provide loans, grants or tax incentives for the conservation heritage	Text has been revised

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	resources.	
	That the use of the word inventory in Section 3.5 be replaced with the word "register" and the role definition of a Heritage Register be expanded.	Text has been revised
PUBLIC AGENCIES (6):		
Region of Durham October 2, 2008 April 24, 2009	Details provided in Attachment 2	
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing May 11, 2009	Hamlets: MMAH is concerned with the amount of growth, up to 25%, proposed outside the existing Hamlet boundaries as Section 3.4.1 of the Greenbelt Plan states; Hamlets are not locations to which growth should be directed. In particular, the Ministry is concerned with the estimated number of units allocated to the following hamlets: Black Stock (69), Caesarea (72), Epsom (12), Nestleton Station (20) and Seagrave (18).	Numbers have been revised. Hamlet growth is 8% of total growth for Township.
	The Greenbelt Plan permits a one time minor rounding out of hamlet boundaries at the time of municipal conformity. A hamlet expansion should be a 'round out' of a hamlet and the 'round out' should be minor in nature, and should not be utilized as a	Further discussion with the Province is required.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	<p>means to direct growth to hamlets that otherwise cannot be accommodated within the Port Perry Urban Area due to servicing constraints. For example, the expansion proposed to Nestleton Station, Utica and Seagrave appear to be linear extensions and promoting strip development and not rounding out of the hamlet boundaries.</p>	
	<p>The MMAH does not support the Township proceeding with its estimated growth potential for Hamlets as it applies to the size and scale of the proposed minor rounding out of certain hamlets and encourages the Township to reconsider this direction in context of the Greenbelt Plan and settlement of the ROPA 114 hamlet appeal.</p>	<p>Further discussion with the Province is required.</p>
	<p>Blackstock – While Blackstock is shown as a Town/Village on Schedule 1 of the Greenbelt Plan, the Greenbelt Plan defers to municipal official plans for the identification and detailed delineation of settlement boundaries. Blackstock has always been and is currently identified as a Hamlet in the Durham Region OP. Further the status of Blackstock as a Hamlet was recently confirmed by the Region through its Five-year review of the Durham Region OP and</p>	<p>Further discussion with the Province is required.</p>

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	the adoption of ROPA 114. Therefore, the Draft OP needs to be revised to reflect the status of Blackstock as a Hamlet to conform to Durham Region OP.	
	The draft OP includes a policy to maintain a ten year supply of land for residential development. This policy needs to be linked to the allocation from Durham Region to Scugog of the growth forecasts (e.g. population and household forecasts) intensification targets and density targets for designated Greenfield areas.	Further discussion with the Province is required.
	The vast majority of growth allocated by the Region should be accommodated within the Port Perry Urban Area as it is the primary settlement area within the Township. MMAH is concerned that the Township is using the ten year supply of housing as a basis to support the proposed expansions of hamlets due to the servicing constraints associated with Port Perry	Further discussion with the Province is required.
Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority April 20, 2009	Assumed alternate designations for lands that may not be suitable for development based on employment designation to an appropriate protective designation.	Redesignations will be considered in areas that may have constraints or simply to other designations, which are appropriately justified.
	CLOCA currently preparing watershed plans which could have implications for Scugog	Watershed plans accounted for in Section 3.21.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	lands.	
	Include reference to protect Chalk Lake as well as Lake Scugog.	Text has been revised. Note Chalk Lake is located in ORM area and is protected by the ORM policies.
	CLOCA supports request to Durham Region to explore opportunities to improve the capacity of Simcoe Street between Port Perry and Oshawa and improvements to Simcoe Street /Coates Road intersection.	Comments noted.
	Requests Shoreline policies for Lake Scugog be applied to Chalk Lake except for several exceptions-private ownership-no public accesses, and Greenbelt/ORM-differentiation for policies as it relates to ORM and Chalk Lake.	ORM policies prevail.
	Detailed comments provided as it relates to Natural Heritage, Resource Management, Groundwater, Planning.	
	Natural Heritage-suggest goal to protect, enhance and restore significant KNHF in settlement areas in Goals and Strategic Directions in OP.	Text has been revised.
	Section 2.2: Ensure protection and enhancement to Chalk Lake as well.	Text has been revised.
	Section 6.4, 6.5 are not in compliance with Greenbelt Plan, since ORM and Greenbelt not harmonized yet. Should be a policy that	Comments noted.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	states the policy that offers the greatest protection should prevail.	
	Section 3.7: Comment whether “significant woodlands” is defined.	Mapped on Schedule B.
	Section 3.15 f): Suggested wording “the elimination of pesticide use should be accomplished though Bill 64 2008 ”Cosmetic Pesticides Ban Act”.	Text has been revised.
	Section 3.17 g): Suggested wording “avoid natural heritage and natural hazard features (vegetation, floodplains and steep slopes).	Text has been revised.
	Section 3.21 d): Suggested wording “A Natural Heritage System which includes a detailed assessment and integrate analysis of the natural heritage features, functions and linkages on a watershed basis for incorporation into the Greenlands System.	Text has been revised.
	Section 3.23 d): Remove “non-exotic”, and concerned that Section f) is confusing, and g) requires definition.	Text has been revised.
	Section 6.4 a): Combine a) and b).	OK as it is.
	Section 6.13.4 i): Suggested consistency in use of “hydrologically sensitive feature” and “key hydrologic feature”.	ORM policies approved as worded.
	Suggested need to mention watershed plans in addition to Section 3.21, and need to incorporate reference to other natural	Cannot reference all related documents.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	resource management documents that provide direction for natural heritage/fisheries related activities.	
	Section 3.15: Suggested modifications related to Source Water Protection and questioned enforceability of c) with respect to Water Taking & Transfers Act, and a permit issued by the province.	
	Section 3.15 e): Suggested it should look to eliminate salt use in the vicinity of municipal wells and clusters (Hamlets with clusters of wells).	In Section 3.15 e).
	Section 3.20: Suggested wording that pre and post development monitoring down gradient be required.	Text has been revised.
	Section 3.22: Use HVA, Highly Vulnerable Aquifer terminology.	Text has been revised.
	Section 4.9.3 a): Suggested additional wording “stable slopes, erosion areas, meander belts and unstable/organic soils”.	Text has been revised. Text in Section 4.9.1 a) also revised to reflect changes made in this section.
	Section 5.2: Suggested separate sections/policies for Lake Scugog, Chalk Lake, no Shoreline designation on Chalk Lake.	Some amendments made. ORM/Shoreline issues. Shoreline will not apply to Chalk Lake.
	Section 6.8.2: Suggested additional wording “to protect those lands with the greatest concentrations of key natural heritage	ORM Policies as approved.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	features which are critical to maintaining the integrity of the Moraine as a whole”.	
	Section 5.22: Suggested same permitted uses as in Section 6.8.2.	No change in ORM policies.
	Section 5.23: Suggested referring to ORM policies.	Shoreline will not apply to Chalk Lake.
	Section 5.2.3: Suggest new section to suggest that tertiary treatment for sewage disposal systems be expanded upon to include all lands within 120m of hydrologically sensitive features connected to Chalk Lake.	New section added to plan.
	Suggested deletion of Section 5.2.3.2 Commercial.	Shoreline will not apply to Chalk Lake.
	Section 5.2.4: Review policies in context of Chalk Lake.	Shoreline will not apply to Chalk Lake.
	Section 6.1: Questioned if “significant” defined.	“Significant” defined in Greenbelt Plan with respect to wetlands, endangered species, woodlands, cultural heritage and archaeology.
	Section 6.2.f): Suggested using same vegetation protection zone as in ORM	Text has been revised.
	Section 6.2 h): Wording unclear	
	Section 6.5: Questioning whether 120m is a true vegetation protection buffer zone or lands within the linkage area	Includes the 30m protection zone.
	Section 6.8.3 a): Suggested this is the same	Yes, wording will be changed.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	wording as Section 6.9.2 b) was this intended?	
	Schedule B: Issues with confusing colour tones, symbols on Chalk Lake	As approved ORM mapping.
	Section 6.13.5 b i): Suggested that encroachment should not occur in vegetation protection zones.	ORM approved policy – but this is more correct - text revised.
Bell Canada October 20, 2008 April 24, 2009	Definitions of Infrastructure and Utility should be added in the Official Plan	Definitions are not forming a section within the Official Plan. Suggested terminology can be added to the existing text.
	Requested an additional section in the Official Plan to address utilities in addition to the transportation and infrastructure policies	Text has been revised.
	Requested new policy be added related to community design and utility infrastructure.	Text has been revised.
	Suggested replacing term “telephone” with telecommunications/communications throughout document	Text has been revised.
	Section 2.1 Growth Management: Suggested adding wording regarding existing infrastructure to Section 2.1 c).	Text has been revised.
	Section 3.17 Telecommunication Facilities: Suggested rewording to Telecommunications Towers and Antennas.	
	Section 3.18 Urban Design: Suggested wording as it relates to utilities.	
	Section 7 Transportation and Infrastructure:	Permitted in all designations but should

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	Clarification needed between policies in Sections 7.2 d) and 7.8 a).	avoid KNHF's and HSF's.
	Section 7.8 e): Concerned that it relates to telecommunications infrastructure	As worded applies to telecommunications infrastructure.
	Section 7.8 c): Suggested rewording.	
	Section 7.3.5 Design Guidelines: Suggested wording "where feasible" instead of where possible.	
Parks Canada October 3, 2008 April 21, 2009	Advises that there should be policy protection provided for all wetlands regardless of provincial classification, which applies to the bed of Lake Scugog.	Text will be revised.
	Advises the Greenbelt Plan's shoreline development policies should be applied to Lake Scugog.	Text will be revised.
	Advises "shoreline" is added to the range of landscapes where rural character is to be protected.	Range of shoreline protection policies within Official Plan.
	Suggested utilizing a range of Federal publications available for the protection and conservation of historic places in Canada in the preparation of heritage protection policies within the Official Plan.	Guidelines will be investigated.
	Section 2: Suggested a statement to recognize the obligation to protect species-at-risk and a policy (Section 3) that implements both federal and provincial	

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	legislation where relevant into OP's	
	Section 2.5 and 3.5 Cultural Heritage Resources: Suggested that the Township should prepare an inventory of existing cultural resources based on an agreed set of criteria. Suggested broadening statements in Section 3.5 to include cultural landscapes of rural and natural value. Suggested Heritage Scugog co-ordinate the work of inventory and evaluation.	
	Suggested the OP use the Standards and Guideline for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada guidelines.	
	Section 3.5: Suggested that Parks Canada be identified as an approval agency with respect to the protection of archaeological resources on the shoreline.	
	Section 3.2: Suggested that alternative energy policies near Lake Scugog account for rural character.	
	Section 3.18 b): Suggested policy be augmented to include presentation of information related to the history and heritage of the community, historic relationship to Lake Scugog, and role as gateway to the Trent-Severn Waterway.	Official Plan to contain only policy.
	Section 4.2.1: Suggested including	Text has been revised.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	reference to recognize, build-upon, and strengthen the downtown’s historic relationship with the waterfront of Lake Scugog.	
	Suggested shoreline designation policies be transferred also to Section 2 and 3 in the plan particularly as it relates to reference to Parks Canada Policies for In-Water and Shoreline Works and Related Activities.	
	Section 5.2.1 d) and e): Suggested a need for a new subcategory 2, objectives to address objectives for the shoreline specifically.	
	Section 5.2.1: Suggested looking at Muskoka phosphorous loading model for Lake Scugog.	Many policies have been included.
	Recommended that the Township be satisfied that the policies in the OP dealing with large-scale fractional ownership are sufficient.	New commercial requires OPA.
	Section 5.2.3.1 f): Suggested may want to clarify “natural vegetated” and “vegetation buffer”; suggested “maintained” in f) viii)	
	Section 5.2.4: Suggested Waterfront design policies should extend beyond the Shoreline designation, apply to urban area of Port Perry, hamlets (Ceasarea), if not these	New section added to urban design guidelines.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	<p>policies should be repeated in the specific subsections, 5.3 Hamlets, and Section 5.4 Greenlands System, cross reference is required</p>	
	<p>Schedule A and Schedule B: Greenlands system on Schedule A does not match the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System on Schedule B. Not clear if the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System on Schedule B is covered by the Greenland System policies. The areas on Schedule A should be brought under the wing of the Greenland System Policies.</p>	<p>Mapping reviewed and modified where necessary.</p>
<p>Kawartha Region Conservation Authority Preliminary Comments May 20, 2009</p>	<p>Linkages to the Lake Scugog Environmental Management Plan be completed by KRCA in partnership with the Township and others be outlined in the OP, specifically how the policies of the OP complement and support the LSEMP.</p>	<p>Text has been revised</p>
	<p>The OP should reference the Endangered Species Act (2007) and mention the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources primary role in the implementation of its species-at-risk program through the implementation of this Act.</p>	<p>Text has been revised – required as part of EIS</p>
	<p>Section 6.15: Should state the importance of East Cross Forest Conservation Area with</p>	<p>Text has been revised</p>

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	respect to its significant function for groundwater protection and its ecological importance as a core area on the ORM.	
	Schedule A-1, Employment Lands: Show the boundaries of the Provincially Significant Wetland (Nonquon River Westland #7) that the MNR has approved in consultation with KRCA, Township and Region as per the meeting of March, 2009.	Mapping has been revised
	Section 4.9 Hazard Lands: Should reference the Regulatory Flood Elevation for Lake Scugog; this elevation is 250.9m above sea level (250.9mASL); the OP should provide policies that direct the development to lands above the Regulatory Flood Elevation for Lake Scugog, except for development permitted by the PPS.	Text has been revised
	Section 5.2 Shoreline Policies: Should make reference to the importance of the shoreline buffers to maintain the health and viability of adjacent aquatic habitat.	Text has been revised
	Section 5.2: Should encourage the use of native plants as much as possible within a required vegetation buffer zone, e.g. a 20m shoreline vegetation buffer (Section 5.2.3.1	Text has been revised

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	f)). Rural System Policy should provide for vegetation buffers in riparian zones along streams and rivers and abutting wetlands in conjunction with Conservation Authority requirements.	Text has been revised
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS/INTEREST GROUPS (3):		
Scugog Lake Stewards Inc. October 3, 2008 March 30, 2009	Concern regarding planning goals for the re-inspection and required upgrade of existing private septic systems especially for the shoreline areas.	Lake Scugog Environmental Management Plan is referenced.
	Concerns regarding existing permanent dwellings vs. original seasonal dwellings and the need for workable, affordable, communal tertiary systems.	In Plan now – additional policies added.
	Suggest shoreline policies should be enhanced to indicate that new and replacement private sewage systems should involve methodologies to reduce the annual volume of nitrogen and phosphorus added to the lake each year. They have suggested a 100 ft. setback from Class 4 septic systems for the shoreline of a lake or rather than the current 50 ft.	In Plan.
	Concerns over stormwater objectives, should be further enhanced to reduce	In Plan.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	nutrients and pollutants to lake/streams	
	Suggested specific objectives regarding the reduction of volume of nutrients and pollutants to Lake Scugog and tributaries by stormwater systems.	In Plan.
	Suggested additional wording for the Preamble of the Official Plan, which sets out growth limitations in the Township in relation to the water quantity and quality of Lake Scugog.	This has not been established yet.
	Suggested Stormwater management concepts should apply to new development as well as “infilling” with mention of specific methodologies such as rain gardens, infiltration swales, rain barrels, below ground cisterns, planting etc.	Text added to Section 3.16.
	Concern that “development” in Shoreline Area only refers to new development.	Term development refers to all development both new and infilling.
	Suggested that the re-inspection and upgrade of shoreline private septic systems could be addressed in the OP	Not an OP related matter.
	Suggested a 100ft. setback from conventional systems from the waters edge	Section 5.2.3 d) specifies for conversions of seasonal to permanent dwellings by 50% that they are required to utilize sewage disposal systems that incorporate tertiary treatment that will significantly reduce or prevent the migration of phosphorous and

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
<p>Port Perry BIA February 2008 April 19, 2009</p>		nitrogen into Lake Scugog or Chalk Lake.
	Suggested making change to Section 4.2.2, Main Central Area to exclude “Entertainment and Private Clubs” under permitted uses.	Text has been revised.
	Suggested recognition/further recognition of “Historic Downtown” in Section 4.2, 8.9 Urban Design Guidelines.	New Schedule prepared.
	Section 1.4: Concerned projected population is low.	Population based on Growing Durham Report.
	Section 2.1: Concerned over units of 110 per year - seems inaccurate based on population.	Based on Regional Growth Plan Projections.
	Section 3.8, 3.9: Concerned Garden Suites and Accessory Apts. and Group Homes permitted in Main Central Area. Concerned with preserving Queen and Water Street for prestige retail use.	Garden Suites and Accessory Apartments permitted in all designations that permit residential uses. Group Homes-by-law to address siting, distance separation etc.
	Section 3.18: Concern regarding definition of “graphic design language” and “landscaping” mean with regard to gateways. Indigenous trees may not be appropriate.	
	Section 4: Reference in Section 4.1.3 a) of 30% for multiple unit dwellings and in p) 25%, Garden suite definition	Text has been revised. Garden Suites defined in Planning Act.
Section 4.2.2, 4.2.3: Concern with preserving Queen and Water Streets in the new Heritage Conservation District Plan for	Variety of retail uses permitted plus residential on second/third floors.	

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	prestige retail use.	
	Section 4.2.5: Concerns regarding allowing 3 rather than 2 storeys, connections to Lake Scugog require clarification, how will not permitting “typical national signage” affect bank signage on Queen St., Concern whether heritage buildings will be permitted to enlarge windows, enclosing garbage may be difficult in the downtown core.	Region recommends minimum height to encourage intensification.
	Section 4.2.6: Inquired as to definition of “recognizable gateway”.	
	Section 4.5: Concerned that there is a need to recognize the east and west entrances into Port Perry as well as north and south.	Text modified in Urban Design guidelines.
	Section 4.7: Designated Main Central Area into two sub-designations Prestige and General.	These are industrial terms.
	Suggested FWD site should identify type of waste	
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation April 24, 2009	Stated the First Nation has a constitutional right to be consulted with respect to any decision that is contemplated that could cause an adverse affect upon the interests of the First Nation. Concerned with procedural and substantive changes that accompany the draft Official Plan.	Informal consultation meeting held. Formal consultation is the responsibility of the Approval Authority, which is the Region of Durham.
	Concern with Seven Mile Island property	Seven Mile Island is primarily

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	zoned C5-8-may require expanding the roadway, concerned that they may not be able to do so.	Environmental Protection. Previous reviews have indicated that roadway could be expanded. Zoning not impacted by OP.
INDIVIDUALS (27):		
17300 Island Road Management Services September 24, 2008	Concern over the interpretation of development in the Shoreline designation in the Greenbelt Plan. In areas designated Shoreline Residential she is of the opinion that development may exceed three new lots.	Text will be revised to reflect expansion of Shoreline Areas beyond 3 lots and minor rounding out to be shown on Land Use Schedules.
Fourteen Estates September 24, 2008	Concern regarding limiting development in the hamlets.	Comment noted. Hamlet expansion policies have been revised to reflect servicing, topographical and environmental constraints.
	Concern regarding Residential Clusters and further development.	Comment noted. Text for draft Official Plan reflects infill development not to exceed more than three new lots.
Honey Harbour Heights October 1, 2008	Concern regarding the expansion of the Urban Area of Port Perry.	No expansion of the Urban Area considered. Section 3.44 of Greenbelt Plan requires a council resolution prior to December 16, 2003 authorizing the consideration of an expansion, substantial completion of background reports on consideration of expansion.
Valerie Cranmer March 30, 2009	Concern regarding Schedule B, Environmental Features- Pt. Lot 7,	Larger dashed blue pattern is ORM Wetland. Kettle Lake designation shown on

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	<p>Concession 3, 681 High Point Road, concern regarding Kettle Lake designation, concern regarding field areas as being designated as ORM Woodland.</p>	<p>kettle lakes. Lands are identified and shown as wetland according to ORM data.</p>
<p>Miriam Labanovitch March 30, 2009</p>	<p>Concern regarding property located on Pt. of Lot 22, Concession 11, adjacent to and south of Washago Bay Lane. Would like to see modification made to Section 5.2.3.1 c) that specifies that development shall be permitted only on existing lots of record on private roads unless the following criteria met: The private road is recognized in the Zoning By-law as a public improved road that is not maintained by the Township.</p>	<p>The OP requires that all new lots have frontage on and direct access on a year round publicly maintained road. The Washago Bay property has been recognized in the Zoning By-law. Only development on existing lots of record are permitted on private roads.</p>
<p>17300 Island Road Management Services March 26, 2009 March 31, 2009</p>	<p>Request to have 20 acre parcel adjacent to existing shoreline development south of Spring Blvd. on the west side of Island Road to be included in Shoreline designation as part of OP review. Further discussions will be held with staff to determine what constitutes “small-scale plan of subdivision”.</p> <p>Concern regarding what is meant by “small scale subdivision in the plan”. Preference that text remains unchanged.</p>	<p>Mapping revisions included.</p> <p>Text has not been changed - no definition of what constitutes a “small plan of subdivision”.</p>

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
		See also Regional Comments
Honey Harbour Heights April 14, 2009	Concern reiterated in letters dated (February 19, 2007, September 25, 2007, and October, 2008) regarding the expansion of the urban area of Port Perry north to Whitfield Road.	No expansion of the Urban Area considered. Section 3.44 of Greenbelt Plan requires a council resolution prior to December 16, 2003 authorizing the consideration of an expansion, substantial completion of background reports on consideration of expansion.
Fourteen Estates April 14, 2009	Concern regarding including land owned by Fourteen Estates in the Hamlet of Caesarea.	Currently only a portion of the Fourteen Estates property is included in the new hamlet boundary.
Walfried Gotthelf April 24, 2009	Concern regarding the 300 acre land locked parcel of land owned by Walfried Gotthelf. Suggested Section 6.12 be modified to allow for lot line adjustment to provide access to existing lots of record, currently land locked subject to criteria.	ORM policies cannot be revised until ORM review post 2015.
Dan McCulloch October 1, 2008	Concern regarding property located at Scugog Point Rd. & Mabel St. Interest in expanding Shoreline Residential Area to include lands east of Scugog Point Road, north of Mabels Road.	No expansion of the Shoreline area considered in this location. Area falls within the Natural Core Area and Natural Linkage Area of the Greenlands System.
James Cannon December 29, 2008	Request to have retail operation located at 1920 Whitfield Road recognized in Official Plan.	Current zoning Rural Exception Forty-Nine (RU-49) recognizes a "Country Market" provided the market is operated on a seasonal basis and is recognized as part of the farm unit in conjunction with farm

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
		<p>holdings to the north. The market currently sells homemade sauces and home décor items.</p> <p>Proposed policies provide more flexibility for commercial uses in Agricultural policies. Specific zoning regulations need to be considered.</p>
<p>Brett Puckrin January, 2009</p>	<p>Request to have 22451 Simcoe Street and 2301 Puckrin Drive included in the Hamlet of Seagrave.</p>	<p>Based on the revisions to the hamlet Schedules for Seagrave, a portion of 22451 east of Simcoe Street is proposed to be included in the hamlet but not all the lands extending north to the Nonquon River. The lands at 2301 is not proposed to be located in the new hamlet boundary as they are located too far south from the boundary to be considered.</p>
<p>Kennedy Self October 22, 2009</p>	<p>Request for enlargement of the hamlet boundary of Nestleton.</p>	<p>The Nestleton boundary has been expanded to reflect the area identified.</p>
<p>Don Farquharson March 24, 2009</p>	<p>Concerned with use of “may” in describing policy for Source Water Protection.</p>	<p>Text has not been revised, still references “Council may” and “Township may” – not mandatory.</p>
<p>Cheryl Helm</p>	<p>Concerned with the lack of park areas for new residential development, no park areas for Honey Heights & Ravines of Cawkers Creek Subdivisions</p>	<p>Text in Official Plan in Section 4.8 Parks and Open Space addresses need for urban Greenland system to be connected to Township’s Greenland system, objective to provide for a continuous trail and integrated</p>

ATTACHMENT 1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS

Comment From	Comment	Response
		park system through Port Perry. Text and mapping revised.
Robert Prentice 18100 Island Road April 3, 2009	Request to have the Shoreline designation extended to include property at Concession 9, Part Lot 7, 1, 2 to allow for widened two-tier development on Stephenson's Point Road, and Spring Boulevard subdivisions.	Lands included in Shoreline designation.
Felix Marco April 20, 2009	Concern regarding the hamlet boundaries of Seagrave. Has a 74 acre parcel within the hamlet boundary and wishes to include an additional 20 acre parcel within the hamlet limits.	A small portion of this property providing for minor infill has been included in the hamlet of Seagrave.
Pat Longmuir April 21, 2009	Request to have Official Plan reviewed in light of specific comments she provided on Accessibility.	Accessibility comments incorporated where appropriate in Strategic Directions, General Development Criteria and Site Plan policies.
Gloria Marco Borys April 22, 2009	Request to have (further to request made on February 26, 2008) to have two properties (50 River Street) incorporated into the hamlet of Seagrave	A small portion of this property providing for minor infill has been included in the hamlet of Seagrave.
Michael Fowler April 23, 2009	Concerned that lands previously designated Main Central Area in the existing Scugog Official Plan located north of North Street from Water Street to Perry Street have been designated Residential in the new draft OP.	Schedule has been revised.
Jennifer Hughson April 23, 2009	Suggested including all of their property at 2370 within the Hamlet of Seagrave.	Hamlet for Seagrave is unlikely to be adjusted due to development constraints.
Peter Wokral	Section 3.5: Suggested changing wording	Text Revised

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
April 24, 2009	<p>from “whenever practical” to “shall be consistent with Provincial Policy Statement, Section 2.6.1: Suggested incorporating Section 2.6.3 of the PPS into OP.</p>	
	<p>Section 3.5b): Suggested wording change from “may” to “shall” with respect to passing by-law to impose interim control of alterations and demolitions.</p>	<p>Suggested wording change may place too onerous conditions on Council.</p>
	<p>Section 3.6 Energy Conservation: Suggested new paragraph as it relates to historic preservation</p>	<p>Text has been revised.</p>
	<p>Section 3.10 Home Based Businesses: Suggested home based business may only be operated by person living in home.</p>	<p>Section 3.10 states that the home based business use is secondary to primary use as a residence to the person conducting business.</p>
	<p>Section 4.1.1 d): Suggested removing small scale commercial uses from Residential designation.</p>	<p>Local commercial permitted but limited based on growth and justification.</p>
	<p>Section 4.2.3: Suggested removing reference to land assembly to create larger, more viable parcels, as it is in conflict with maintaining scale and form that exists.</p>	<p>Text has been revised.</p>
	<p>Section 4.2.5: Suggested limiting height in historic downtown to 2 storeys, building materials not in keeping with character should read “not permitted” rather than “be</p>	<p>Three stories requested by Region.</p>

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	discouraged, re-word section 4.2.5 xi).	
	Schedule A-1: Suggested Suny's gas station should be shown in the Community Commercial designation.	It is designated that way.
	Suggested there should be discussion on accessibility in conjunction with heritage conservation.	Text has been revised in Sections 4.2.5 and 4.2.6
	Suggested plan needs to identify where automobile oriented facilities can be located, these uses should not be permitted in Neighbourhood Commercial or Main Central Area, Policies in Section 4.3.4 should be repeated in urban design guidelines for designations permitting auto oriented facilities.	Text has been revised.
	Suggested the Township should prohibit use of snowmobiles in the urban area.	Disagree due to proximity of Lake Scugog within the urban area.
	Suggested too many residential properties have been designated as part of the Main Central Area and Corridor Commercial Area.	Designation not extended.
Michael Fowler April 23, 2009 John & Sandra Frey	Concerns regarding Hamlet of Nestleton boundaries. Suggested a larger portion of clients lands to be included in Nestleton boundary.	Expansion can be incorporated as requested.
James Taylor April 24, 2009	Noted that he is unable to provide comments until he receives drawings/definitions related to the Employment Lands.	

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
<p>Zelinka Priamo Ltd. April 24, 2009</p>	<p>Concern regarding Official Plan text, Loblaws has no plans/desire to relocate the existing YIG store. Suggested a site specific OP policy may be appropriate rather than proposed designation for lands. When YIG constructed, new standard of design was developed that predates proposed OP design policies.</p>	<p>Special Policy Area to Address</p>
	<p>Section 3.1: Suggested soils and drainage better addressed at site plan stage.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>Section 3.2 Alternative energy: concerned at what stage of energy project triggers need for OPA.</p>	<p>Plan revised – Over 2.0 Mw</p>
	<p>Section 3.6 g): Suggested use of “requiring” inconsistent with other Section 3.6 wording.</p>	<p>Consistent with other policies in Plan.</p>
	<p>Section 3.12: Suggested requiring all new construction to meet LEED standards onerous, inconsistency in wording, no definition of “major renovation projects”, what authority is Twp. Requiring LEED silver to be met.</p>	<p>Consideration given to the adoption of LEED: EBOM (Existing Buildings Operation and Maintenance) and LEED: CS (Core and Shell). Policy similar to those adopted by municipalities across Canada.</p>
	<p>Section 3.18: Concern about Urban Design Guidelines being implemented as policies of the OP, Section 3.1, statement regarding General Development Policies and the fact that they do not apply to every development.</p>	<p>Provided for in Bill 51. Important for Site Plan consideration.</p>

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	<p>Section 3.18: Concerned that policies regarding Gateway Design Study may include Loblaws lands. Concerned no mention made of spacing of street trees.</p>	<p>Design Study as a condition or redevelopment. Design guidelines to specify.</p>
	<p>Section 4, Schedule A-1: Appears to be mapping error for Loblaws lands - is designated Main Central Area, Corridor Commercial and Residential.</p>	<p>Mapping Revised.</p>
	<p>Section 4.2-Main Central Area: Concern that there is not two designations for Historic Downtown Area and Water Street.</p>	<p>Mapping Revised.</p>
	<p>Section 4.2.1e): Main Central Area designation only includes part of YIG property.</p>	<p>Intended as shown.</p>
	<p>Section 4.2.2: Concerned that it has removed department (retail) stores as a permitted use.</p>	<p>Legal existing uses protected.</p>
	<p>Section 4.2.3: Concerned that it renders YIG non-conforming (1,400m² in OP), YIG store 5,107 m², area at odds with policy for land assembly.</p>	<p>Land assembly section deleted.</p>
	<p>Section 4.2.6: Clarification needed if YIG is subject to guidelines in this section.</p>	<p>Not included.</p>
	<p>Section 4.3: Suggested missing previous OP wording addressing function of and</p>	<p>Reworded in new text.</p>

Comment From	Comment	Response
	character of Main Central Area.	
	Section 4.4 Corridor Commercial: Suggested defining “certain”	Commercial uses in excess of 2,300 sq m may not be permitted to expand.
	Section 4.4: Location of multi-use trail not clear, clarification from staff requested, in addition to clarification on access points to be consolidated.	Trail to be mapped.
	Section 4.5 Gateway Regeneration Area: Suggested no policies related to protecting Main Central Area, permission of uses in Section 4.5.2 should be more clearly and consistently stated. No development cap specified., “Large format retail uses” and “large-scale commercial uses” not defined.	Text revised to limit commercial – require more light industrial. Retail uses limited to 1,500 sq m
	Section 4.8 Parks and Open Space: Inconsistent with Open Space on schedule, concern over the requirement for a 10m land dedication along shoreline	Already on the Loblaws site.
	Section 7 Transportation and Infrastructure: No reference in OP to Strategic Goods Movement Link.	Strategic Goods Movement Section added to Official Plan.
	Section 8.2: Concerned with wording that private official plan amendments will be generally discouraged.	Same as current Plan.
	Section 8.3 b): Suggested section lacks consistency since determination of	Text has been revised.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	completion should be determined at the outset.	
	Section 9.1: Loblaws lands governed by 3 designations, should be single policy direction.	Designations amended.
Susan Bradley April 23, 2009	Concerned with ratio 1:2, jobs to people; are there proposed by-laws how B&B's, home based businesses will be owned/operated, how much capacity at the plant, are B&B's allowed in Main Central Area, Community Commercial and Corridor Commercial; can farms, cottages operate a B&B; does the continuous shoreline trail include land south of the causeway.	Policies in by-law related to home industry, home-based business. B&B's in residential areas – two rooms without rezoning. Trail to be mapped.
Gavin Baxter April 29, 2009	Section 1.3 Purpose and Goals of Plan: Statements should include using an integrated design process as an approach to build community cohesion.	
	Section 2.1 (b) Can a schedule be created which identify potential infill lots in the community.	Not to be included in Official Plan.
	Section 2.2.2 (d) Employment Targets: should dedicate a certain percentage of land within urban boundary as agricultural food production and distribution. Should also designate spaces in new subdivision areas for community gardens.	Policy added to reflect importance of local food production.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	Schedules C & C1 should show current cycling and pedestrian pathways.	Schedule Revised
	Section 2.8 Sustainability: Township needs to concentrate on a more human centric focus when discussing sustainability.	Text has been revised.
	Section 3.4 Brownfields: All potential Brownfield sites within community should be identified within Official Plan.	More appropriate for Township to create survey identifying potential Brownfield sites and make available to public and developers outside Official Plan.
	Section 3.6 Energy Conservation: Township should demand Platinum level development.	Platinum level presently too cost prohibitive. Will consider adoption of other LEED Standards including LEED: CS and LEED: EBOM
	Section 3.8 (a) Garden Suites and Accessory Apartments: Does statement mean that development fees would apply.	Not applicable to the Official Plan.
	Section 3.12 LEED Design: There are other programs that should be considered depending on the particular scenario including Green Globes	Township to focus on LEED.
	Section 3.16 Stormwater Management: MOE Stormwater Management should not take precedence. Each development application should consist of a site specific proposal outlining how to maintain and reuse 100% of storm-water.	Policy added.
	Section 4.1.1 Residential Objectives: include	Policy added.

Comment From	Comment	Response
	a provision that promotes sustainable design objectives.	
	Infill development should also apply to agricultural spaces. Under guidance from the Municipality/Region, agricultural landowners should be allowed to sever small portions of land and sell them to their family.	Not permitted under Provincial Policy.
	Section 4.2 Main Central Area: A site specific by-law should be designed to cover the area referred to as the Historic Downtown Area and Water Street	Not applicable to Official Plan.
	Section 4.3 Community Commercial Area: You cannot encourage large-scale commercial developers to create a more pedestrian-oriented environment. This needs to be clearly defined in this O.P.	Can encourage pedestrian oriented developments through urban design and site plan control.
	Section 4.3.4 Community Commercial Urban Design Guidelines: We need to have guidelines for the reuse of water for car washes.	Policy added.
	Section 4.5 Gateway Regeneration Area: Create additional pedestrian/cycle defined links between adjoining residential neighbourhoods, existing commercial on Van Edward Dr. and the trail to the waterfront.	Schedule Revised.
	Section 5.1 Agricultural: We need to explore	Not permitted under Provincial Policy.

**ATTACHMENT 1
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS**

Comment From	Comment	Response
	the idea of Rural Infill as a possible solution to promotion multi-generational farming activities.	
	General comments: Possibility of adopting green parking requirements.	Policy added.
	Heat Island Effect Mitigation – Municipality should require all new non-residential structures to have a minimum 50% of roof area designed as cool roof.	Policy added.
	Mandatory/Monitored Recycling Composting Program for commercial facilities.	Policy added.