



**THE CORPORATION OF THE
TOWN OF GEORGINA
Special Council Minutes**

Date: Wednesday, April 27, 2022
Time: 7:00 PM

Members of Council Present: Mayor Margaret Quirk

Regional Councillor Grossi
Councillor Waddington
Councillor Fellini
Councillor Neeson
Councillor Sebo
Councillor Harding

Staff Present: Ryan Cronsberry, CAO
Harold Lenters, Director of Development Services
Rob Wheeler, Deputy CAO/Treasurer
Mamata Baykar, Deputy Clerk
Carolyn Lance, Council Services Coordinator
Tolek Makarewicz, Senior Policy Planner
Alan Drozd, Manager of Planning Policy

1. CALL TO ORDER- MOMENT OF MEDITATION

“The Town of Georgina recognizes and acknowledges that we are on lands originally used and occupied by the First Peoples of the Williams Treaties First Nations and other Indigenous Peoples, and on behalf of the Mayor and Council, we would like to thank them for sharing this land. We would also like to acknowledge the Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation as our close neighbour and friend, one with which we strive to build a cooperative and respectful relationship.

We also recognize the unique relationship the Chippewas have with the lands and waters of this territory. They are the water protectors and environmental stewards of these lands and we join them in these responsibilities.”

2. ROLL CALL

Councillor Neeson arrived at 7:03pm

3. COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

4. INTRODUCTION OF ADDENDUM ITEM(S)

None.

5. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

RESOLUTION NO. C-2022-0160

Moved By Councillor Waddington

Seconded By Councillor Fellini

That the April 27, 2022 Special Council agenda be adopted as presented

Carried

6. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

None.

7. ADOPTION OF MINUTES (None)

8. SPEAKERS

9. DELEGATIONS/ PETITIONS (None)

10. PRESENTATIONS

11. PUBLIC MEETINGS

1. Statutory Meeting(s) Under The Planning Act Or Meetings Pertaining To The Continuation Of Planning Matters

1. Keswick Secondary Plan Review – Keswick Secondary Plan Draft #2 (7:00pm)

Report No. DS-2022-0033

Mayor Quirk explained the procedure for public meetings at this time.

Councillor Neeson arrived at 7:03pm

Tolek Makarewicz, Senior Policy Planner;

- project team to present the draft and design guidelines for the Keswick Secondary Plan and to receive input and feedback from Council and the public to assist with preparation of the final Keswick Secondary Plan. Proposed plan anticipated to be before Council in late July, early August

- special meeting of Council held Nov. 11, 2020 to discuss changes that may be required to the Secondary Plan,
- Draft #1 released for agency review and public comment, taken to public workshop #3, all comments summarized in report. throughout 2021, comments reviewed by agencies and the public, resulted in Draft #2, all input summarized in report.
- Draft #2 presented to Steering Committee, received feedback, released Draft #2 in January 2022 for public review and comment.
- Currently in formal process of considering public comments. Statutory open house held.
- KEY CHANGES incorporated into Draft #2; i) rewording of policies and restructuring of sections, ii) removing duplication of policies, iii) policy vs. explanatory text vs. design guidelines, iv) Secondary Plan vs. Official Plan policies, v) growth management section, vi) 'Lake Simcoe Protection' subsection, vii) approach to calculating residential density, and viii) additional definitions
- COMMENTS, Town Departments; Development Engineering and Municipal Law Enforcement Division both indicated 'no comments'
- COMMENTS, External Agencies; York Region providing suggestions for policies and mapping revisions, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority concerning mapping and identification of environmental features, Ministry of Transportation indicating consultation will be required related to proposed realignment of Glenwoods Avenue adjacent to Hwy 404, York Region District School Board concerning active transportation requesting sidewalks on both sides of the street, wider sidewalks, adjacent roadways connecting to school sites, road network to and from schools is conducive to safe transportation, Bell regarding urban design guidelines, how they relate to their standard processes
- COMMENTS, public; Anthony Usher Planning Consultant on behalf of North Gwillimbury Forest Alliance regarding environmental protection policies for ecological offsetting requirements and changes within the policies of the plan between Drafts 1 and 2, KLM Planning on behalf of DG Group addressing policy wording, proposed mapping, affordable housing requirements, amenity areas, permitted uses/policies related to mixed use corridor 2 designation, urban centres and environmental protection area designation, Michael Smith

Planning Consultants on behalf of Treasure Hill regarding wording for flexibility in designation, policies to support standalone residential uses, Martha Doherty of Keswick concerning excessive future development in Keswick, lack of sidewalks and the need for sympathetic development

- Additional comments; Michael Smith requesting additional height permissions, from 11 metres in height to 12 and 13 metres within low rise residential use requirements to allow for transition

Ron Palmer;

- Secondary plans are important planning documents; start with a vision, support that vision, link vision with principles
- VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES; words that talk about the future, a sense of community, better connections, ways to bike, walk, transit, vehicles, protection of natural heritage system, stronger commitment to sustainability and resiliency
- Vision statement supported by 8 principles; complete, healthy, attractive, safe, inclusive and accessible community, desire to see stronger mix of affordable housing types, strengthening community identify and cohesion, logical, orderly, efficient, connected and multimodal transportation network, competitive and adaptable economic environment, projection of employment and how that impacts population to job ratio, Lake Simcoe, Maskinonge River, Natural Heritage System and Parks Network
- GROWTH MANAGEMENT; Population and Employment Forecasts
- A defined Urban Structure, boundaries within Keswick with different meaning for different types of development
- planning horizon for this plan is 2041, expecting Keswick to have population of 41,000 and accommodate 7,000 jobs not including the Keswick Business Park. Population-related employment such as retail and service-commercial uses, institutional uses including schools, municipal employment
- Defined Urban Structure to consider includes Settlement Area Boundary, Urban Service Area Boundary, Delineated Built-up Area, Designated Greenfield Area, Natural Heritage System and Parks Network, Local Strategic Growth Area
- Accommodating Projected Growth - Province and Region looking for two types of development - i) Intensification within the Delineated Built-Up Area, minimum 28% of all residential

development shall occur within the delineated built-up area, primary areas along Woodbine and The Queensway, ii) Development within the Designated Greenfield Areas shall achieve an overall minimum density of 50 residents and jobs combined per gross hectare

- BUILDING A COMPLETE KESWICK; four important primary overarching categories; a healthy and accessible community, a strong economy, an attractive and high-quality community, a sustainable and resilient community - important for how Keswick and Georgina will grow
- LAND USE DESIGNATIONS; Local strategic growth area
- Three Urban Centres Designations - Glenwoods, Maskinonge and Uptown Keswick
- Mixed Use Corridor 1 Designation - The Queensway - more urban including residential, retail and service-commercial uses as well as mid-rise and low-rise residential forms of development
- Mixed-Use Corridor 2 Designation - Woodbine Avenue - mid-rise and high-rise forms of development, mixed use
- Neighbourhoods; existing neighbourhood designation and new neighbourhood designation
- Community Supporting Land Uses; tourist commercial designation, institutional/community designation
- The Natural Heritage System and Parks Network; Environmental Protection Area Designation, Environmental Overlays, Parks and Open Space Designation
- SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE; Transportation System including general transportation policies, road network, active transportation, public transit and parking management. Sanitary Sewage and Water Supply Services of sewage and water allocation, and Stormwater Management including best management practices and phosphorus budget
- ROLE OF THE GUIDELINES
- Urban Design and Architectural Control Guidelines, an appendix to Secondary Plan, not statutory but are guidelines to provide guidance for homeowners, designers, architects, developers and landscape architects by outlining the Town's expectations for new development. Consistent development.
- THE PUBLIC REALM;

- Guidelines for Roads and Streetscapes, Guidelines for Natural Heritage System and Parks Network, Guidelines for Active Transportation and Guidelines for Stormwater Management Facilities
- THE PRIVATE REALM;
- Guidelines for all development; urban centres and mixed-use corridors, neighbourhoods, Site Planning for site layout, site landscaping and landscaping details, Low-Rise Buildings up to 3 storeys, Mid-Rise Buildings up to 6 storeys, High-Rise Buildings up to 12 storeys, Commercial and Mixed Use Buildings include building design, parking options, servicing, storage and loading, Public Service Facilities include building design, school sites, fire stations and places of worship
- GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND BUILDING; energy conservation, water use and management, lighting, green buildings and green sites, stewardship /education, retrofitting existing private properties

Tolek Makarewicz;

- Next Steps; second open house and public meeting for the proposed Keswick Secondary Plan will be held in late July/early August, forward plan to the Region for approval
- Draft 2 is comprehensive and forward-looking, provides a clear vision for development in Keswick
- Small revisions will be required to improve the plan but not anticipated revisions will significantly alter the direction of the plan
- recommend Council approve the recommendations in the report, receive the report, endorse the next steps for completion of the proposed Keswick Secondary Plan for adoption in July/August and that staff forward the report with resolution to the Region and the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority lands along Woodbine Avenue designated as Employment lands, some changes regarding mixed-use

Ron Palmer;

- the purpose of intensification is to allow the municipality to identify locations where significant denser, taller development should go so that it can be better managed elsewhere. Local centres have quite large properties that would withstand significant forms of development in retail/commercial function, The Queensway could form an important transit route, and

Woodbine Avenue has a lot of opportunity to accommodate larger scale forms of development without causing significant undue adverse impact on existing communities. If that can be achieved in the Woodbine Corridor, it takes pressure off of the rest of Keswick for significant intensification.

- there are portions along Woodbine Avenue that are within the existing built boundary that can be the focus of intensification and there are parts of Greenfield development opportunity being proposed to accommodate higher density built forms as well. The goal is to achieve intensification through both the defined intensification and higher intensity uses in the Greenfield context.
- Growth Plan gives York Region a target and the target is Region-wide. Municipalities with higher intensification abilities assist the municipalities with lower intensification abilities.

Martha Doherty, 159 Cedar Street, Uptown Keswick;

- intention of the plan is to build a healthy and prosperous community
- concerned with urban designation applied to Keswick Uptown area - by putting that in the Keswick Secondary Plan, will enable developers to have a negative impact on the community. Mid-rise buildings that can be built next to single family dwellings can create noise, shadowing, etc; there is currently a proposal for an oversized six-storey building on a steep hill fronting on The Queensway, abutting a single family dwelling and across the road from other single family dwellings and believes this is not in character with the neighbourhood.
- feel Uptown Keswick area is a different, long established neighbourhood, Keswick historical society has a photograph of the intersection of Church Street and The Queensway and the road and some of buildings look much the way it does today.
- in Uptown Keswick, many seniors and residents need motorized vehicles to travel and many school-aged children, therefore there should be sidewalks on both sides of the street so pedestrians do not need to cross busy street to access a sidewalk
- two-lane roads; no room for bike lanes, overflow parking/traffic on nearby residential streets that have no sidewalks and have ditches
- Uptown Keswick requires revitalization, want to ensure changes do not aggravate social problems such as a methadone clinic

next to a primary school, development can escalate these issues

- urban design guidelines, not mandatory
- providing cash-in-lieu allows developers to destroy green spaces, remove mature trees, and these funds can be allocated elsewhere; should ensure any compensation should be focused in the areas where the development has taken place
- Council must ensure the Keswick Secondary Plan will safeguard the quality of life for those who live in the neighbourhood

Harold Lenters; Bill 109 was approved recently, it did not include a lot of the recommendations from the Committee concerning compatibility issues.

Ron Palmer;

- Bill 109 does not include many of the 55 recommendations contained in the Affordable Housing Task Force report a report to strip away any value of municipal planning in Ontario. Some elements of the report were good ideas and a lot were focused on issues in Toronto, much like all Provincial legislation is intended to solve problems in Toronto and do not have use anywhere outside of Toronto.
- Bill 109 identifies a different approach to the Minister's zoning tool and is not aggressive
- Will forward information explaining implications to municipalities

Harold Lenters;

- one change is the requirement for Council to delegate site plan approval to staff. Also, the Province is allowing municipalities to adopt Official Plan Amendments to the effect that municipalities can now delegate the approval of minor zoning applications to staff level as well, temporary use bylaws, deeming bylaws, holding zones, etc. However, that delegation requires an Official Plan Amendment through a process to enact that.
- regarding scale, intensity, amount of development in Uptown Keswick; 1. Ms. Doherty likes the way it is in terms of its history, but there are a number of issues and concerns about existing development today, protection for future but improvements required.
- new development provides opportunity to address some concerns that exist on properties. Compatibility is the key issue.

- all concerns are valid, need to ensure balance and growth are provided. Keswick Secondary Plan allows for the evolution of an area but that takes time to do so.

Ron Palmer;

- believes the Keswick Business Park has a full build out between 7,500 to 8,000 jobs and is very close to the 2:1 employment ratio. People working from home could create more jobs. Every business and office is different, the goal is to have a broad enough strategy to accommodate all forms of development, to create a range in mix of housing types to attract various types of employers, provide opportunities in the Woodbine corridor for mixed use development including offices, the goal is to permit as much as possible and still have compatibility. The Bradford Bypass will create a significant improvement to the accessibility of Keswick.

Harold Lenters;

- need to recognize that Georgina is in the Greenbelt which limits opportunity for significant urban development and employment. Dealing with limited land in Keswick and a lesser degree in Sutton. We constantly advise the Region, in terms of rural countryside area, the opportunities need to be there to allow for more compatible uses in the countryside, more rural designations to allow for some better suited uses. Important to maximize what we can, Woodbine Corridor mixed-use area, need to be careful we do not just permit residential, even high density residential, begin to lose opportunities for commercial uses as there is a desire to separate residential and commercial uses. There are constraints due to the Greenbelt Plan respecting how much development can occur.
- At 2.6 people per jobs, the Region has Georgina at 70,000 population with approximately 21,000 jobs

Ron Palmer;

- Woodbine Corridor is a crucial part of this plan and it cannot be just standalone residential. Georgina needs employment opportunity, the complete community element.

Harold Lenters;

- development pays for development, legislation allows municipalities to determine appropriate charges for development. Where developers remove trees, both the Conservation Authority and the Town have the opportunity to collect compensation which can be utilized to address other

issues within the community. Instituting costing mechanism or financial revenue stream requires legislative authority to do so.

- Can determine if there is merit in offsetting development through low impact development and some environmental improvement.
- Keswick Secondary Plan contains an entire section based on the Maskinonge River, will be requiring from developers a number of items to help improve the river
- balance to be found with existing property owners backing onto the Maskinonge River and the requirement for a 30 metre buffer from the river

Tolek Makarewicz;

- comments noted within the report will be responded to in the next draft. Next staff report to be submitted to Council in mid to late summer will include all accumulated comments to draft #2 as well as all comments received up to the report submission; all comments are tabulated and responded to.
- interchange at Glenwoods Avenue is preferred

Harold Lenters;

- during original secondary plan, the Province initially suggested interchanges at Morton Avenue and Ravenshoe Road; the Morton Avenue location did not make sense and the Town suggested an interchange at Glenwoods Avenue. The Province rejected that suggestion.
- The Province indicated that if the municipality desired an interchange at Glenwoods Avenue, it would be the municipality's responsibility to pay for it and build it. Nothing has been conducted in terms of studies or a funding model. The first step is getting the interchange approved by the Province and that was done. Part of discussion with Business Park land owners will include whether the traffic analysis require an interchange for truck and traffic movement. Will require future studies concerning timing and a funding model, will need further discussion to move the interchange to Glenwoods Avenue.

Tolek Makarewicz; will determine the land designation of Park and Open Space in Simcoe Landing, property directly north of the school, area is held by an organization

Ron Palmer;

- expectation that this plan will build-out Keswick and there is capacity for further intensification
- part of development potential shown will require some level of enhancement to sewage treatment plant capacity to fully build out and once we get to the point of a built out Keswick, become different kind of community and will focus on intensification in future.

Tolek Makarewicz;

- this is a land use plan that forecasts growth into the future; the allocation component is measured and monitored. The Region provides a certain amount of allocation and it is Council's responsibility to disperse it. The Town needs to meet certain capacities within the existing system to justify an expansion. In order to build out fully, an expansion to the sewage treatment plant required to realize the build-out forecasted by this plan.
- the allocation in the Keswick Secondary Plan is provided by the Region through the municipal comprehensive review process. Once the Region's Official Plan is in force, the deferral on the forecasted plan is removed. Allocation comes in the form of the Region releasing the next round of allocation when the plant is expanded.
- staff is presenting draft #2 but it has been out in the public for some time. In order to comprehensively respond to all comments at once, staff is receiving all of them first and strategically responding with all information available.

Harold Lenters;

- staff can establish a method to provide Council with an assessment of comments received, for review.
- Staff will schedule a separate evening date solely for consideration of this plan

RESOLUTION NO. C-2022-0161

Moved By Councillor Waddington

Seconded By Councillor Fellini

1. That Council receive Report No. DS-2022-0033 prepared by the Planning Policy Division, Development Services Department dated April 27, 2022, respecting the Keswick Secondary Plan Review – Keswick Secondary Plan Draft #2.

2. That Council endorse the next steps for completing the preparation of a Proposed Keswick Secondary Plan for Council's adoption in late July, early August 2022, as outlined in Section 6.2 of Report No. DS-2022-0033.
3. That the Town Clerk forward a copy of Report No. DS-2022-0033 and Council's Resolution to the York Region Director of Community Planning and Development Services, the York Region Chief Planner, and the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, General Manager, Planning and Development.

Carried

12. REPORTS (None)

13. DISPOSITIONS/PROCLAMATIONS, GENERAL INFORMATION ITEMS AND COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

1. Dispositions/Proclamations

1. KLM Planning Partners Inc regarding Draft No. 2 of the Keswick Secondary Plan Public Meeting

RESOLUTION NO. C-2022-0162

Moved By Councillor Waddington

Seconded By Regional Councillor Grossi

That correspondence from KLM Planning Partners Inc. regarding Draft No. 2 of the Keswick Secondary Plan Public Meeting be received and referred to the Development Services Department for consideration.

Carried

2. General Information Items (None)
3. Committee of Adjustment Planning Matters (None)

14. MOTIONS/ NOTICES OF MOTION

15. REGIONAL BUSINESS

16. OTHER BUSINESS

17. BY-LAWS (None)

18. CLOSED SESSION (None)

19. CONFIRMING BY-LAW

Moved By Regional Councillor Grossi

Seconded By Councillor Neeson

That the following bylaw be adopted;

1. Bylaw Number 2022-0035 (COU-2) confirming proceedings of Special Council on April 27, 2022.

Carried

20. MOTION TO ADJOURN

Moved By Regional Councillor Grossi

Seconded By Councillor Fellini

That the meeting adjourn at 9:10pm

Carried

Margaret Quirk, Mayor

Mamata Baykar, Deputy Clerk



Via e-mail only

Town File No.: 02.195
Refer To: Sara Brockman

August 25, 2022

Mr. Harold Lenters
Director, Development Services
Town of Georgina
26557 Civic Centre Road
Keswick, ON L4P 3G1

Attn: Tolek Makarewicz, Senior Policy Planner

Dear Mr. Lenters:

**Re: Request for Review – Public Draft #2 - Keswick Secondary Plan (January 2022)
Town of Georgina
York Region File No.: LOPA.19.G.0033**

This letter is further to our correspondence dated December 10, 2019, March 10, 2020, September 30, 2020, February 16, 2021 and March 25, 2022 regarding the Keswick Secondary Plan Review. We recently received Notices of Public Open House and Public Meeting and Request for Comment on the August 2022 Draft of the Keswick Secondary Plan (KSP). The Town is soliciting comments until September 6, 2022 and we understand the Public Open House and Public Meeting are scheduled for September 7, 2022, and that staff will also be recommending adoption of the KSP to Town Council.

Purpose of the Updated Keswick Secondary Plan

The purpose of the review is to bring the KSP, including all its schedules and appendices, which was originally approved in 2004, into compliance with current Provincial and Regional planning documents and to appropriately plan for future growth within the Keswick Community. The KSP is subject to the following legislative and planning policy context:

- Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020
- Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan), 2019
- Greenbelt Plan, 2017
- Lake Simcoe Protection Plan (LSPP), 2009
- York Region Official Plan (YROP), 2010

York Region staff have participated in Georgina's KSP process since late 2019 by attending kick-off meetings and Technical Advisory Committee Meetings, as well as reviewing Background

Reports and past drafts of the KSP. York Region also previously provided a number of comments on January 2022 KSP Draft.

Draft Keswick Secondary Plan and York Region Official Plan Conformity

Local Official Plan Amendments, including secondary plans, are required to conform to the upper-tier Official Plan. A meeting was held with Town staff in January 2022, where it confirmed by the Town that given the proposed timing of adoption the intent of the KSP is to conform to York Region's current Official Plan, 2010 (YROP), not the Region's draft new Regional Official Plan, 2022 (new ROP) which has yet to be reviewed and approved by the Province and is currently not in force. At that meeting, as well as in past meetings and previous correspondence, York Region planning staff outlined concerns regarding the KSP's conformity with the current YROP, particularly related to the Growth Management Section policies, growth forecasts and target beyond the 2031 planning horizon, and references to the new ROP and its policies. In an effort to address conformity with the current 2010 YROP, the Town advised that any decisions where the draft KSP currently references population and growth targets beyond the 2031 planning horizon, particularly in the Growth Management Section, that these policies will be deferred until York Region's new Regional Official Plan (ROP) is finalized and approved by the province.

Keswick Secondary Plan – August 2022 Draft

Given the limited review time and the anticipated adoption timing, there is insufficient time to conduct a fulsome review of this latest draft by the Town's requested commenting deadline. However, based on our cursory review, we note the August 2022 Draft of the KSP continues to make references to population and growth targets beyond 2031. Further, in our March 25, 2022 letter we requested a response matrix be provided outlining how are comments were considered and addressed in previous drafts of the KSP. While one was not provided with this circulation; it appears some comments are still outstanding and/ or were not addressed by this recent draft and require continued discussion. As such, we are of the opinion that conformity with the YROP has not been fully demonstrated and we continue to recommend that any outstanding conformity issues and Regional comments, including those of the LSRCA as per our Memorandum of Understanding, be fully addressed prior to adoption of the KSP.

Should Georgina Council proceed in adopting this draft of the KSP, as the approval authority for this secondary plan, any conformity issues with the York Region Official Plan will be subject to deferrals, and any outstanding comments and further regional requirements may be translated into proposed modifications to the adopted secondary plan prior to a final decision by York Region Council. Town Planning staff have indicated continued support for this approach and have committed to work with the Region through this ongoing review.

We continue to note that, in addition to the Town of Georgina Official Plan, the KSP will also require updating to address conformity with the new ROP, once approved. Any updates needed to the KSP can be done at the same time as the Town's Official Plan conformity exercise.

Adoption Package

Should the August 2022 KSP Draft be adopted by the Town of Georgina, to assist with our review and in an effort to consider the KSP within the proposed timeline as outlined in the *Planning Act*, in addition to the information as required by Section 17(31) of the *Act*, we also require submission of the following in accordance with 17(32):

- A complete and detailed response matrix clearly outlining how the comments of our March 25, 2022 have been addressed. Please include KSP section and/ or policy references, where applicable.
- A draft outline of the applicable sections and policies of the KSP to be the subject of the deferrals (e.g. Policies/ targets in the Growth Management Section referencing 2041 and beyond, etc.).

York Region is committed to working in continued partnership with the Town through the remaining Keswick Secondary Plan process. We are available to meet and provide assistance if required. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact myself or Sara Brockman, Senior Planner, at 905-830-4444, ext. 75750 or by email at sara.brockman@york.ca.

Sincerely,



Karen Whitney, MCIP, RPP
Director, Community Planning and Development Services

/sb

Attachments

- c. Alan Drozd, Town of Georgina – by email only
Dave Ruggle, LSRCA – by email only

YORK-#14157105

April 23, 2022

Our File Nos. 1224-00 & 1265-00

Tolek Makarewicz, MCIP, RPP
Senior Policy Planner
Town of Georgina
26557 Civic Centre Road
RR#2, Keswick, ON., L4P 3G1

Dear Mr. Makarewicz:

Re: Draft Keswick Secondary Plan Review
Treasure Hill (Orchidtrail Building Corp. & Starlish (BT) Homes Corp.)
Treasure Hill (Carryspring Holdings Inc.)
Town of Georgina, Region of York

On behalf of our client, Treasure Hill, the owner of multiple properties in Keswick, and further to our previous letters, we are submitting this letter to provide comment on Section 5.3.1 **Low-Rise Residential Uses** of the January 22, 2022, Draft Keswick Secondary Plan (KSP) (January draft).

Section 5.3.1 b) provides that: *Low-rise residential buildings shall have a maximum height of 3-storeys or 11 metres, whichever is less.* This is consistent with the provision at 13.1.2.7 *Low Density Residential Development* in the current Keswick Secondary.

The current Keswick Secondary Plan has a further provision “...unless otherwise specified in this Secondary Plan.” whereas the January draft does not.

Treasure Hill has determined through its marketing of Phases 1 and 2 in the Starlish Homes subdivision on the north side of Church Street, and other projects in the GTA, that there is a demand for single detached homes with greater height.

The homes constructed in the Starlish Homes subdivision, Phases 1 and 2, were subject to a zoning by-law amendment that provided for a transitional height increase. Where the Starlish Homes lots abutted existing lots, the height remained at 11 metres (maximum). However, those lots in the subdivision that did not abut existing lots were permitted a maximum height of 12 metres. (See attached – Section 7.5.107 a) at Page 6 of the By-law).

More recent marketing has shown a demand for even higher single detached dwellings up to 13 metres in height.

Based on the foregoing, we respectfully request that the Town consider a modified provision as follows:

Low-rise residential buildings shall have a maximum height of 3-storeys or 12 metres (maximum), whichever is less, on lots adjacent to lots that existed prior to October 26, 2004 and a maximum height of 3-storeys or 13 metres (maximum), whichever is less, on lots that are not adjacent to lots that existed prior to October 2004.

In the alternative we ask that this provision be specifically applied to the Treasure Hill developments and set forth in a sub-clause to Section 5.3.1.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael R. Smith". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Michael Smith, RPP
Planning Consultant

- c. Matt Creador – Treasure Hill
Farah Ibrahim – Treasure Hill
Alexander Smith

Enclosures

Keswick Secondary Plan Review – Draft #2
Public Submissions Summary and Staff Repose

#	Date: Contact	Summary of Comments	Staff Comment/Response
1	March 9/22: Anthony Usher Planning Consultant on behalf of North Gwillimbury Forest Alliance	<p>Concerns with how environmental protection policies have been translated from draft 1 into draft 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding forest management, sections 4.2.3(x) and 4.2.3(y) in draft 1 do not appear to be replicated in draft 2. 2. Regarding Lake Simcoe protection policies, the last paragraph of section 4.2.4(c), and sections 4.2.4(d) and 4.2.4(i), do not appear to be replicated in draft 2. <p>In draft 1, the ecological offsetting policies, 6.4.1(k) and 6.4.1(l), were essentially the same as sections 5.8.1 and 5.8.2 of the parent Official Plan. However, the currently proposed section 6.4.1(q) is a considerably weaker version of Official Plan section 5.8.1, and there is nothing in draft 2 corresponding to 5.8.2. We believe there would be a conflict between 6.4.1(q) and the parent 5.8.1. In this case, the Secondary Plan prevails. Our key concerns here are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Official Plan requires that ecological offsetting can only kick in "after the provincial and municipal policy tests have been met". Those essential words mean that offsetting can only be applied after the tests of section 2.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement and its parallel expressions in the York Region and Town official plans have been met. The quoted words are missing in draft 2 and the substituted words are less clear. 4. The second sentence of 6.4.1(q) is completely new material. One might think it is a deliberate attempt to circumvent the kinds of concerns we raised about removing Official Plan-protected wetland and woodland, without Plan amendments, to enable the Schell Lumber development 5. There is no longer any reference to or description of an ecological offsetting strategy. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section 4.2.3 x) is now Section 4.4 2 l). Section 4.2.3 y) addressing variety/species of trees in the "urban forest" has been removed. The KSP is a land use plan managing growth, development and environmental protection. Specifics regarding variety and species of trees are addressed through other policies such as the Town's Tree Preservation and Compensation Policy. 2. The last paragraph of Section 4.3.4 c) identifies what the implementing zoning by-law may regulate. This statement adds nothing to the policy document so it was removed. Section 4.2.4 d) was taken word-for-word from the LSPP (Policy 6.29 DP). To duplicate the policy in the KSP provides no additional guidance, so it has been removed. Section 4.2.4 i) identifies that by-laws may be used to implement the approved phosphorus budget. This policy is not required. 3. The current policy requires that ecological offsetting and/or compensation shall be in accordance with the policies of the Town, York Region and the LSRCA. The LSRCA has developed and implement an Ecological Offsetting Policy which derives its basis and justification from Sections 1.8 and 2.1.2 of the PPS. No revision required. 4. If an EIS prepared by a qualified professional considers wetlands to be degraded and/or have negligible local or regional ecological value, the development may be permitted subject to compensation, replacement or other satisfactory arrangements. In the opinion of staff, this is a

		<p>6. The Official Plan wording says what needs to be said and undoubtedly, was developed in full consultation with and to the satisfaction of the Conservation Authority. We strongly urge that section 6.4.1(q) be replaced, either with both Official Plan sections verbatim, or a direct reference to them as the source of ecological offsetting policy in Keswick.</p>	<p>reasonable and justified approach to deal with such lands. No revision required.</p> <p>5. Policy 6.4.1 q) revised to include reference to Ecological Offsetting Strategy and wording from OP Policy 5.8.2 for clarity.</p> <p>6. The LSRCA has been a contributing member to the KSPR process through the Technical Advisory Committee. They have raised no issues or concerns with the proposed approach to ecological offsetting. Between the Town and the LSRCA, ecological offsetting is accomplished through the development review process. No revisions are required to Policy 6.4.1 q).</p>
2	March 10/22: KLM Planning on behalf of DG Group	<p>1. Section 4.1.2.g – We object to the requirement of 25% of new housing units annually to be affordable. It remains our opinion that 25% annually is not achievable and a more realistic number would be 10% annually which is consistent with other municipalities across the GTA.</p> <p>2. Section 5.3.7 requires amenity areas for live-work units. Perhaps there should be some additional clarification in this policy that ensure the amenity space is not always required at grade and can be a balcony or amenity space above a garage.</p> <p>3. Section 6.1.1.c) only permits existing low-rise residential uses. As noted below, the boundary of the Glenwoods Urban Centre is not consistent with existing approvals which includes low density residential uses. Either the policy should be revised to permit low-rise residential uses or the mapping should be corrected.</p> <p>4. Section 6.1.3.c) Mixed Use Corridor 2 does not permit low-rise residential uses whereas Mixed Use Corridor 1 does permit low-rise residential. As it relates to the Simcoe Landing Community, in our view it is important to permit low-rise residential uses within the Mixed-Use Corridor 2 designation so that an appropriate transition between the approved low-density residential uses to the</p>	<p>1. Policy 3.5.6 of the York Region Official Plan requires that a minimum 25 per cent of new housing units across the Region be affordable, be distributed within each local municipality and should be coordinated across applicable local planning areas including secondary plan areas. The Region in consultation with the local municipalities monitors the affordability of new housing on a yearly basis. This policy is reflected in the Town's OP (8.1.3) and is being replicated in the KSP. No revision required.</p> <p>2. Clarity provided to allow for balcony or amenity space above a garage.</p> <p>3. The proposed boundary of the Glenwoods Urban Centre is consistent with the existing Glenwoods Urban Centre boundary. Further, there are currently no approvals for low-rise residential development within the Glenwoods Urban Centre. Lastly, policy 9.1.(c) would recognizes legally existing and approved land uses to continue should there be existing approvals in place that do not conform to the permitted uses in the designation. No revision required.</p>

	<p>west have a similar built form within the Mixed-Use Corridor 2 lands.</p> <p>5. Section 6.1.3.e) requires a minimum of 50% of the gross leasable floor area of the ground floor in all mixed-use buildings be used for non-residential uses. This is not reasonable. With the amount of land proposed to be designated Mixed Use Corridor 2 it is completely unrealistic to assume each mixed-use building would contain commercial or other non-residential uses, especially considering how much commercial uses are already in close proximity to the south along Woodbine. It is our recommendation this requirement be removed from this policy.</p> <p>6. Section 6.1.3.f) permits stand alone residential uses provided all of the uses are deemed by the Town to be affordable. Again, this is unreasonable and unachievable policy. Perhaps a requirement that 10% of the units be affordable would be more reasonable.</p> <p>7. Section 6.2.3.d).iii), iv) & vi) each section restricts the maximum GFA available for business and office uses. Perhaps this policy should encourage these uses without a restriction on the maximum size given how unintrusive these uses are within a neighbourhood context.</p> <p>8. Section 6.4.1.e).iii) Although flood and erosion control project are noted, we recommend that stormwater management and Low Impact Development options be included as a permitted as many of the existing Environmental Protection Area within Simcoe Landing consist of stormwater management ponds.</p> <p>9. Section 6.4.1.j) requires a minimum 30 metre vegetation protection zone. There are a number of instances where a 10 or 15 metre buffer have been deemed sufficient, yet this policy does not recognize a reduced buffer. In our opinion, this policy needs to be revised to reflect the opportunities for reduced buffers, where demonstrated by an Environmental Impact Study.</p>	<p>4. The New Neighbourhood designation abuts the Mixed Use Corridor 2 designation. The New Neighbourhood designation permits mid-rise and low-rise residential uses. Appropriate transition and compatibility can be achieved through design elements without permitting low-rise residential uses in the Mixed Use Corridor 2 designation. No revision required.</p> <p>5. Revised approach to the requirement for mixed-use development in the Mixed Use Corridor 2 is proposed that would permit Council to consider stand alone residential development that is incorporated as part of a master planned mixed-use development.</p> <p>6. This policy has been removed.</p> <p>7. Staff are of the opinion that imposing maximum floor area requirements for certain neighbourhood supporting uses is appropriate given that these uses would be permitted to establish within existing and new neighbourhoods which primarily consist of low-rise residential uses. Capping the floor area helps ensure these uses are appropriate for their context as supporting uses that are complementary to the primary residential function of the neighbourhood. This is also consistent with the hierarchy approach for restaurants, retail and service commercial uses within the Mixed-Use Corridor 2 (no maximum gross floor area per business), Urban Centres (maximum 4,000 sq. m per business), and Mixed-Use Corridor 1 (maximum 1,000 sq. m per business) designations. No revision required.</p> <p>8. Policy 7.3 b) provides that stormwater management facilities shall be permitted in all land use designations and that new stormwater management facilities located in the EPA</p>
--	--	--

	<p>10. Section 6.4.2 which relates to environmental overlays in conjunction with those being graphically shown on Schedule C. This schedule, as it pertains to Simcoe Landing, provides the overlay to lands which are already constructed or draft plan approved. In our view, this schedule should be removed within Simcoe Landing.</p> <p>11. Schedule A: Growth Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Natural Heritage System identified in the Simcoe Landing Community continue to be incorrect. There proposes to be new Natural Heritage System features adjacent to the Queensway, which do not exist and should not be shown. • The Local Strategic Growth Area also adjacent to the Queensway South and within the Simcoe Landing Community is not reflective of existing approvals in place nor does it respect the existing development patterns that have been established in that area. We request all schedules be revised to reflect this. This applies not only along the Queensway South but also along Woodbine Avenue. The area designated as “Local Strategic Growth Area” along Woodbine Avenue should be to the westerly limit of the MURC block along Woodbine Avenue. Further to the west of this westerly limit already contains draft plan approved low density residential units. <p>12. Schedule B: Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Natural Heritage System identified in the Simcoe Landing Community is not correct and should be revised to reflect the correct limits. • The Glenwoods Urban Centre boundary, in particularly within the limits of the Simcoe Landing Community, are not consistent with the draft approved lands in the area and should be revised to reflect the existing approvals. • There is a label for a Proposed Secondary School on the north side of the Environmental Protection Area, 	<p>designation shall be subject to the policies of same, including the submission and approval of an EIS. No revision required.</p> <p>9. Revised wording is proposed that would provide flexibility for a reduced Vegetation Protection Zone, subject to an EIS, as per discussion with the LSRCA.</p> <p>10. The environmental overlays are triggers to require an EIS in support of a development application and are based on the best available data. No revision required.</p> <p>11. The NHS and Parks Network in the Local Strategic Growth Area (Glenwoods Urban Centre designation) on Schedule A has been removed. The Local Strategic Growth Area along The Queensway is reflective of the Glenwoods Urban Centre designation on Schedule B and the existing KSP. Regarding the Local Strategic Growth Area adjacent Woodbine that is effectively the Mixed-Use Corridor 2 designation on Schedule B, a revision has been made to the boundary of the Mixed-Use Corridor 2 designation and Local Strategic Growth Area to better reflect approved draft plans.</p> <p>12. The EPA designation is based on best available mapping. The proposed Glenwoods Urban Centre designation is consistent with the current KSP. The proposed secondary school site has been relocated as per discussion with the York Region District School Board.</p> <p>13. The Environmental Overlay is not a Vegetation Protection Zone. They are different. The Environmental Overlay is a tool used to trigger the requirement for the submission of an EIS in support of development. Whereas, a Vegetation</p>
--	---	---

		<p>west of Woodbine Avenue, within the Camlane Phase 10 draft approved lands. This is not a land use contemplated in the existing approval and should be removed.</p> <p>13. Schedule C: Environmental Overlay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted above, many of the approved buffers within the Simcoe Landing Community are 10 metres in width, which is not consistent with this schedule. We respectfully request the overlay reflect the approved natural heritage limits and buffers for greater consistency. <p>14. Schedule D: Source Water Protection Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We question how much of the Simcoe Landing Community is identified as having a Significant Groundwater Recharge, when much of it is developed and/or approved for development without this being raised as an issue. <p>15. Urban Design Guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Urban Design Guidelines, for the most part, provide flexible language within the document, save and except for the language used for the community park and neighbourhood park size. In our opinion, the word "shall" should be replaced by "may" given that it is not always possible to provide this minimum size and yet the park would still function as either community or neighbourhood park. The language within the village green sizing is flexible and we believe the community park and neighbourhood park should also be flexible. 	<p>Protection Zone is the minimum buffer required to an environmental feature. The minimum Vegetation Protection Zone is determined through the review and approval of an EIS. No revision required.</p> <p>14. Source Water Protection mapping and policies are required by the Province. The Clean Water Act was passed in 2006 and the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection plan was passed in 2015. The best available data has been used for mapping Source Water Protection Areas in the Secondary Plan. No revision required.</p> <p>15. Revision made to the guidelines to provide flexibility regarding the size of the types of parks. However, it should be noted that these are "guidelines". The Town through the development review process and subject to the Town's Park Levy By-law, Recreation Facility Needs Study, Parkland Standards Manual and Parks Facilities and Construction Standard Details will determine the eventual size, location, type and facilities of a park.</p>
3	March 11/22: Michael Smith Planning Consultants on behalf of Treasure Hill	<p>1. Section 6.1.3 c) i) proposes to permit Midrise residential uses, but only in the form of an apartment building. In our opinion this is too restrictive a policy and ask that all forms of mid-rise buildings be permitted.</p> <p>2. Section 6.1.3 e) the policy again reiterates that "Residential uses shall only be permitted as part of a mixed-use building". We believe that the market demand</p>	<p>1. This policy has been revised to permit all mid-rise residential uses save and except for ground-oriented built forms. A definition has been added for ground-oriented to clarify this requirement.</p> <p>2. Revised approach to the requirement for mixed use development in the Mixed Use Corridor 2 designation is proposed that would permit Council</p>

	<p>for mixed-use and commercial uses are being overestimated (i.e. every residential building within the Mixed Use Corridor 2 having a non-residential component). We believe that a more flexible policy is appropriate. The mandated approach may lead to situations where there are vacant commercial units within mixed-use developments or where owners, which are unable to find a ground floor non-residential use tenants may choose to not proceed with housing. We suggest that the policy would be more appropriately applied to mixed-use centres at Woodbine intersections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Section 6.1.3 f) provides that stand alone residential development may be considered by the Town provided that i) all residential units are deemed by the Town to be affordable. This is an onerous financial burden which makes it difficult for private sector standalone residential development to be financially viable. 4. 6.1.3 h) provides that "to enable buildings to adapt to a range of uses over time, the floor to ceiling height of the ground floor for all new buildings shall be a minimum of 4.25 metres". This adds extra costs to standalone residential construction under Section 6.1.3 f). This policy should not be applicable to standalone residential development under Section 6.1.3 f). 5. Schedule B Land Use Plan, a proposed Elementary School site is still shown on the Orchid Trail land notwithstanding that the Public School Board has confirmed that an elementary school site is not required. We respectfully request that the symbol be removed. 6. Schedule B Land Use Plan, there is a small strip of land designated Mixed-Use Corridor 2. The property does not front on Woodbine Avenue and cannot be effectively developed for commercial/employment uses due to its small size, lack of direct frontage, general lot orientation, and due to the layout of the future development blocks of the Orchid Trail subdivision to the west. For the purposes 	<p>to consider stand alone residential development which is incorporated as part of a master planned mixed use proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. This policy has been removed. 4. This policy has been removed. 5. The York Region District School Board has confirmed that a proposed elementary school site is not longer required. The symbol has been removed from the Schedule. 6. Policy 13.9.2 a) and b) permits minor adjustments to the land use designations provided the general intent and purpose of the Secondary Plan is preserved. Staff have reviewed the request and are of the opinion that Policy 13.9.2 a) and b) may be used in this situation to extend the New Neighbourhood designation and policies to abutting lands currently designated Mixed-Use Corridor 2, subject to justification being provided through the development review process that the general intent and purpose of the Secondary Plan is preserved.
--	---	---

		of continuity and effective use of the lands, our clients are requesting that the lands be designated New Neighbourhood.	
4	March 21/22: Martha Doherty of 159 Cedar St., Keswick	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Uptown Keswick is already contending with the impact of a Methadone Clinic adjacent to an Elementary School, a Parole Office, and several subsidized housing buildings. We realize housing support is essential in a compassionate society, however it is a disservice to everyone involved to have it all concentrated in one area. 2. The most recent and largest of these developments is the scene of ongoing Police activity, including incidents of stabbings, assault, drugs etc. While the causes of these incidents can be attributed to many factors, it can't be denied that Planning is one link in the chain of the entire process that will permanently impact the surrounding community. It's important that responsible development is required, not just encouraged. Current YRP crime community statistics indicated on a per capita basis, Keswick has one of the greatest crime problems in York region. Planners and law enforcement professionals alike are aware that unless executed properly, development can have a negative impact on quality of life and community safety. 3. We realize the Town has an obligation to accommodate population growth as per the Province and Region however, the Uptown area with its narrow, winding 2 lane roads that were established in the 1800's is far less able to safely accommodate this growth relative to the other two Keswick "Urban" areas identified and as such should not permit the same level of growth as for example Woodbine Ave. 4. Residential streets adjacent to the Uptown area have no sidewalks and speeding already poses a danger to pedestrians, especially children, the elderly and handicapped who reside in the area. Winter conditions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The institution or government agency establishing the use based on the need of the community and its residents determines the type and location of public service facilities within a given area. 2. The Secondary Plan provides a vision and policy framework for the establishment of a complete community where people can live, work and play. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design policies in the Secondary Plan require that buildings and site design assist in the reduction of the incidence of crime through design considerations. 3. As per Section 6.1.1 of the Secondary Plan, each of the three Urban Centres play an important role in the community. The Uptown Keswick Urban Centre is envisioned to evolve into a centre containing a diverse array of specialized and boutique retail activities, restaurants, small-scale office and mid-rise mixed-use residential and commercial buildings. All development proposals go through detailed review to ensure that there is adequate infrastructure to support the proposal. In general, the majority of new population growth within Keswick will occur in the New Neighbourhood designation. Woodbine Ave/Mixed Use Corridor 2 will see some residential growth in the form of mixed use developments, while the Uptown Keswick Urban Centre will generally see limited residential growth in the form of infill and intensification developments on a site-by-site basis. 4. Speeding is a police enforcement issue. New development will be required to assess the impact

	<p>narrow the available roadways making it more dangerous, the increase in traffic resulting from excessive development will magnify these risks.</p> <p>5. Recently a developer was seeking a By-Law amendment to permit a development that hundreds of residents petitioned as inappropriate to the surrounding neighborhood. Our concern is that as this Secondary Plan and inevitable By-Law rezoning process unfolds, area residents will have limited or no say in future proposed projects that will negatively impact the area.</p> <p>6. One policy that I have great concern with pertains to the practice of “Cash In Lieu” allowing Developers to destroy green spaces and remove mature trees while compensating the Town with money that can be allocated elsewhere. Essentially one area bears the brunt while another area reaps the benefits. It should be imperative any Cash in Lieu funds be allocated in the immediate vicinity of where any trees/greenspace has been destroyed to create parks, walking paths, streetscape improvements etc.</p> <p>7. Its essential that there be requirements for developers to build projects sympathetic to the area. This area needs walking trails, sidewalks and moderately sized housing, not high-rises with insufficient parking, casting shadows on neighboring properties.</p>	<p>from the development on local roads in the immediate area and make recommendations for improvement where warranted.</p> <p>5. All developments are considered on their own merit and are required to go through a statutory public planning process in accordance with the Planning Act. The Secondary Plan and the Town support and encourage public participation in the planning process.</p> <p>6. Unsure if this comment is related to cash in lieu of parkland or cash in lieu of trees removed as a result of development. Either way, both are standard practices in the development industry. The Town has established policies and by-laws to adequately implement both these practices. Cash in lieu of parkland is obtained when it is not possible or practical to provide adequate land for park purposes in accordance with the Town’s Parks Standard Manual. Park location and facilities are dictated by the Town’s Recreation Facilities Needs Study. Cash in lieu for removed trees is received where it is not possible to replace trees on a development site. If development precludes re-planting then the Town’s second most preferred option is to provide other locations outside of the proposed development. If the Developer at the Town’s discretion cannot meet the preferred replacement requirements, the Developer shall provide cash-in-lieu of planting. The Town utilizes funds received in lieu of planting to maintain and grow the existing urban forest, to achieve replacement requirements elsewhere or to acquire lands of Natural Heritage significance within the Town.</p> <p>7. The Secondary Plan and Design Guidelines implement policies and design criteria for</p>
--	---	--

			<p>“compatible development” to ensure new development is sensitively integrated with existing development. This includes consideration of the height and massing of nearby buildings, additional setbacks and buffers, and angular plane projections. Further, the Secondary Plan promotes active transportation facilities such as trails, where appropriate, and requires the installation of sidewalks within new subdivision roads. In existing, established residential areas such as the Uptown Keswick Urban Centre, the installation of new trails and sidewalks would need to be considered through a local improvement.</p>
5	<p>April 23/22: Michael Smith Planning Consultants on behalf of Treasure Hill</p>	<p>Section 5.3.1 b) provides that: Low-rise residential buildings shall have a maximum height of 3-storeys or 11 metres, whichever is less. This is consistent with the provision at 13.1.2.7 Low Density Residential Development in the current Keswick Secondary Plan. The current Keswick Secondary Plan has a further provision "...unless otherwise specified in this Secondary Plan" whereas the January draft does not. Treasure Hill has determined through its marketing of Phases 1 and 2 in the Starlish Homes subdivision on the north side of Church Street, and other projects in the GTA, that there is a demand for single detached homes with greater height. The homes constructed in the Starlish Homes subdivision, Phases 1 and 2, were subject to a zoning by-law amendment that provided for a transitional height increase. Where the Starlish Homes lots abutted existing lots, the height remained at 11 metres (maximum). However, those lots in the subdivision that did not abut existing lots were permitted a maximum height of 12 metres. More recent marketing has shown a demand for even higher single detached dwellings up to 13 metres in height. Based on the foregoing, we respectfully request that the Town consider a modified provision as follows: Low-rise residential buildings shall</p>	<p>The current KSP does not contain a maximum height for low-density residential development. The "...unless otherwise specified in this Secondary Plan" provision in the current KSP relates to the maximum density permitted. Staff have considered the request and have added language to the Low-Rise Residential Use section to permit Council in certain situations to allow additional height above 11 metres for a 3-storey building.</p>

	<p>have a maximum height of 3-storeys or 12 metres (maximum), whichever is less, on lots adjacent to lots that existed prior to October 26, 2004 and a maximum height of 3-storeys or 13 metres (maximum), whichever is less, on lots that are not adjacent to lots that existed prior to October 2004. In the alternative we ask that this provision be specifically applied to the Treasure Hill developments and set forth in a sub-clause to Section 5.3.1.</p>	
--	---	--

Certificate of Approval

AMENDMENT NO. ____

TO THE TOWN OF GEORGINA OFFICIAL PLAN

(KESWICK SECONDARY PLAN)

This Secondary Plan document which was adopted by the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina is approved pursuant to Sections 17 and 21 of the Planning Act and came into force on _____, 2022.

Date: _____

**Karen Whitney, MCIP, RPP
Director of Community Planning and
Development Services
The Regional Municipality of York**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AMENDMENT NO. ____

TO THE TOWN OF GEORGINA OFFICIAL PLAN (KESWICK SECONDARY PLAN)

PART A – THE CERTIFICATION	PAGES
1. The Certification Page	1
2. By-law No. 2022 - _____ (PL-2) adopting Amendment No. ____	2
PART B – THE PREAMBLE	
1. Title	3
2. Components of the Amendment	3
3. Purpose	3
4. Location	3
5. Basis	3 and 4
PART C – THE AMENDMENT	
1. Introduction	5
2. Actual Amendment	5
3. Implementation	5
4. Interpretation	5
SCHEDULE ‘A’ – LOCATION MAP	
ATTACHMENT ‘A’ – THE KESWICK SECONDARY PLAN	

PART A – THE CERTIFICATION PAGE

AMENDMENT NO. ____

TO THE TOWN OF GEORGINA OFFICIAL PLAN

(KESWICK SECONDARY PLAN)

The attached explanatory text and location map, constituting Amendment No. ____ to the Town of Georgina Official Plan (Keswick Secondary Plan), was adopted by the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina by By-law No. 2022 - ____ (PL-2) pursuant to Sections 17 and 21 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, on the ____ day of ____ 2022.

Margaret Quirk, Mayor

Rachel Dillabough, Town Clerk

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA

IN THE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF YORK

BY-LAW NUMBER 2022- ____ (PL-2)

**BEING A BY-LAW TO ADOPT AMENDMENT NO. ____ TO THE TOWN OF GEORGINA
OFFICIAL PLAN (KESWICK SECONDARY PLAN)**

The Council of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina, pursuant to Sections 17 and 21 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, as amended, hereby **ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:**

1. **THAT** Amendment No. ____ to the Town of Georgina Official Plan (Keswick Secondary Plan) constituting the attached explanatory text, is hereby adopted.
2. **THAT** the Corporation of the Town of Georgina make application to York Region for approval of said Amendment.
3. **THAT** the Clerk of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina is hereby authorized and directed to make such application on behalf of the Corporation and to execute under the Corporate Seal such documents as may be required for the above purposes.

READ and **ENACTED** this ____ day of _____, 2022.

Margaret Quirk, Mayor

Rachel Dillabough, Town Clerk

PART B – THE PREAMBLE

1. TITLE

This Amendment shall be known as:

Amendment No. ____
to the Town of Georgina Official Plan
(Keswick Secondary Plan)

2. COMPONENTS OF THE AMENDMENT

Only that part of this document entitled "Part C – The Amendment", comprising the attached explanatory text, constitutes Amendment No. ____ to the Town of Georgina Official Plan (Keswick Secondary Plan).

3. PURPOSE

The purpose of Amendment No. ____ is to delete the existing "Keswick Secondary Plan", as amended, which forms Section 13.1 of the Town of Georgina Official Plan and replace it with a new Section 13.1, which constitutes a new "Keswick Secondary Plan".

4. LOCATION

Amendment No. ____ applies to the lands shown on Schedule 'A' – Location Map, to this Amendment.

5. BASIS

The Keswick Secondary Plan (KSP) forms an integral part of the Official Plan, and provides a more detailed vision and land use policies for the community of Keswick. The current KSP was approved in 2004 and, since its approval, has been amended numerous times mainly to accommodate site-specific development applications.

Since 2004, there have also been numerous changes and updates to the provincial, regional and local planning policy documents necessitating a comprehensive update of the Secondary Plan. This includes the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan (2009), York Region Official Plan (2010), South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan (2015), Town of Georgina Official Plan (2016), Greenbelt Plan (2017), Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2019), and the Provincial Policy Statement (2020). This update was largely undertaken in the context of and concurrently with, the York Region Municipal Comprehensive

Review and the preparation of the new Regional Official Plan, which has informed the growth projections to the 2041 planning horizon, while also implementing the updated Regional planning policy framework.

Amendment No. ____ deletes the existing Keswick Secondary Plan (2004) and replaces it with a new Keswick Secondary Plan (2022) that sets out the vision for the future growth, development and redevelopment of the community of Keswick. The new Secondary Plan includes specific land use designations, mapping and policies directing the type and character of development that may occur, environmental protection, municipal servicing requirements, and transportation and other policies to manage change in the community to 2041.

The primary purpose of the Keswick Secondary Plan is to manage growth and development, ensuring a high quality of life for present and future residents, and the provision of a range of housing opportunities, parkland and recreational space, access to goods and services, enhanced natural features, and expanded employment opportunities.

The Council of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina is satisfied that Amendment No. ____ is appropriate.

PART C – THE AMENDMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

The whole of that part of the Amendment entitled "Part C – The Amendment", which consists of the following explanatory text constitutes Amendment No. __ to the Town of Georgina Official Plan (Keswick Secondary Plan).

2. ACTUAL AMENDMENT

That the Official Plan of the Town of Georgina, as amended, be further amended as follows:

- 1) That the reference to the Schedules and Appendices of the Keswick Secondary Plan in Section 13.1 of the Town of Georgina Official Plan be revised to read:

“Schedule A: Growth Management
Schedule B: Land Use Plan
Schedule C: Environmental Overlays
Schedule D: Source Water Protection Areas
Schedule E: Transportation
Schedule F: Site-Specific Exceptions

Appendix I: Urban Design and Architectural Control Guidelines
Appendix II: Natural Environmental Background Report Mapping”

- 2) That the text of Section 13.1, being the existing “The Keswick Secondary Plan” and Schedules F1, F2, F3, F4 and F5, be deleted in its entirety and replaced with a new Section 13.1, “The Keswick Secondary Plan”, that consists of the attached text along with Schedules A, B, C, D, E and F, forming Attachment ‘A’ to this Amendment.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

The Keswick Secondary Plan will be implemented in accordance with Section 11, Implementation, of the Town of Georgina Official Plan and Section 13.1.8, Implementation, of the Keswick Secondary Plan.

4. INTERPRETATION

The provisions set forth in Section 12, Interpretation, of the Town of Georgina Official Plan and Section 13.1.9, Interpretation, of the Keswick Secondary Plan, as amended from time to time regarding the interpretation of that Plan, shall apply in regard to this Amendment.

READ and **ENACTED** this ____ day of _____, 2022.

Margaret Quirk, Mayor

Rachel Dillabough, Town Clerk

SCHEDULE 'A' - LOCATION MAP

Official Plan Amendment No. _____

The lands within the limit of the bold outline on the map below are identified as "Keswick" on Schedule A2 to the Town of Georgina Official Plan and shall be subject to the text, schedules and appendices of the Keswick Secondary Plan that is being adopted through this Amendment.



SUBJECT LAND DESCRIPTION: The Community of Keswick which is generally bounded by the Lake Simcoe shoreline to the west, Metro Road North and Woodbine Avenue to the east, Boyers Road and Old Homestead Road to the north and Ravenshoe Road to the south.

LAND USE DESIGNATIONS: Urban Centres, Mixed- Use Corridor 1, Mixed-Use Corridor 2, Existing Neighbourhood, New Neighbourhood, Tourist Commercial, Institutional/Community, Environmental Protection Area and Open Space.