



Staff Report PL2021-089

Title of Report: PL2021-089-C21-21 Timothy Shantz
Department: Clerks
Branch: Planning Services
Council Date: October 20, 2021

Recommendation:

Be it resolved that Council receive Staff Report PL2021-088 for information; and
That Council consider approval of By-law 2021-153; and
That Council waive the site plan control process for this application.

Property Location: 223798 Southgate Road 22



The Proposal

Subject property is described as Con 16, PT Lot 8, Con 17 Lots 8 and 9 and RP16R11093 Pt 1 Geographic Township of Egremont. It is approximately 191 acres in area and has frontage along Southgate Road 22.

The proposal is rezone an approximately 2 acre portion of the subject lands to allow for the construction of a parochial school.

Background

A Public Meeting was held on September 22 at 1pm using a virtual meeting platform.

Agency Comments are as follows:

County of Grey indicate that from a general planning perspective, given that many students will likely be travelling to school by foot or bicycle, it is recommended that Southgate seek to consider any necessary upgrades to Southgate Road 22, to ensure road-shoulder access is available to increase pedestrian safety from passing road traffic. Provided that: MDS can be achieved, safe access can be provided to the proposed school building; and the SVCA is supportive of the proposed building envelope, County staff have no further comments with the proposal.

Public Works indicate that a new entrance will be required. No current 911 sign for Civic # 223798, Solar School Zone flashing set of lights recommended due to 80 km/h speed zone in mid section of block with hills, to traffic calm during school travel times, and school zone signage requirements.

The Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority indicate that the application is acceptable to SVCA staff and the MECP should be contacted regarding potential threatened and endangered species.

No issues were raised at the public meeting by members of the public.

Staff comments:

With respect to the requirement by the County of Grey regarding MDS, The proposed development meets the requirements of MDS based upon the MDS information submitted with the application.

To justify the location of the school in the rural area as apposed to a settlement area I offer the following justification that the Township has considered in the past when considering development of rural schools of this nature.

The primary reason for locating the school in this location is that the school community relies on horse drawn transportation and therefore the school must be located within a certain radius of its attendees. Locating parochial schools within settlement areas often creates more conflicts such as conflicts between automobile traffic and horses, horse manure on roads and travel distance from farms to the school itself are increased. For these reasons, it make some sense to locate the school in an area that is close to the attendees rather than within a settlement area.

Furthermore, the closest settlement area of Dromore is not a serviced community and there are very few larger lots available that would allow for a school to be

serviced by a private well and septic system. Based on the above the Township considered this issue.

Staff Review

Staff reviewed this application based on the Planning Act, the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), County of Grey Official Plan and Southgate Official Plan and the Zoning By-law.

The Provincial Policy Statement 2014 (PPS)

The PPS has been reviewed in its entirety however only the most relevant policies have been identified below. The subject land would constitute "rural" lands under the definition of the PPS. The PPS allows for a variety of uses in the rural areas which can be broadly defined to include a small parochial school in the rural area.

1.1.4.1 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) encouraging the conservation and *redevelopment* of existing rural housing stock on *rural lands*;
- e) using rural *infrastructure* and *public service facilities* efficiently;
- f) 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;
- g) providing opportunities for sustainable and diversified tourism, including leveraging historical, cultural, and natural assets;
- h) conserving biodiversity and considering the ecological benefits provided by nature; and
- i) providing opportunities for economic activities in *prime agricultural areas*, in accordance with policy 2.3.

Comment: The provision of a rural school is an essential part of maintaining the character of rural areas and appropriately uses rural infrastructure.

1.1.4.2 In *rural areas*, rural *settlement areas* shall be the focus of growth and development and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted.

1.1.4.3 When directing development in rural *settlement areas* in accordance with policy 1.1.3, planning authorities shall give consideration to rural characteristics, the scale of development and the provision of appropriate service levels.

Comment: While the PPS suggests that settlement areas shall be the focus of growth it does allow for opportunities for limited development in Rural areas.

"1.1.5.2 On *rural lands* located in municipalities, permitted uses are:

- a) the management or use of resources;
- b) resource-based recreational uses (including recreational dwellings);
- c) residential development, including lot creation, that is locally appropriate;
- 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. "

"1.1.5.4 Development that is compatible with the rural landscape and can be sustained by rural service levels should be promoted.

1.1.5.5 Development shall be appropriate to the *infrastructure* which is planned or available, and avoid the need for the unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion of this *infrastructure*."

Comments: A rural parochial school can be considered as "other rural land uses" under the PPS and is therefore a permitted use. The proposal meets MDS and there is a need based upon the limited range of the attendees to travel to the school community and there are limited opportunities to locate a school within the nearest settlement area which is 2.8km to the east in Dromore. The size of the development is appropriate for the existing infrastructure and will not require any expansion of that infrastructure beyond new signage .

Based on the above it is my opinion that the proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

Official Plan

The Township of Southgate Official Plan (OP) designates the subject lands "Rural, Wetlands and Hazard lands".

5.2.1 Permitted Uses

5.2.1(vii) limited non-farm land uses (including social, recreational and institutional uses such as churches, schools, cemeteries, community halls, public uses, airports, receiving and transmission towers and historic sites).

Based on the above the proposed parochial school is a permitted use within the rural designation subject to meeting the development criteria.

Section 5.1.3 Development Policies (6)(7)(8)(9) and (14) require that MDS be addressed. Based on the information supplied by the applicant the proposal meets the requirements of MDS.

Section 5.1.3 (7) requires that the site can be adequately services with private services. The site is large enough that a well and septic system can be accommodated on site. There is potable water in the area based on adjacent wells. Section 5.1.3 (8) requires that the site have sufficient drainage. The site is large enough that drainage can be accommodated on site.

5.1.3(9) requires that the proposal have year round access to a public highway. The proposal fronts on to Township Road 22 which is an open and maintained road. 5.1.3(14) requires the preparation of and EIS when lands are adjacent to natural heritage features such as Wetlands. Given the proximity of the development to the wetland on the subject site and the comments from the SVCA, the requirement for an EIS has been waived.

The proposal is consistent with the Township Official Plan. Site Plan Control is required unless waved by Council. I am not certain that there would be much benefit to entering into an agreement with the land owner for the school so I am seeking Council's direction in this regard and recommending that the requirement for site plan control be waived.

Zoning By-law

The subject property is currently zoned Agricultural (A1) and Environmental Protection (EP) and Wetland (w). The proposed amendment would rezone a specific area to permit a school to be allowed on a 2acre portion of the subject lands. The proposed rezoning would zone the property to Community facility(CF). It is normally my recommendation that Site Plan control be required in order to address issues such site layout, fencing, parking and buffer/screen from the road. We have required this in the past, however, based on the applicant's proposal I see little benefit to require a full site plan process. If it is Council's wish a resolution to wave Site Plan control can be brought forward.

Conclusions

Based on the above, the concerns of the agencies have been satisfactorily addressed in my professional opinion. It is therefore my Professional opinion that the application be approved.

Respectfully Submitted,

Municipal Planner: Original Signed By
Clinton Stredwick, BES, MCIP, RPP



CAO Approval: Original Signed By
Dave Milliner, CAO

Attachments:

1. Site Plan drawing