

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|--|--|--|---|
| Public Comments on Draft Official Plan (January 2017 Draft) | | | |
| 1 | Gary Bell Skelton Brumwell & Associates Inc. (Comments made at Jan. 19, 2017 Open House) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule B2 – Cookstown needs to reflect land uses from Official Plan Amendment 19 (lands redesignated from Rural Area) | Agree – OPA 19 redesignated lands from Rural Area to Residential Low Density 1 outside of NEA designation. Scheduled B2 has been revised accordingly. |
| 2 | General Comment from Resident (Comment made at Jan. 19, 2017 Open House) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wants the Town to develop a strong tree cutting by-law to prevent loss of mature private trees | The Draft Official Plan contains a policy requiring the Town to institute a private tree cutting by-law to address this issue (applies to lands within settlement areas). |
| 3 | Leah Emms Resident and employee of Ontario Federation of Agriculture (Comments made at Jan. 19, 2017 Open House) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided comments at the open house primarily on the Natural Heritage System policies and Agricultural/Rural policies Natural Heritage: concern about buffer requirements from intermittent streams (too large) Agriculture: Concern about hedgerow protection –hedgerow protection should be “promoted” rather than “required”. Agriculture: should clarify what “small scale” means when describing agricultural-related uses Roads in agricultural areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should avoid curbs, guard rails, and narrow turning lanes Turning radii at rural intersections should account for farm vehicles If planning for roundabouts, need to ensure they are large enough (case study at York/Durham Townline) Shoulders should be a consistent width (gravel shoulders are OK too) | <p>The Natural Heritage and Agricultural Policies have been revised according to comments received from the public and agencies and are in conformity with County and Provincial policy.</p> <p>The draft Official Plan includes a maximum floor area size for agricultural-related uses.</p> <p>These are matters to be addressed in engineering standards not in an OP.</p> |
| 4 | Dave Lucas Resident (Comments made at Jan. 19, 2017 Open House) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official Plan should consider appropriate road standards to accommodate farm vehicles Concern about policies related to keeping “countryside character”. For example, | See responses above for road standards, hedgerows and scale of agricultural-related uses. |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | <p>hedgerows... Farmers often need to remove hedgerows to improve viability and usability of agricultural lands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with the “scale” requirements for agricultural-related uses – want flexibility on scale and for the Official Plan to recognize opportunities to grow Concern about urban forest policies – do not want the public to interpret or think that all agricultural lands and forests on agricultural lands are for public use – feeling that urban forest policies encourages trespassing on private land | <p>The Urban Forest policies apply specifically to the urban areas, and not the agricultural areas.</p> |
| 5 | <p>Edward Gres Owner of 1988 7th Line, Innisfil (Letter submitted on January 25, 2017)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official Plan should designate 1988 7th Line Rural Area – to be congruous with adjacent designations | <p>This property is currently designated as “Agricultural Area” in the existing, in-force Official Plan. No change in land use designation is proposed to this property, or adjacent Rural and Agricultural lands through this Official Plan update. The Agricultural Discussion Paper recommended that all requests for re-designation to Rural designation be accompanied by an agricultural capability analysis and needs assessment. No change is recommended.</p> |
| 6 | <p>Neil Smiley (Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP), on behalf of Nextnine Ltd, 2025890 Ontario Inc., and Middlefield Financial Services Ltd. Owners of 173, 201, and 225 Big Bay Point Road (Letter submitted on February 14, 2017)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official Plan should designate the site as Parks and Open Space Concern that the current Natural Environmental Area designation was made in error or without regard to the principles of good planning Concern that their property has been generalized – feeling that a portion of their lands which contains trees has resulted in the entire site designated as NEA without regard for the characteristics and appropriate planned function of the site Concern that trees planted on the site should not be considered significant – state that they were planted, rather than naturally occurring, and are not greater than 100 years old. | <p>This set of properties is currently designated as “Natural Environmental Area” in the existing, in-force Official Plan based on the environmental studies done at that time. In order to facilitate a change to the land use designation, the owner will have to submit an application for Official Plan Amendment and supporting studies including a Natural Heritage Evaluation. No change is recommended.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Innisfil Self Storage, submitted by Darren Vella (Innovative Planning Solutions)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official Plan should designate the site Rural Commercial – feels this is better fit because the site has been significantly altered and | <p>There is a site specific policy applying to a portion of these lands (policy 18.3.14). This policy permits the existing uses specifically. It is not the intent of the Rural Commercial designation to permit a broad range of commercial uses, but specific to the proposed</p> |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|---|---|---|--|
| | 7326 Yonge Street February 14, 2017 | <p>would better align with surrounding land uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Commercial uses better match the sites current use – A site specific zoning regulation permits a mini-self storage establishment and the Rural Commercial designation permits self-storage business • Section 18 – add an objective to “recognize existing commercial and employment uses as part of the character of the countryside and provide opportunities for these uses to prosper” • 18.6.3 should including considerations for expansions of existing rural commercial uses and offer similar or new criteria to that listed under this section. Alternatively the site could be added to 18.6.9 • | <p>use. The site specific policy does that. In addition, the majority of the property is farmed so it is not appropriate to designate the entire property as Rural Commercial. No change recommended.</p> |
| 8 | Vanessa Simpson (IPS Consulting Inc) 7958 Yonge St. (email submitted on February 14, 2017) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draws attention to active Official Plan Amendment (file No. D09-2016-007) which would re-designate the site from Village Commercial Area to Village Residential Special Area and Village Commercial special. | <p>Once adopted, it will be added to the new Official either before Council adoption or through Simcoe County modifications.</p> |
| 9 | Sunset Speedways, submitted by Kris Menzies (MHBC) 6918 Yonge St. (Letter submitted on February 17, 2017) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about how “uses legally established” will be interpreted, within the definition of Existing Uses • Concern that the definition would not recognize the use of the racetrack on the entirety of the site, since the rear portion is zoned Agricultural • Concern that a portion of the rear of the site, which is designated Natural Environmental Area, was not scaled back and included in the Rural Commercial designations, as previously requested • Desire confirmation that the existing racetrack is recognized as an “existing commercial use” in the context of the Rural Commercial designation • | <p>The sunset speedway property has been re-designated as a Rural Commercial property, with a site specific permission permitting the existing racetrack use is. This designation applies to the entire property outside of the Natural Environmental Area designation.</p> <p>The NEA designation can only be refined through a site specific Official Plan Amendment with supporting studies including a Natural Heritage Evaluation. No change is recommended to the boundaries of the NEA designation.</p> |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|--|--|--|
| 10 | Andrew Payne, MasonryWorx February 17, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are pleased to see a number of progressive principles, such as the use of Architectural Control Guidelines prior to Site Plan or Subdivision approval, ensconced within the plan • They encourage the Municipality to support this draft OP with firm Urban Design Guidelines along these lines, including applying a foundational “basic standard” of architectural design across the municipality, ensuring that all parts of Innisfil are built to a high standard of design and that all future Architectural Control Guidelines are built upon a strong base. • They provide the following suggesting regarding specific policies (<u>underline</u> means suggested added texts, strikeout means suggested deleted words): • 3.1.7 We will ensure that development within the Settlement Areas creates high-quality urban form, <u>built environments</u> and streetscapes through site design, urban design standards and architectural control that create attractive and vibrant places that support walking and cycling for everyday activities and are transit-supportive. • 3.1.8 We shall consider preparing <u>prepare</u> urban design guidelines for each settlement area, which will <u>employ detailed architectural control directions to explore how design can be used to promote a sense of place, ensure a resilient and beautiful built environment, and enhance place making for the residents in that community and contributing neighbourhoods.</u> • 3.9.7 <u>vii) the architectural design features and exterior cladding materials of the structure.</u> • 3.9.8 <u>iv) utilize high-quality natural building materials which respect and/or enhance the existing neighbourhood.</u> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>This policy has been changed to 9.1.4, and changed to “built form”. Architectural control is not required.</p> <p>Changed to policy 9.1.3, and now requires preparation of Urban Design Guidelines for each settlement area (architectural control not required).</p> <p>This is a consideration to be addressed through the urban design guidelines rather than the OP.</p> <p>This is a consideration to be addressed through the urban design guidelines rather than the OP.</p> |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.2.18 Generally, the front facades of buildings should align with development on neighbouring lots to define a continuous streetscape. Houses should be designed to frame the street edge with a consistent setback, and have front doors, windows, and entry features facing the road. <u>Building materials should be carried around to all sides of the structure to avoid false-fronting.</u> • 4.7.1 b. add the following requirement: <u>A Secondary Plan guiding Urban Design for the area, with associated Architectural Control Guidelines and a designated Control Architect.</u> • 5.1.8 New commercial developments shall be encouraged to contribute to the achievement of the Town’s strategy for creating great places, as outlined in Section 2.2 of this Plan. This can shall be achieved through streetscape improvements in front of individual stores including wide sidewalks, attractive signage, <u>high-quality exterior building materials</u>, public art and pedestrian related street furniture, such as benches and lampposts as well as privately owned but publicly accessible community gathering spaces on larger properties. All applications for new commercial developments shall demonstrate how the proposed development contributes to the achievement of the Town’s place making strategies and principles. • 5.2.32 The design of streetscape facades for large scale commercial buildings shall adhere to the principles of promoting active streetscapes and achieving a high quality of architectural design through inclusion of entrance elements, windows, articulated wall areas, high quality building materials, and roof expression. • 13.30 The built form of new development | <p>Policy has been removed.</p> <p>Disagree – no Secondary Plan required as this applies to a small area.</p> <p>Policy 5.1.8 (now 11.1.7) has been simplified to be less specific. Does not get into the details of materials. Nonetheless this matter can be addressed at site plan.</p> <p>Policies have been simplified to be less specific – policy removed.</p> |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>shall give consideration to the inclusion of include architectural elements that reference or enhance the elements and characteristics of the communities within which they are planned. Building height, massing and, building materials and architectural features should complement neighbourhood character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22.4.1 They recommend: utilizing Site Plan Control for single-family dwellings including those not abutting the Lake Simcoe shoreline, particularly for new dwellings in established neighbourhoods. Utilize Architectural Control and Secondary Plans for new subdivisions. • 22.9.2 They recommend: Implement the use of Architectural Control Guidelines into the Official Plan. Require that all new Plans of Subdivision require the use of a Control Architect and the drafting of Architectural Control Guidelines addressing specifics of built form and building materials. • 22.19.1 xvi) Architectural Control Guidelines. • 22.22.3 i) The Town of Innisfil may shall require preparation of Architectural Control Guidelines and Landscape Master Plans at later stages of development, prior to the granting of draft plan of subdivision approval or of site plan approval. Architectural Control Guidelines will address more detailed issues of architectural and landscape design including guidelines for site planning on specific lots, guidelines for detailed built form and architectural details including the character, scale, appearance, exterior materials, colours, façade treatments, and other design features and detailed landscape provisions. • 22.22.3 ii) Approval of proposed development through an Architectural Control Process may shall be required by the Town of Innisfil prior to the granting of Building Permits. In such | <p>Policy removed and now refers to residential design policies.</p> <p>No changed recommended with respect to applicability of site plan control.</p> <p>No changed recommended with respect to subdivision control and use of architectural control.</p> <p>Disagree with requirement for architectural control. No change recommended.</p> |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|--|---|--|
| | | instances, the Architectural Control Process shall involve review of the proposed development by a Control Architect appointed by the Town to review development applications for conformance to the Urban Design Guidelines, the Architectural Control Guidelines and the Landscape Master Plan. | |
| 11 | Flato Developments Inc. submitted by Katarzyna Silwa (Dentons) 1159-1265 Lockhart Road February 17, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Their land is proposed to be Agricultural Area, but they desire their land be designated Rural Area. They state that their land has low agricultural capacity for only producing perennial forage crops and the Rural Area designation is consistent with the general Rural Area land use west of Alcona | In the existing Official Plan, this property is subject to a deferral (non-decision). The previous Official Plan, which governs in the case of a deferral, designated the property as Agriculture. The Agricultural Discussion Paper has recommended that all non-decisions be removed and the lands be identified as “Agricultural”. The paper has also recommended that all requests for re-designation to Rural designation be accompanied by an agricultural capability analysis and needs assessment. No change is recommended. |
| 12 | Gres Development Ltd. and Dudo Development Ltd., submitted by Michael Bissett (Bousfields Inc.) 7231 Yonge Street | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They desire their land be designation Community Space, with the intent to develop a restaurant and an electric car charging station on their property. They feel this would complement the existing adjacent Community Space land uses • They desire that a range of commercial uses, such as a restaurant and electric car charging station, be permitted in Community Space designations to complement other permitted uses • While they recognize their lands meet the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement to be Prime Agricultural Land, they believe the proposed Agricultural Area does not suit their property because the predominate land use in the area is not agriculture and there is only 6ha of land that could be cultivated. | A charging station and restaurant, not including the other proposed uses, could be considered a rural commercial development, subject to policy 3.7.5 of the County Official Plan. Rural commercial uses must primarily serve the travelling public and tourists to the area on the basis of convenience and access. Similar criteria have been added to the Town’s Official Plan. A site specific application to amend the Innisfil Official Plan would be required, which would look at how a specific proposal addresses the criteria in the new OP and the County Official Plan. |
| 13 | Innisfil Mapleview Development Ltd., submitted by Katarzyna Silwa (Dentons Canada LLP) Part of North Half Lot 25, Concession 11 designated as Part 1 on Plan 51R- | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They desire the portion of their property that is proposed to be designated Agricultural Area be designated Rural Area because of the following reasons: • The soil type is uncondusive to agricultural uses and the land has not been used for | The Agricultural Area portion of this property has been changed to “Rural Area” to reflect previous submission on the agricultural capability of this property. |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|---|---|--|
| | 35677, located in the southwest quadrant of Mapleview Drive and 25th Sideroad, Town of Innisfil | <p>agricultural purposes for over 40 years;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The small size of the area would make agricultural use difficult; • Agricultural designation is not conducive to abutting residential uses; and • The agricultural area is not a prime agricultural area as defined by the Provincial Policy Statement. • They feel policy 3.8.4 contradicts other policies that direct growth to primary and urban settlement areas. They also believe that Sandy Cove should be included in this policy, and should be given priority before the other three hamlets because of its urban and serviced nature. • 3.8.6 They believe that urban settlements, including Sandy Cove, should be considered a priority for future population allocation. They cite that this is consistent with the Minutes of Settlement they entered into in March 2016 regarding its appeal of the Town’s 2006 Official Plan. • They believe policies 3.9.4 and 3.10.3 are inconsistent with each other. | <p>Policy 3.8.4 has been removed.</p> <p>Policy 3.8.6 has been revised (now policy 9.8.3). Urban Boundary expansions can only be considered at the County Level through a Municipal Comprehensive Review process, as per new Growth Plan policies.</p> <p>Mixed Use Area in Sandy Cove is now identified as a Strategic Growth Area, which under the Growth Plan can occur in both built-up areas and in Designated Greenfield Areas. As a result, there is no inconsistency.</p> |
| 14 | Paul Laruccia 25 th Sideroad and 10 th Line, in Sandy Cove | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They asked how the the Sandy Cove settlement boundary was determined • What population projections were used to determine if the boundary covers future growth? • They do not understand why their property is proposed to be designated Environmental Protection and question what the true extent of the environmental feature is. | <p>The Sandy Cove settlement area boundary was established through the current Official Plan and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</p> <p>The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper determined that current settlement boundaries can accommodate the population and employment projections to 2031.</p> <p>The Natural Environmental Designation was determined in the current Official Plan through natural heritage studies undertaken at that time.</p> |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|---|--|---|
| 15 | Simcoe County Christian Senior Home Inc., submitted by Ray Duhamel (Jones Consulting Group Ltd.) 1870 Big Bay Point Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They desire the following site-specific policy: “Lands known as 1870 Big Bay Point Road might be suitable for a future aged care development. The Town of Innisfil will consider any future applications for Official Plan Amendment to permit an aged care facility subject to the applicant demonstrating, to the Town’s satisfaction, that the proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conforms to the Growth Plan, and conforms to the intent of the County of Simcoe Official Plan and the Town of Innisfil Official Plan.” | The process to create a new Official Plan is not considering site specific designations and policies. A site specific application to amend the Innisfil Official Plan would be required, which would look at how the proposal addresses the criteria in the new OP. Nor should the Official Plan contemplate future applications through site-specific policies allowing for future applications. No change recommended. |
| 16 | 1602859 Ontario Ltd. (Cortel), submitted by Michael Biossett (Bousfields inc.) 6 th Line and the Railroad in Alcona | Major Transit Station Area Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general support the draft Official plan, and specifically policy 10.8.1 They feel the Official Plan should provide mechanisms for planning all four quadrants around the GO station, even though they may be outside the settlement boundary Alcona Urban Settlement Boundary Expansion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They believe that once the 2036 forecasts are allocated based on the 20 year timeframe, there will be a deficit, which they feel justifies an expansion to the urban settlement boundary. They feel this expansion should occur around the proposed GO station Natural Heritage Designation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They believe there are inconsistencies between Schedule A and B in relation to 6th Line and east of the rail line. Campus Node <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They support a Campus Node proposed at Yonge and 6th Line | The Official Plan contains policies to support transit supportive development around the GO station. However, the plan can only designate a major transit station area within the settlement area boundary. A per the new Growth Plan, boundary expansions can only be initiated at the upper-tier (Simcoe County) level through a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) process. The OP contains a policy that recognizes the major transit station area as an important area of future growth, to be considered as a priority in the future. Schedule A has been revised to exclude natural heritage. |
| 17 | Owner of 3214 Fleming Blvd | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The owners desire their property be designated residential | This property is currently designated “Rural” in the existing Official Plan. These lands are identified as “lands not for urban uses”, according to the Simcoe County Official Plan, and must be subject to an Official Plan Amendment in order to be redesignated to “lands for urban uses”. No change is recommended. |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|---|---|---|
| 18 | Heather Minns 3584 Highway 89 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> She desires the property to be designated Rural Commercial because it is situated at the corner of Highway 89 and Highway 400 | This property is currently designated “Agricultural” and “Natural Environmental Area” in the existing Official Plan. The Agricultural Discussion Paper has recommended that all requests for re-designation from the Agricultural designation be accompanied by an agricultural capability analysis and needs assessment. In addition, a Natural Heritage Evaluation would be required to confirm the natural features on the property. If a re-designation is desired, it should proceed through a site-specific Official Plan amendment. |
| 19 | Owner of 6393 County Road 27 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current zoning is Community Services as it was once owned by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation; however, there is currently a landscaping business and other commercial uses on the property. Therefore, they feel that the property should be designated Rural Commercial to reflect current uses and zoning | This site is currently designated as Agricultural in the Official Plan. The Innisfil Zoning By-law zones this property CS (Community Services). The Community Services zone does not permit a landscaping business. A zoning amendment would be required to permit this use. As such, it is not appropriate to designate the property as Rural Commercial in the Official Plan for a use that is not in compliance with the Zoning By-law. No change is recommended. |
| 20 | Fariba and Enayat Rawhani, submitted by Kevin Bechard (Weston Consulting) 4583 15 th Line | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They support policies 16.3.2, 16.3.11, and 16.3.13 as well as municipal initiatives in Cookstown such as the Water and Wastewater Control Plan Class Environmental Assessment. The propose the following policy: “3.4.7 Expansion of Cookstown Settlement Area boundary will be considered at the time of the completion of both the Water and Wastewater Plan Class Environmental Assessment and release of Provincial and County Growth Allocation population projections for 2036-2041.” | As per the new Growth Plan, boundary expansions can only be initiated at the upper-tier (Simcoe County) level through a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) process. At this time, the current settlement area boundaries within Innisfil can accommodate population to 2031 – and Innisfil can not expand boundaries beyond this planning horizon until the County of Simcoe undertakes their next MCR. |
| 21 | Creek Golf Course, submitted by MHBC 239 Reive Boulevard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They request that the existing golf course be designated Rural Commercial rather than Parks and Open Space to better align with its current zoning as Tourist Commercial. They feel that the Parks and Open Space designation is more appropriate for lands that are intended to be used long-term for public open space and not for privately owned lands, such as their golf course. The following are suggested revisions for specific policies: Add the following underlined portion to Section 5, “Rural Commercial sites provide for | <p>All golf courses are designated Parks and Open Space. Rural Commercial designations are meant to permit limited uses and are to be designated through a site specific poicy with limits the range of uses to the specific proposal. Policies have also been included in the OP to permit additional “Rural Commercial” uses, subject to a site specific application and subject to studies to ensure new developments are able to adequately be accommodated on private services, as well as addressing the County Official Plan criteria in section 3.7.5 for Rural Commercial uses. No change is recommended.</p> <p>Rural Commercial policies have been moved to the Countryside section of the OP and the policies have been revised to closely follow the County of Simcoe policy criteria.</p> |

**Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update**

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>commercial uses that primarily serve rural residents and the travelling public and/or tourists on the basis of convenience and access. They are uses that <u>may not be appropriate for settlement areas</u> or cannot be located within a settlement area due to their <u>size and locational attributes.</u>”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1 request clarification on if the policies applies to both urban and rural commercial uses. • 5.1.9 should be cross referenced to 18.6 • 17.2.18, 17.2.21, 17.3.6, and 19.1.7 should cross reference the EIS requirements • 23.10 should be change to 22.10 since addresses EIS matters • Add the following underlined portion to 18.1, “The Town shall direct development to settlements, except where necessary for development related to the management or use of resources, resource based recreational activities and rural land uses that cannot be located in settlements and <u>may not be appropriate in a settlement area.</u> In this respect, Rural, non-agricultural uses shall be limited and only permitted pursuant to the general direction of this Section and the Rural Area land use policies of Section 18.4, <u>18.5 and 18.6.</u>” • They request confirmation that the uses listed in Policy 18.1.4 are permitted on all lands within the Countryside designation or if there are specific designations where these uses would be excluded • They request confirmation that the list in policy 18.6.2 is a sample list and is not meant to be an exclusive list of uses. They request the list be revised to be more categorical and less specific. They also believe that uses such as RV dealerships, boat dealerships, and pre-fabricated home showrooms, should | <p>See comment above – rural commercial policies have been moved out of the “urban commercial” section.</p> <p>Policy references have been corrected.</p> <p>The Rural Commercial policies have been revised to closely follow the County of Simcoe policy criteria</p> <p>Correct, these are on-farm diversified uses and agricultural related uses that are permitted throughout the Countryside in Agricultural and Rural designations.</p> <p>This list has been revised to be more general and an additional policy, stating that “other similar uses meeting the intended function of Policy 18.6.1” are permitted.</p> |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|--|--|---|
| | | <p>be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.1.7 They suggestion considering defining the term “accessory” 23.25 They request that the comma be removed from after the word “structures” 23.36 The request confirmation that “legally established” means either “zoned” or “legal non-conforming,” in other words that “existing” means zoned or legal non-conforming. | <p>Definition is not required.</p> <p>Comma has been removed</p> <p>The Section on non-conforming uses has been clarified.</p> |
| 22 | <p>DLR Holderings and 2524445 Ontario Ltd., submitted by Darren Vella (Innovative Planning Solutions)</p> <p>7326 Yonge Street</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They note that Schedule A and B appear to conflict with each other in regards to their properties. They are unsure how 90% of their lands is designed Natural Heritage System when their lands are devoid of any natural vegetation. They request their lands be designated Rural Area due to the abutting designations, uses, and roads. They also note that their lands are not a Prime Agricultural Area and the soil quality is poor for agricultural uses. They suggest that some small rounding out development of residential lots be allowed. | <p>Lands are primarily designated “Agricultural”. The Natural Heritage System is now an overlay from the County Official Plan, however existing agricultural uses are permitted to continue. The Official Plan has been revised to clarify the relationship between the NHS and the lands designated Key Natural Heritage Features and Key Hydrologic Features.</p> <p>The Agricultural Discussion Paper recommended that all requests for re-designation to Rural designation be accompanied by an agricultural capability analysis and needs assessment. The submitted report “State of Agricultural Conditions” is not a full agricultural capability analysis.</p> <p>Changes to Settlement Area boundaries are only permitted through a County MCR.</p> <p>No changes recommended.</p> |
| 23 | <p>Georgian College, submitted by Angela Lockridge</p> <p>3722 Fairway Road</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They desire the property to maintain the current Official Plan designation of Shoreline Residential while also recognizing the Klempenfelt (Conference) Centre and community uses that are proposed for the Community Space designation. Therefore, they desire a dual designation. | <p>The Official Plan designation has been changed to recognize the existing use of the property, as well as the existing zoning (Community Services – CS Zone). As such, the Community Space designation is appropriate for the property. Even if the property were to be designated Shoreline Residential, the Growth Plan only permits a maximum of 3 new lots to be created. No change is recommended.</p> |
| 24 | <p>Sally Stanleigh</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> She feels there should be considerable thought to establishing architectural consistency to downtown. Suggests a town square, continuation of sidewalks to the 20 SR, a greater variety of retail shows and restaurants, more trees and green space. Believes new housing develops should be expect to build new parks and green spaces for the people in the developments. | <p>The Official Plan contains many policies related to place making and the creation of animated public places. Downtown Alcona along Innisfil Beach Road has been identified as a key place making destination. The Official Plan calls for an urban square and animated public sidewalks as well and shops and restaurants facing the public sidewalk. The Official Plan also contains policies to promote active transportation (walking, cycling) throughout the Town.</p> |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|---|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes more attention needs to be spent on people movement as traffic has been increasing. | |
| 25 | Parkbridge Lifestyle Communities, submitted by Celeste Phillips Planning Inc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They ask if the designation of the recreational area of the Community Centre for Innis-Village should be something other than “Parks and Open Space”. They are seeking clarification as to the implications of ‘net’ hectare versus ‘gross’ hectare in Section 4.2.5 and Section 4.6.8 of the Official Plan Update. As Section 4.2.5 sets the maximum permitted density of the Residential Low Density One area at 13 units per net hectare and Section 4.6.8 sets the Retirement Residential Area maximum permitted density at 16 units per gross hectare. | <p>Recommend changing the Community Centre lands from Parks and Open Space to “Community Space” designation.</p> <p>“Net density” refers to the area of land measured in hectares utilized for residential dwelling units including only the lot area and the local and collector residential streets as well as lanes and private streets.</p> <p>“Gross” refers to the broader area, and also includes SWM facilities, parks, and other areas, except for Natural Heritage features.</p> <p>The reason for the use of “gross” is that this term was carried over from the former policy and the subsequent OMB decision applying to these lands.</p> |
| 26 | Stan Wismer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> He is wondering why the discrepancy between the Town and County of Simcoe OP respecting #517 which is a private stump dump. Wondering if all private dumps are to be recorded in the land use schedules. | The Official Plan does not map private dump sites. No change recommended. |
| 27 | Jim and Kelly Cook 2124 25th Sideroad. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They are interested in their property becoming commercially zoned. | Agree. The Downtown Commercial Area has been expanded in this area. |
| 29 | Strathallan Woods Limited, submitted by Celeste Phillips Planning Inc. Lands on the north side of Big Bay Point Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They advise that the Natural Environment designation in the OP is not appropriate for these lands. They request that the Town not proceed with proposed designation of Natural Environmental Area and believe it would be more appropriate to designate as Rural Area. | The NEA designation is an existing designation in the current Official Plan. As such no change is recommended. |
| 31 | Mosaik (Innisfil) Inc. – 1207 Corm Street, submitted by Humphries Planning Group Inc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 4.3.2 should address rear land and/or rear loaded townhouse dwellings and other rear loaded dwelling units as a specific housing form permitted within the Residential Medium Density designation. Suggestion to allow blocks of Townhouses that back onto open space or commercial | <p>Agree. Section 4.3.2 (now Section 10.3.2) has been amended to address a broader range of townhouse units, as follows: “iii) Townhouses, back-to-back townhouses and stacked townhouses”.</p> <p>Agree. Rather than creating an additional policy as suggested, this policy has been revised (now policy 10.1.43) to remove specific references to the number of units in a</p> |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|---|---|--|
| | | <p>land uses to exceed 8 units, to a maximum of 10 units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest policy language as follows: “4.3.X Notwithstanding policies 4.3.7 and 4.3.13, where a multiple attached building is proposed that backs onto an open space block or a commercial use, a maximum of 10 units in a block, on public and private streets shall be permitted”. | <p>block, as follows: “Where townhouses are proposed, a mix of long and short townhouse blocks should be provided, with a maximum number of units per block established in the zoning by-law to provide variety to the streetscape. The massing of long townhouse blocks should be broken up with a variation of lengths and facades so that a single monotonous elevation is not created. The zoning by-law may contain standards controlling this circumstance.”</p> |
| 32 | Darren and Anne Hofland 1015 Arnold Street | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request Official Plan to reflect the current use of the building as a 4-plex | Property has been changed to medium density residential to permit the use. |
| 33 | Paul Neals, Orion Environmental Solutions 3445 14 th Line | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to identify site as a closed landfill site | The closed landfill has been added to Schedule B. |
| 34 | 1906 Commerce Park Drive | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that policies do not restrict development on smaller existing lots. Requests that hotels and restaurants be a permitted use | <p>Policies have been revised to indicate that minimum lot size required on remaining undeveloped lands should be in the range of 5 to 10 hectares. This policy would not apply to already developed lands.</p> <p>The lands within the Mixed Commercial/Employment Area designation will also be subject to the Employment Supportive Commercial Area overlay which will permit hotels and restaurants.</p> |
| 35 | Todd Pierce, SmartREIT 3575 Innisfil Beach Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that the restrictions contemplated by the Primary Visual Impact Area Overlay are not conducive to Employment Area uses such as manufacturing, processing, warehousing and distribution Requests that the Employment Supportive Commercial Area Overlay be enlarged to encompass the Primary Visual Impact Area or to decrease the size of the Primary Visual Impact Area | The policies have been modified to recognize legally existing outdoor storage in the overlay area and to permit ancillary outdoor storage in the southwest quadrant provided it is not located between the building and Highway 400. Policies regarding building placement in the overlay have also been clarified. |
| 36 | Trans Canada Pipelines | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request re-wording of policy 16.4.4 to reflect recent regulatory revisions. | <p>Agree with proposed changes – they have been incorporated into final draft Official Plan, as follows:</p> <p>“16.4.4 TransCanada Pipelines Limited (TransCanada) operates two high pressure natural gas pipelines within its right-of-way within the Town. TransCanada is regulated by the National Energy Board, which has a number of requirements regulating development in proximity to the pipelines centreline. This includes approval requirements for certain activities within 30 metres of the pipeline centreline such as</p> |

**Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update**

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| | | | conducting a ground disturbance, constructing or installing a facility across or along the right-of-way, driving a vehicle, mobile equipment or machinery across the right-of-way and the use of explosives.” |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2018
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|---|--|--|---|
| Comments on Draft Official Plan (October 2017 Draft) | | | |
| 1 | Attilo Iantorno Resident Email November 3, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommends that Belle-Ewart be developed since it is a settlement area, the town should bring all services to the town, located near several marinas and near transportation hubs | Lefroy-Belle-Ewart is identified as an urban settlement area in Innisfil, where future residential growth is to be accommodated, as per the designations in the Official Plan. |
| 2 | Jeff Stovold Lefroy Harbour Resorts 727 Harbour Road November 3, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The north side of the Lefroy Harbour property show Natural Heritage, but this area is zoned Commercial (T) and there is a site application with the town on this portion. The south side of the property also shows Natural Heritage, but after an OMB meeting years ago I believe it was zoned Open Space with an (H) on it. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The portions of the property that are within the Commercial Zone will be reflected accordingly on Schedule B13. There is dense vegetation on the southern portion of this property. As such, it is recommended that the lands remain within the NHS overlay designation and the Key Natural Heritage and Key Hydrologic Features designation. |
| 3 | Michael Boland Landowner Glenhaven Beach Road November 5, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disappointed to see Glenhaven Beach Road as having a sharrow in Appendix 3A. This is a private road and should not be in even long term phasing for this development. | We acknowledge that though Glenhaven Beach Rd is currently a private road, the Trails Master Plan is intended to provide a long term vision and conceptual network of trails and bike routes throughout Innisfil for the next 15-20 years. The draft plan is therefore specifying that any form of cycling route along Glenhaven Beach Rd is part of the long term phasing plan (beyond 16+ years). Additionally, the draft Plan is also specifying (e.g. page 117) that prior to the implementation of any form of cycling routes on private roads, the Town is to engage with the applicable association regarding routing opportunities. |
| 4 | Rosemarie L. Humphries Humphries Planning Group 1205 Corm Street November 7, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continues request to receive notification of all decisions and meetings regarding the Draft OP | Noted. Thank you for your comments. |
| 5 | Patricia de Baseggio and John Munshaw 1104 Ewart St November 7, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests their large acreage property be designated Medium Density instead of Low. | Recommend that this request be the subject of a site-specific Official Plan amendment by the owner, in order for the Town to appropriately identify and evaluate this proposal and associated considerations (transportation, density, servicing capacity, interface with adjacent properties etc...). |
| 6 | Nicola Mitchinson Mitchinson Planning & Development Consultants November 8, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Leslie Drive future parcels have been accommodated in Schedule B1- Alcona of the Town's October 2017 Draft OP. However, Schedule B1 does not accommodate the future parcels along Webster Blvd. As such, | The remaining portion of the lots that are already partially within the Alcona settlement area boundary have been added to the settlement boundary. Those lots that are currently located completely outside of the settlement area boundary will not be brought in. |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2018
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|---|---|--|
| | | we request that this matter be addressed prior to adoption of the final version of the OP and other schedules. | |
| 7 | Ray Duhamel Jones Consulting Group November 17, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The in-effect Schedule A refers to a Natural Heritage System area shown in ‘yellow’. The proposed Schedule A does not contain any such area; however, proposed Schedule B now contains a new “Natural Heritage System Overlay” which is a black hatched shape. During our meeting on November 13th, you mentioned that the current ‘yellow’ area on in-effect Schedule A should match the new ‘hatched’ area on proposed Schedule B. However, upon closer inspection we see that the ‘yellow’ and ‘black hatched’ areas are quite different. | The Natural Heritage System as shown on Schedule A of the in-effect Official Plan implemented the then Natural Heritage System contained in the Simcoe County Official Plan (2007). Schedule B of the proposed Official Plan now reflects Simcoe County’s revised Natural Heritage System, as per Schedule 5.1 of the County Official Plan (2016), as an overlay designation. The underlying land use designation on Schedule B, the Key Natural Heritage Features & Key Hydrologic Features designation, remains the same as in the current in-effect Official Plan, with minor changes to reflect environmental studies that have been submitted and reviewed to support a change. |
| 8 | Peter Agnelli Gaspé Estates 1150 Mapleview Drive East November 8, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that the 1150 Mapleview property be re-zoned for residential development to allow either single family homes, townhouses, estate lots or a combination of these. | These lands are located outside of a settlement area. The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population and employment projections to 2031. Further, the new Growth Plan (2017) requires that only upper-tier municipalities such as Simcoe County can determine the settlement boundary expansions through a municipal comprehensive review (MCR) process. As such, no expansions are being recommended at this time. |
| 9 | Keith MacKinnon KLM Planning Partners on behalf of Lucy Lombardi and Vincent Fava 881 and 883 Holland Road November 8, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local road on the south side of Killarney Beach Road is incorrectly shown running through the middle of the client’s lands, which translates to a much larger Parks and Open Space designation. This should be replaced with the Residential Low Density 1 designation. | Schedule B3 has been updated to reflect the draft plan of subdivision for these lands. |
| 10 | Keith MacKinnon KLM Planning Partners on behalf of 903287 Ontario Limited November 8, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Altus has determined there are no opportunities for larger format commercial uses because of the small size of vacant parcels. Requests the subject lands be included in the Alcona urban boundary to meet these needs. | These lands are located outside of a settlement area. The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper and Retail Discussion Paper have determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population and employment projections to 2031 (including commercial lands). Further, the new Growth Plan (2017) requires that only upper-tier municipalities such as Simcoe County can determine the settlement boundary expansions through a municipal comprehensive |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2018
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|--|--|--|
| | | | review (MCR) process. As such, no expansions are being recommended at this time. |
| 11 | Claudio Brutto Brutto Consulting 4 George Street November 10, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to recognize existing apartment units on the property and to designate the property as Medium Density. | The property and adjacent property have been re-designated to Medium Density to recognize the existing use on the property and the adjacent semi-detached building. |
| 12 | Ryan Mino-Leahan KLM Planning Partners on behalf of Belleaire Properties November 8, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The collector road on the south side of Killarney Beach Road should be updated to match the draft plan of subdivision Requests clarification that the Neighbourhood Commercial designation permits the same range of uses as the former Convenience Commercial designation Requests a provision for moving or deletion of Neighbourhood Commercial without OP amendment be implemented, based on existing provision Does not support and asks staff to reconsider policy 8.5 requiring 10 years before lands designated Community Space can be redeveloped Part F: Section 24 should refer to schedule E and E1, as F has been deleted. Policies should refer to 20th Sideroad instead of County Road 39 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule has been updated to reflect road location in draft plan. The neighbourhood commercial designation includes the uses in the convenience commercial designation as well as a broader range of uses. A similar policy has been added to allow the two sites in the north part of Lefroy to be moved without amendment. The Town wishes to maintain this policy to promote a greater range of community uses within neighbourhoods. Although the time period has been increased to 10 years, the permitted range of uses has been increased for properties designated as Community Spaces. References to Schedule E and E1 instead of F have been corrected. References to 20th Sideroad instead of County Road 39 have been corrected. |
| 13 | T. Tjeerdsma Tollendale Village November 10, 11, 16, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that Policy 8.2 (vii) include retirement homes as permitted use in Community Spaces designation to allow for more options for location of retirement homes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Retirement homes” has been added as a permitted use within 8.2 vii) |
| 14 | Ryan Guetter Weston Consulting on behalf of the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that the development subject property, which is at the edge of the Sandy | These lands are located outside of a settlement area. The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2018
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|---|---|--|
| | owner of 2849 Clarksville Street November 8, 2017 | Cove settlement area, be considered in growth management analysis | expansions are not required to accommodate population and employment projections to 2031. Further, the new Growth Plan (2017) requires that only upper-tier municipalities such as Simcoe County can determine the settlement boundary expansions through a municipal comprehensive review (MCR) process. As such, no expansions are being recommended at this time. |
| 15 | Gary Bell Skelton, Brumwell & Associates in behalf of Belpark Homes and Wally and Don Smith November 8, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that Cookstown be maintained as a settlement area to allow client to continue with development approved by the Town in OPA 20 Requests notice of any decision on the approval of the Plan | Due to the limited servicing capacity of Cookstown, the Village Settlement classification is appropriate. Policies are included within the Official Plan that state that should servicing capacity be improved, Cookstown would be upgraded to an Urban Settlement Area. |
| 16 | Gary Bell Skelton, Brumwell & Associates in behalf of the Bruno and Galeota 173, 201, and 225 Big Bay Point Road November 8, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposed designation of the subject property as Rural and Natural Environmental Area Requests notice of any decision on the approval of the Plan | Noted. Thank you for your comments. |
| 17 | Claudio Brutto Brutto Consulting on behalf of Nextline November 14, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeking a redesignation of the lands to permit a golf course expansion, which has been the long standing request of his clients. Believes that the existing golf course and expansion would build on the theme of the “Our Place” Official Plan Review. | Recommend that this request be the subject of a site-specific Official Plan amendment by the owner, in order for the Town to appropriately evaluate this proposal and associated natural heritage, transportation and compatibility implications. |
| 18 | Kris Menzies MHBC on behalf of Sunset Speedway 6918 Yonge Street November 20, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continues to request that the portion of the Key Natural Heritage Features and Key Hydrologic Features designation be amended and the subject lands be designated Rural Commercial | <p>Recommend that this request be the subject of a site-specific Official Plan amendment by the owner, in order for the Town to appropriately identify and evaluate this proposal and associated considerations. Regarding the EIS that was submitted in support of this, the Town has received a peer review of the EIS, conducted by North South Environmental. The peer review concluded that there is not enough information to come to a conclusion on the request, and that the following should be completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wooded area should be re-examined to determine whether the contours on the map are correct, and if so, how the potential impacts of fill should be addressed; and A storm water management plan should be prepared to address water quality issues resulting from parking lot runoff. <p>As such, the Town’s recommendation remains that the request should be addressed through a site-specific Official Plan amendment by the owner.</p> |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2018
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|--|---|--|
| 19 | Deb Crawford Town of Innisfil's Heritage Committee November 20, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggests removing use of the word “we” from parts of 4.2 of the OP and replacing with “will be established”. Suggestions for re-wording policies 4.2.7 to 4.2.10 Suggests that the scope of policies 4.2.11 and 4.2.12 may be too broad, and may be redundant Suggests changes of wording to 4.2.13 properly reflect local processes and OP Suggests reference should be made to Cookstown HCD Plan and and Design Guidelines | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of “we” is intentional to illustrate that the Official Plan is “Our Place”. We have slightly revised policy 4.2.7 to reflect the wording of the Ontario Heritage Act. In our opinion, policies 4.2.8 to 4.2.10 appropriately reflect the Ontario Heritage Act, tailored specifically to the Innisfil context. In our opinion, these policies reflect the Ontario Heritage Act, and distinguish between cultural heritage and built heritage resources as well as those resources recognized as significant in terms of archaeological potential. Agreed, we have clarified the wording in policy 4.2.13 We have re-worded policy 4.2.16 to directly link the creation of urban design guidelines (referred to in policy 9.1.3) to HCD's. |
| 20 | Colleen Steiner Resident November 20, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes expansion of the settlement boundaries for the Alcona North Secondary Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your comments. The Official Plan does not recommend or implement any settlement area boundary expansions. However, ongoing OMB hearings are not affected by the Official Plan approval. |
| 21 | Sabi Ahsan Landowner 853 6 th Line & 31 Victoria Street West November 20, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that the properties at 853 6th Line and 31 Victoria Street be zoned from rural to urban because of their location within delineated urban boundaries and built area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31 Victoria Street is already designated Residential. The rezoning process is a separate process from the Official Plan. The 6th Line property is not located within a settlement area. The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population and employment projections to 2031. Further, the new Growth Plan (2017) requires that only upper-tier municipalities such as Simcoe County can determine the settlement boundary expansions through a municipal comprehensive review (MCR) process. As such, no expansions are being recommended at this time. |
| 22 | Bruce Reid South side of Innisfil Beach Road between 25 th Sideroad and Lake Simcoe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to proposed Downtown Commercial Area designation on these lands. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Town has heard from many of its residents throughout the Our Place Official Plan update process of a desire to better link Lake Simcoe to the Downtown of Alcona in terms of pedestrian connectivity and promoting walkability, as well as animating the area with a greater mix of uses. As such, the Official Plan proposes to extend the Downtown Commercial Area designation to Lake Simcoe |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2018
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|---|--|---|
| | | | to help achieve the Town’s place making goals. |
| 23 | Randall Reid South side of Innisfil Beach Road between 25 th Sideroad and Lake Simcoe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to proposed Downtown Commercial Area designation on these lands. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town has heard from many of its residents throughout the Our Place Official Plan update process of a desire to better link Lake Simcoe to the Downtown of Alcona in terms of pedestrian connectivity and promoting walkability, as well as animating the area with a greater mix of uses. As such, the Official Plan proposes to extend the Downtown Commercial Area designation to Lake Simcoe to help achieve the Town’s place making goals. |
| 24 | Michael Bisset on behalf of 1602850 Ontario Ltd. (Cortel) November 8, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests a policy to establish a planning approach to achieve intensification around the GO station (all 4 quadrants) • Requests removal of “other wetland” and “stream” from Appendix 9 on Sleeping Lion lands. • Requests removal of “Significant Woodland” from Appendix 10 on Sleeping Lion lands. • Requests Rural Area designation at southwest quadrant of 6th Line and rail line to remain. • Requests Special Rural Area designation to reflect potential for Campus Node on Sixth Line. • Requests the Town look at placing a cap on cash-in-lieu for parkland dedication. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy approach has been established for higher densities in the vicinity of the GO station, however that approach can only apply to those lands within the current settlement boundary of Alcona. • Agreed – Appendix 9 has been revised to reflect the approved development. • Agreed – Appendix 10 has been revised to reflect the approved development. • The in-effect Official Plan designates the property as “Rural”, but that designation is a non-decision. The Agricultural Discussion Paper has recommended that all non-decisions be removed and identified as “Agricultural”. The paper has also recommended that all requests for re-designation to Rural designation be accompanied by an agricultural capability analysis and needs assessment. No change. • A policy has been included (14.1.7) to support finding an appropriate location within Innisfil for a hospital and/or post secondary institution. • The Town has recently completed the Active Innisfil Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and changing the parkland dedication rate was not a recommendation from that process. As such, no change recommended. |
| 25 | Meagan Palynchuk Bell Canada November 17, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests adding the phrase “where feasible” to policy 5.1.6 • Suggests adding “and encourages the delivery of efficient and coordinated utilities” to section 6.1 • Suggests adding “while ensuring that essential infrastructure and utilities can be feasibly accommodated” in policy 12.9.5 • Suggests changing the word “possible” to | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not required, as the policy already allows for an exemption. Have added in the 2nd “where feasible” though. • This is a “sidebar” and is not a policy. No change. • Agreed. This policy has been added. • Agreed. This policy has been revised. |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2018
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>“feasible” in policy 16.4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests removing the phrase “cable television companies” and adding the word “communications” to 23.1.4 ii) • Comment about “public” utility and confusion therein • Suggests adding a definition of Utilities to section 23.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleted “such as telecommunications or cable television companies” to simplify this policy, and achieve intent of suggested revision. • The term “public” has been deleted in front of policies where previously it said “public utility”. • Agreed. This definition has been added. |
| 26 | County of Simcoe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County of Simcoe has provided detailed comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments have been reviewed and incorporated into the updated Official Plan. |
| 27 | Lake Simcoe and Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LSRCA has provided detailed comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments have been reviewed and incorporated into the updated Official Plan. |
| 28 | Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NVCA has provided detailed comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments have been reviewed and incorporated into the updated Official Plan. |
| 29 | Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit has provided detailed comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments have been reviewed and incorporated into the updated Official Plan. |
| Comments on Draft Official Plan (December 2017 Draft) | | | |
| 30 | Justin Klimkait, on behalf of Edward Gres and Margaret Dudo 7231 Yonge Street December 8, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the lands at 7231 Yonge Street be recognized as a FD (Future Development) zone, surrounding the Civic Campus Area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Civic Campus Area is not a settlement area but rather a part of a rural area, and as such, a future development designation is not appropriate in a rural area. Any redesignation for non-rural and non-agricultural uses must meet the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement and County Official Plan and must consider specific uses. As previously noted, a site specific application to amend the Innisfil Official Plan would be required (for the uses noted in previous correspondence), which would look at how a specific proposal addresses the criteria in the new Innisfil Official Plan and the County Official Plan. |
| 31 | Celeste Phillips, on behalf of Parkbridge Lifestyle Communities Inc. and Belmac Estate Properties Inc. December 8, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stream shown on Schedule B5 and Appendix 9 across the Johnson lands should be removed. • Request confirmation that no secondary plan will be required as a precursor to the submission of plans of subdivision and/or site plans along with associated zoning by-law amendment requests for the subject lands. • Concern about policy 10.4.44 that requires garages to not project beyond the front | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current Official Plan shows a water course on the property and air photos show what appears to be a wet area. As such, an EIS is required to confirm that there are no significant natural features on property before the feature could be considered for removal. • Correct, a secondary plan is not required for lands within the settlement boundary of Sandy Cove. • The intent of this policy is to encourage house design with facades that are not dominated by a garage. By providing for a garage that is in line or further back |

Comments & Response Matrix DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN: January 2018
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|----|--|--|---|
| | | <p>façade of the dwelling or a covered porch. Request that a new policy be added to Section 10.6 that will permit a maximum garage projection of 3 metres in front of a porch.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about policy 10.6.6, which requires a supply/demand analysis of retirement units across the entire town, and suggest the following for the southern portion of the former golf course lands: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Either a dual designation for these lands (i.e. Retirement Residential/Residential Low Density 1), or; ○ A site-specific policy that permits either Residential Low Density and/or Retirement Residential; or ○ A revision to 10.6.6 to exempt lands in Sandy Cove from the requirement for an Official Plan Amendment. | <p>from the front façade of the dwelling, this can be achieved. The Town acknowledges the importance of providing for barrier-free design and access in dwellings, however the Town acknowledges that barrier-free design can be achieved while also providing for a façade that is not dominated by a garage. As such, no change is recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that these lands maintain their Retirement Residential designation, with a site specific policy that permits Low Density Residential 1 development (see policy 10.6.12). |
| 32 | <p>Darren Vella (Innovative Planning Solutions) on behalf of Innisfil Self Storage</p> <p>December 11, 2017</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Innisfil Self Storage property should be designated as Rural Commercial to recognize the existing use. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – the Innisfil Self Storage property (only the portion of the property currently being used for this use) is now designated as Rural Commercial to reflect the existing use. |
| 33 | <p>Darren Vella (Innovative Planning Solutions) on behalf of Centreville Stroud</p> <p>December 11, 2017</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Stroud schedule should be amended to reflect the site specific OPA that has been approved for the Centreville Stroud property | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – Schedule B7 – Stroud has been updated to reflect the approved OPA. Schedule D – Site-Specifics has also been updated to reflect the approved OPA. |
| 34 | <p>Darren Vella (Innovative Planning Solutions) on behalf of owners of two properties</p> <p>1194 & 1224 Belle Aire Beach Road</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two properties should be re-designated from Agricultural Area to Rural Area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report prepared by DBH Soil Services Inc. was prepared to examine both properties and assess their potential for future agricultural production. At the request of the applicant, this report was peer reviewed by AgPlan limited. The peer review concluded that a complete Agricultural Impact Assessment had not been provided, and as such, more information was required. Specifically, it recommended that a detailed soil survey and soil capability interpretation be completed before considering the matter. As such, no change in designation is recommended at this time. |

Comments & Response Matrix UPDATED: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| A – Site-Specific Submissions | | | |
| A – 1 | 0 Leonard John Caruso June 5, 2013 | Wants land re-designated 'estate residential' | These lands are not within a settlement area. The majority of this property is within the Natural Environmental Area designation, with the exception of a small portion of land (70X150 foot lot) that fronts onto Leonard St. that is designated Shoreline Residential. Appendix 1 of the current Official Plan identifies a Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) on this property, as well as Significant Woodland. Development is not permitted within a PSW, or within a minimum buffer to the feature as determined through an Environmental Impact Study. A home can already be built on the Shoreline Residential portion of the lot, subject to a re-zoning. Recommend no change in designation. |
| A – 2 | 1696 Cedar Grove | Neighbour (1733 Cedar Grove) wants Natural Environment Area designation to remain on this property | 1696 Cedar Grove is the large block of land on the west side of the road. It is entirely within the Natural Environment Area designation. It is identified within the Natural Heritage Discussion Paper as a significant woodland as well as an unevaluated wetland. Recommend and agree that NEA designation should remain. The Landowner could bring an application for development, but it would have to meet the policies of the Official Plan requiring an EIS to be completed, demonstrating that the proposed development will have no negative impacts on the natural feature or its ecological function. Recommend no change in designation at this time. |
| A – 3 | 4583 15th Line Weston Consulting, on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Rawhani April, 28, 2014 Additional Letter from December 21, 2016 | Wants western expansion of Cookstown settlement boundary to include property Request for policy inclusions in the Official Plan stating that an expansion of the Cookstown Settlement Area will be considered through way of the next Municipal Comprehensive Review. | Detailed submission received. The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population and employment projections to 2031. No expansions are being recommended at this time. Further, there are servicing constraints in Cookstown that limit future growth within that settlement area. The Draft Official Plan contains policies requiring a municipal comprehensive review to evaluate all options should a settlement area boundary expansion be required in the future. |
| A – 4 | 1859 and 1933 6th Line Cliff Thomson March 18, 2013 | Wants properties re-designated as Rural | The property is in the Agricultural Area designation and the majority of the property is considered prime agricultural area (Class 1-3 soils). The Agricultural Discussion Paper has recommended that all requests for re-designation to Rural designation be accompanied by an agricultural capability analysis and needs assessment. |
| A – 5 | 1055 7th Line (Alcona) September 22, 2015 | Wants re-designation to Residential to permit severance (property currently zoned Open Space) | The north portion of property, fronting onto 7 th Line, is designated Natural Environmental Area. The same situation exists for the 7 other properties along the south side of 7 th Line in the same block. It also appears that this property is subject to the Hazard Land |

Comments & Response Matrix UPDATED: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|-------|---|--|--|
| | | | overlay designation. However, there appear to be no natural features on this property. On the north side of the road, the OP identifies a significant woodland and “other wetland”, however these features are separated from the subject property by 7 th Line. There do not appear to be any streams running through the lands or to the north. Therefore it is recommended that the NEA designation be removed from this property. |
| A – 6 | 2575 4th Line (John St. lots) Augusto Nailli (ARN Project Management Inc) July 11, 2014 | Wants SW boundary of Churchill settlement area squared off to include portion of property | These lands are currently zoned Residential R1, and previous to this, the lands were zoned R1S. As the lands are already zoned, the settlement boundary should be squared off to recognize the property lines and existing zoning of the property. The updated land use schedule for Churchill reflects this. |
| A – 7 | 1460 7th Line (northeast corner of 7 th Line and 20 th Sideroad Keith MacKinnon (KLM Planning Partners), On behalf of his client December 4, 2014 | Wants property designated commercial as per OPA1 designation | The Retail Discussion Paper has determined that there is a need for additional retail space in the municipality, and that Alcona should be the focus to accommodate the majority of that need. However, based on the 2031 Growth Plan employment allocation for Innisfil, there is currently no justification for an expansion. The forecast of population related jobs to 2031 is less than the amount of population related jobs that can be accommodated in the existing settlement boundaries. At the time of the next 5-year review of the Official Plan, if there is sufficient employment allocation to Innisfil, consideration should be given to adding additional retail lands if it is deemed appropriate, through a Municipal Comprehensive Review. |
| A – 8 | Concession 15 East Part Lot 2 John and Nancy Williams February 18, 2015 | Wants property included in eastern expansion of Cookstown settlement boundary | The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population and employment projections to 2031. No expansions are being recommended at this time. Further, there are servicing constraints in Cookstown that are currently limiting growth potential within that settlement area. |
| A – 9 | 7231 Yonge Street (NE corner of Yonge/7 th Line – south of Town Hall) J.R. Bousfield (Bouisfield Inc), On behalf of Gres-Dudo Developments Subsequent letters: Edward Gres (Gres-Dudo Developments) July 15, 2016 July 26, 2016 September 2, 2016 | Proposal for commercial uses, electric car charging station, rest area, 30 seniors residences (life lease), and a prestige business park | The Growth Plan and the Simcoe County Official Plan direct growth, including commercial, employment and residential growth, to existing settlement areas, as well as to the Innisfil Heights Strategic Settlement Employment Area. The area proposed is not within or adjacent to a settlement area and new settlement areas are not permitted. This area is designated Agricultural Area and under the Provincial Policy Statement lot creation for residential uses are not permitted in Agricultural Areas. Only agriculture and agricultural related uses are permitted. Received updated information on an electric car charging station in July 2016. A charging station, not including the other proposed uses, could potentially be considered as a rural commercial development, subject to policy 3.7.5 of the County Official Plan. Rural commercial uses must primarily serve the travelling public and tourists to the area on the basis of convenience and access. Similar criteria have been added to the Town’s |

Comments & Response Matrix UPDATED: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|--------|--|--|--|
| | | | Official Plan. A site specific application to amend the Innisfil Official Plan would be required, which would look at how the proposal addresses the criteria in the new OP. |
| A – 10 | 2849 Clarkesville St Gerry & Teresina Fumo February 9, 2015 | Wants property included in southern expansion of Sandy Cove settlement boundary | Majority of property (except NW portion) designated as a Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) and no development is permitted within it or within a minimum of 30 metres. These lands are not within a settlement area. The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper exercise has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population and employment projections to 2031. No settlement expansions are being recommended at this time. |
| A – 11 | 1194 Belle Aire Beach Rd John Stevens (DLR Holdings) September 13, 2013 | Wants entire property included in Alcona 'Urban Settlement Expansion Area' as per Official Plan Amendment 1 | This property is adjacent to the Lefroy – Belle Ewart Settlement Area, not Alcona. Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population and employment projections to 2031. No settlement expansions are being recommended at this time. |
| A – 12 | CON 9 N PT LOT 15/CON 9 PT S 1/2 LOT 15 Keith Lew (Lew Associates Limited) Jul 11, 2013 | Wants property included in expansion of Stroud settlement boundary for residential and retail purposes. | Conceptual site and architectural plans for retail/residential development received. Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population and employment projections to 2031. Settlement area boundary expansions are preferable in settlements with full municipal services. No settlement expansions are being recommended at this time. |
| A – 13 | 2108 20th Sideroad Oksana Arkhitko June 17, 2014 | Wants property included in western expansion of Alcona settlement boundary and re-designated to allow mixed-use | The Retail Discussion Paper has determined that there is a need for additional retail space in the municipality, and that Alcona should be the focus to accommodate the majority of that need. However, based on the 2031 Growth Plan employment allocation for Innisfil, there is currently no justification for an expansion. In view of the fact that this property is adjacent to existing commercial uses within Alcona and is located along Innisfil Beach Road, the property has been designated as Rural Commercial on Schedule B, in line with the proposed criteria outlined in the draft Official Plan policies. |
| A – 14 | 2044 25th Sideroad Susan Grace April 29, 2015 | Wants property designated residential. This is an old club, “Alcona Seniors Club”, within an established residential area of Alcona. | Recognizing that this site is within an established residential neighbourhood, the north half of this property (currently vacant) has been re-designated to Residential Low Density and the south half, where the existing building is situated, has been re-designated to Community Space. |
| A – 15 | CON 14 N PT LOT 24 Marika Franko (National Homes) | Wants property included in southern Cookstown settlement boundary expansion | The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate |

Comments & Response Matrix UPDATED: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|--------|---|--|---|
| | May 6, 2015 (date of Town response to verbal conversation) | | population projections to 2031. No settlement expansions are being recommended at this time. Further, there are servicing constraints in Cookstown that are currently limiting growth potential within that settlement area. |
| A – 16 | Lands west of Cameron Street (Lefroy) Attilio June 25, 2015 | Wants lands to be developable, and not within the Natural Environmental Area designation | These lands are within the Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) as defined by the MNRF. The owner will need to provide the Town and consulting team with more recent natural heritage analysis that can be provided to MNRF to demonstrate that there is no PSW on the property. |
| A – 17 | Lands located immediately north of the existing Alcona Settlement boundary, south of 9 th Line Ray Duhamel (Jones Consulting Group Ltd), On behalf of D.G Pratt Construction October 25, 2015 | Lands currently designated as “Agricultural” in the Official Plan. Want lands to be re-designated to “Rural”. Landowners’ consultants have undertaken a detailed soil and agricultural capability analysis on the lands. | Recommend meeting with the landowner’s consultant to review the landowner’s agricultural study. Field work confirmation may be required in order to determine the appropriate land use designation. |
| A – 18 | Conc. 14N, Pt. Lot. 1 (south east side of Cookstown, outside settlement area) Barb Jerry September 9, 2015 | Request for inclusion of their lands within the Cookstown Settlement Area, to be considered for future development, including possible commercial development. | The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population projections to 2031. No expansions are being recommended at this time for residential purposes. Further, there are servicing constraints in Cookstown that limit future growth within that settlement area. The Retail Discussion Paper has determined that there is a need for additional retail space in the municipality, however the report states that Alcona should be the focus to accommodate the majority of that need. However, based on the 2031 Growth Plan employment allocation for Innisfil, there is currently no justification for an expansion. The forecast of population related jobs to 2031 is less than the amount of population related jobs that can be accommodated in the existing settlement boundaries. At the time of the next 5-year review of the Official Plan, if there is sufficient employment allocation to Innisfil, consideration should be given to adding additional retail lands if it is deemed appropriate, through a Municipal Comprehensive Review. |
| A – 19 | 24 Queen Street (Cookstown) Claudio Paolini June 29, 2015 | Request to redesignate lands to permit townhouses. | The subject lands are currently designated Residential Low Density 1 in the Town’s Official Plan. This designation permits single detached dwellings. The site would have to be re-designated to Residential Medium Density, which permits Townhouses. Recommend that this request be the subject of a site-specific Official Plan amendment by the owner, in order for the Town to appropriately identify and evaluate this proposal and associated considerations (transportation, density, servicing capacity, etc...). |

Comments & Response Matrix UPDATED: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|--------|--|--|--|
| A – 20 | 1017 Robinson Street (Lefroy – Belle Ewart) William Pring (Legions) Oct. 27, 2015 | Request for redesignation of lands from Parks and Open Space to a residential designation to permit the future severance of the lands (2 to 3 residential lots). | Recognizing that this site is within an established residential neighbourhood, the vacant portion of this property has been re-designated to Residential Low Density and the portion of the property where the existing building is situated has been re-designated to Community Space. |
| A – 21 | 687 Innisfil Beach Road & 624 Lakelands Ave. (Alcona) Sergip Navaretta June 25, 2015 | Request for permission for a 5-storey mixed use condo with commercial on main floor (art gallery, café, etc.), as well as a lighthouse tourist information / welcome centre. | This section of Innisfil Beach Road is now within the Downtown Commercial Area, which now extends to Lake Simcoe (to revitalize Innisfil Beach Road and reinforce the connection to the Lake). The Draft Official Plan also applies a site specific provision to this section of Innisfil Beach Road, with a minimum of 2 storeys and a maximum of 4 storeys. |
| A – 22 | 2 nd Line (south side), adjacent to Gilford Settlement Area November 25, 2015 | Lands currently designated Rural, request is to expand the Gilford Settlement Boundary to permit residential lots on the property. | The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population and employment projections to 2031. No expansions are being recommended at this time. |
| A – 23 | Sunset Speedway (6906 and 6918 Highway 11) Marvin Geist (Marvin Geist Professional Group), On behalf of Sunset International Speedway Inc. March 30, 2016 | Request to expand the site for those uses that exist at the Sunset Speedway facility, including parking, entertainment and sports related uses. | It is recommended that the existing use be recognized in the Official Plan. The site will be re-designated as Rural Commercial, with a site specific policy that would recognize and permit only the existing use. It is also recommended that any request for the expansion of permitted uses or additional uses be the subject of a site specific Official Plan amendment by the owner, in order for the Town to appropriately evaluate this proposal. |
| A – 24 | 239 Reive Boulevard (Innisfil Creek Golf Course) Jamie Robinson (MHBC Planning) January 25, 2016 June 22, 2016 October 24, 2016 | Request for designation of additional commercial lands in the vicinity of Highways 400/89 (and specifically, the Innisfil Creek Golf Course lands). Request June 2016: Request for lands to be placed within the Highway Commercial designation, and request to change wording from “shall” to “may” in former policy 3.4.3.1. Request October 2016: Further request to place lands within the Highway Commercial designation. | The Retail Discussion Paper has determined that there is a need for additional retail space in the municipality and that Alcona should be the focus to accommodate the majority of that need. However, based on the 2031 Growth Plan employment allocation for Innisfil, there is currently no justification for an expansion. The forecast of population related jobs to 2031 is less than the amount of population related jobs that can be accommodated in the existing settlement boundaries. At the time of the next 5-year review of the Official Plan, if there is sufficient employment allocation to Innisfil, consideration should be given to adding additional retail lands if it is deemed appropriate, through a Municipal Comprehensive Review. In terms of the June 2016 and October 2016 requests to redesignate the lands to Highway Commercial, this should be addressed through a site specific application, which addresses technical aspects such as traffic, servicing and compatibility. Policies in the draft Official Plan have been changed to recognize commercial uses in the countryside as “Rural Commercial” instead of “Highway Commercial”. Policies have also been included to permit additional “Rural Commercial” uses, subject to a site specific |

Comments & Response Matrix UPDATED: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | application and subject to studies to ensure new developments are able to adequately be accommodated on private services, as well as addressing the County Official Plan criteria in section 3.7.5 for Rural Commercial uses. |
| A – 25 and A- 26 | Rizzardo Brothers Land Partnership (lands south of Alcona) – Letter from Planscape Don Stone (Planscape Inc.) On behalf of Rizzardo Brothers Land Partnership April 15, 2016 May 30, 2016 | Request for including of lands within Alcona Urban Boundary | The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population projections to 2031. No expansions are being recommended at this time for residential purposes. However, the draft Official Plan recognizes Alcona as a Primary Settlement Area and a priority to accommodate future population allocations in Innisfil. The Official Plan also recognizes the previous secondary plan studies for Alcona South and Alcona North and will give priority consideration to the lands within those Secondary Plans at the time of the next Municipal Comprehensive Review. The Draft Official Plan also includes a policy that the area around the future GO Station shall be considered a priority for future expansion at the time of the next Municipal Comprehensive Review (should additional population be allocated to Innisfil). |
| A – 27 | 1438 6 th Line David Charzenko (Stantec Consulting Ltd.), on behalf of Innisfil Alcona Limited. April 20, 2016 | Request for “Future Community Area” designation for Alcona North and South lands to recognize future expansion potential. | No settlement boundary expansions are being recommended at this time, and while we agree that a significant portion of growth and future growth should be directed to the Primary Settlement Area (Alcona), an expansion is not possible at the moment. However, the draft Official Plan recognizes Alcona as a Primary Settlement Area and a priority to accommodate future population allocations in Innisfil. The Official Plan also recognizes the previous secondary plan studies for Alcona South and Alcona North and will give priority consideration to the lands within those Secondary Plans at the time of the next Municipal Comprehensive Review. |
| A – 28 | Weston Consulting on behalf of the West Family (Southeast corner of Shore Acres Drive and 20 th Sideroad) April 20, 2016 | Request for inclusion in Gilford Settlement Area. | The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population projections to 2031. No expansions are being recommended at this time for residential purposes. |
| A – 29 | Nicola Mitchinson June 16, 2016 | Request for inclusion of part lots along the northern extension of Webster (Pratt Alcona North) and Leslie (Pratt Alonzi) within the Alcona settlement boundary. | This request is reasonable, as it does not create any new lots beyond the part lots that have already been created in the draft plan to the south. Recommend inclusion within the Alcona Settlement boundary. |
| A – 30 | Bousfields, on behalf of 1602850 Ontario Ltd. (Cortel) September 1, 2016 | Request for inclusion of lands (125 hectares), in the vicinity of 6 th Line and 20 th Sideroad, within the Alcona Urban Area. Cortel has retained IBI group to | The Land Budget and Municipal Comprehensive Review Discussion Paper has determined that settlement boundary expansions are not required to accommodate population projections to 2031. No expansions are being recommended at this time for |

Comments & Response Matrix UPDATED: January 2017
Town of Innisfil – “Our Place” Official Plan Update

| # | Property Address (if applicable) | Submission / Issue | Response |
|--------|---|---|---|
| | | undertake a review of the land budget, as they believe an expansion is warranted. | residential purposes. However, we welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter further with IBI Group and to discuss the findings of their review. |
| A – 31 | Kristine Loft, on behalf of SanDiego Homes Inc. October 5, 2016 | Request for the redesignation of lands (Block 39, Plan of Subdivision I-T-0003 (Webster and 7 th) to a commercial / mixed use designation. | This request recognizes a potential opportunity to provide for a new neighbourhood servicing commercial area that would be integrated within the community and within walking distance to residential areas and other amenities. It is not anticipated that the redesignation of these lands would detract from the viability and success of the Downtown Commercial Area along Innisfil Beach Road, as the commercial uses would serve a different purpose in this location. Recommend the redesignation of this block to the “Neighbourhood Commercial” designation in the Official Plan. |
| A – 32 | Celeste Phillips, on behalf of Parkbridge (Sandy Cove) September 21, 2016 | Request for removing Retirement Residential designation from individual lots within Innis-Village; Request to remove the cap on convenience commercial floor space; Request to introduce a grocery store in Sandy Cove; Request for a density of 12-16 uph for Parkbridge’s future expansion lands; Request to consider the removal of the Retirement Residential designation from the golf course lands to accommodate “land lease development” for first time homebuyers. | As Sandy Cove is an urban area within Innisfil, the following updates have been made to the Official Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Innis-Village lands are no longer within the Retirement Residential designation – they are within the Residential Low Density 1 and 2 designations, and the Downtown Commercial Area designation; • The cap on convenience commercial space has been removed in Sandy Cove, and policy added to permit and encourage a grocery store in Sandy Cove has been included; • The retirement residential designation has been updated to permit all housing forms and tenure, and the permitted density has been updated to be 12-16 uph; and • The golf course lands have been re-designated to the Residential Low Density 1 designation. |
| A – 33 | Dentons Canada LLP, on behalf of Innisfil Mapleview Developments Limited (“IMDL”) January 13, 2017 | Letter to request that the terms of the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Settlement are respected through the Official Plan review process and that appropriate consideration is given to the Subject Lands. | Yes, the terms of the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Settlement have been respected and the settlement has been reflected in the Draft Official Plan. |