

**Ontario Municipal Board**  
**Commission des affaires municipales de l'Ontario**

**IN THE MATTER OF** subsection 17(40) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: 451082 Ontario Limited  
Appellant: 861945 Ontario Ltd. et al  
Appellant: County of Simcoe  
Appellant: Estate of Mary Louise Francom; and others  
Subject: Failure to announce a decision respecting Proposed Official Plan Amendment 43-OP-2008  
Municipality: Upper Tier of Simcoe  
OMB Case No.: PL091167  
OMB File No.: PL091167

**MOTION RECORD**  
**PHASE 1a – 20,000 Population**  
(Returnable April 15, 2014)

THOMSON, ROGERS  
Barristers and Solicitors  
Suite 3100, 390 Bay Street  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5H 1W2

ROGER T. BEAMAN  
416-868-3157  
Fax No. 416-868-3134

Lawyers for the Corporation  
of the County of Simcoe

**TO: ALL APPELLANTS/PARTIES LISTED IN ATTACHMENTS "A" AND "B"**

**AND TO: ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD**  
655 Bay Street, 15th Floor  
Toronto, Ontario, M5G 1E5

Attention: Kimberly Livingstone, Planner  
[kimberly.livingstone@ontario.ca](mailto:kimberly.livingstone@ontario.ca)

Phone: 416-326-6773  
Fax: 416-326-5370

**ATTACHMENT "A"**  
**LIST OF APPELLANT PARTIES- COUNTY OF SIMCOE OFFICIAL PLAN**  
**OMB File PL091167**

March 12, 2014

No.	Appellant	Lawyer/Agent*	E-mail Address
1	County of Simcoe	Roger Beaman	<a href="mailto:rbeaman@thomsonrogers.com">rbeaman@thomsonrogers.com</a>
2	2a Carson Road Development Inc. 2b Midhurst Development Doran Road Inc.	Susan Rosenthal David White	<a href="mailto:susanr@davieshowe.com">susanr@davieshowe.com</a> <a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a>
3	Craighurst Land Corp.	Susan Rosenthal	<a href="mailto:susanr@davieshowe.com">susanr@davieshowe.com</a>
4	Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd.	Susan Rosenthal Meaghan McDermid	<a href="mailto:susanr@davieshowe.com">susanr@davieshowe.com</a> <a href="mailto:meaghanm@davieshowe.com">meaghanm@davieshowe.com</a>
5	Midhurst Rose Alliance Inc.	Ira Kagan Paul DeMelo	<a href="mailto:ikagan@ksllp.ca">ikagan@ksllp.ca</a> <a href="mailto:pdemelo@ksllp.ca">pdemelo@ksllp.ca</a>
6	Township of Springwater	Barnet Kussner	<a href="mailto:bkussner@weirfoulds.ca">bkussner@weirfoulds.ca</a>
7	451082 Ontario Limited	James Feehely	<a href="mailto:jfeehely@feehelegastaldi.com">jfeehely@feehelegastaldi.com</a>
8	8a 861945 Ontario Ltd. 8b Golfview Estates Limited W/D 8c Mark Rich Homes Limited 8d Silver Spring View Estates Limited 8e Simcoe Estates Limited 8f Royal Heights Estates Limited 8g OMC Development Corp. W/D	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
9	Innisfil Aleona Limited <i>[Appeal Withdrawn]</i>	Lynda Townsend Jennifer Meader	<a href="mailto:ltownsend@weirfoulds.com">ltownsend@weirfoulds.com</a> <a href="mailto:jmeader@weirfoulds.com">jmeader@weirfoulds.com</a>
10	Tesmar Holdings Inc.	Michael Melling Meaghan McDermid	<a href="mailto:michaelm@davieshowe.com">michaelm@davieshowe.com</a> <a href="mailto:meaghanm@davieshowe.com">meaghanm@davieshowe.com</a>
11	Janice & David Wright	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
12	12a Snow Valley Planning Corporation 12b 453211 Ontario Limited	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
13	McMahan Woods Developments Ltd.	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
14	Innisfil Beach Farms Inc.	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
15	Estate of Marie Louise Frankcom	James Feehely	<a href="mailto:jfeehely@feehelegastaldi.com">jfeehely@feehelegastaldi.com</a>
16	Midhurst Ratepayers <sup>2</sup> Association <i>[Appeal Dismissed]</i>	David Strachan* Margaret Hutchison*	<a href="mailto:davidistrachan@yahoo.com">davidistrachan@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:mhutchis1000@gmail.com">mhutchis1000@gmail.com</a>
17	Narinder Mann	Ian Rowe Adrianna Pilkington	<a href="mailto:irowe@barristonlaw.com">irowe@barristonlaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:apilkington@barristonlaw.com">apilkington@barristonlaw.com</a>
18	Yorkwood Group of Companies	Patricia Foran	<a href="mailto:pforan@airdberlis.com">pforan@airdberlis.com</a>
19	19a Rama Resorts International Inc. 19b Fernbrook Homes (Rama) Limited <i>[Appeal Resolved]</i>	Brian Goodreid*	<a href="mailto:briangoodreid@hotmail.com">briangoodreid@hotmail.com</a>
20	1091402 Ontario Ltd. <i>[Appeal Withdrawn]</i>	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
21	Nicole and Brent Fellman	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
22	Travel-Rite Property Corp.	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>

23	Aqua-Gem Investments Ltd.	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
24	442023 Ontario Limited	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
25	1045901 Ontario Limited	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
26	Kellwatt Limited	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
27	27a Ontario Potato Distributing Inc. 27b 1567219 Ontario Limited	Chris Barnett	<a href="mailto:cbarnett@davis.ca">cbarnett@davis.ca</a>
28	Black Marlin Management Inc.	Caterina Facciolo Barry Horosko	<a href="mailto:cfacciolo@bratty.com">cfacciolo@bratty.com</a> <a href="mailto:bhorosko@bratty.com">bhorosko@bratty.com</a>
29	Ahmadiyya Muslim Jama'at Canada Inc. (AMJC)	Caterina Facciolo Barry Horosko	<a href="mailto:cfacciolo@bratty.com">cfacciolo@bratty.com</a> <a href="mailto:bhorosko@bratty.com">bhorosko@bratty.com</a>
30	D.G. Pratt Construction Limited	Jane Pepino Andrea Skinner	<a href="mailto:jpepino@airdberlis.com">jpepino@airdberlis.com</a> <a href="mailto:askinner@airdberlis.com">askinner@airdberlis.com</a>
31	Hanson Development Group	Patricia Foran	<a href="mailto:pforan@airdberlis.com">pforan@airdberlis.com</a>
32	Town of New Tecumseth	James Feehely	<a href="mailto:jfeehely@feehelygastaldi.com">jfeehely@feehelygastaldi.com</a>
33	Township of Adjala-Tosorontio	Stephen Waqué Isaac Tang	<a href="mailto:swaque@blg.com">swaque@blg.com</a> <a href="mailto:itang@blg.com">itang@blg.com</a>
34	Robert Schickedanz in Trust	Ian Rowe Adrianna Pilkington	<a href="mailto:irowe@barristonlaw.com">irowe@barristonlaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:apilkington@barristonlaw.com">apilkington@barristonlaw.com</a>
35	2115441 Ontario Inc.	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>
36	Carson Trail Estates Inc.	David White Cory Estrela	<a href="mailto:david.white@devrylaw.ca">david.white@devrylaw.ca</a> <a href="mailto:cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca">cory.estrela@devrylaw.ca</a>

**ATTACHMENT "B"**  
**LIST OF PARTIES- COUNTY OF SIMCOE OFFICIAL PLAN PL091167**

March 12, 2014

No.	Party	Lawyer/Agent*	E-mail Address
<b>A</b>	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Ken Hare Ugo Popadic Michael F. Spagnolo (Student-at-Law)	<a href="mailto:ken.hare@ontario.ca">ken.hare@ontario.ca</a> <a href="mailto:Ugo.Popadic@ontario.ca">Ugo.Popadic@ontario.ca</a> <a href="mailto:Michael.F.Spagnolo@ontario.ca">Michael.F.Spagnolo@ontario.ca</a>
<b>B</b>	Town of Collingwood	Leo Longo	<a href="mailto:llongo@airdberlis.com">llongo@airdberlis.com</a>
<b>C</b>	<b>C1</b> Town of Penetanguishene <b>C2</b> Township of Ramara	Edward Veldboom	<a href="mailto:eveldboom@russellchristie.com">eveldboom@russellchristie.com</a>
<b>D</b>	Town of Innisfil	Quinto Annibale/ Mark Joblin	<a href="mailto:qannibale@loonix.com">qannibale@loonix.com</a> <a href="mailto:mjoblin@loonix.com">mjoblin@loonix.com</a>
<b>E</b>	Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury	Tom Halinski	<a href="mailto:thalinski@airdberlis.com">thalinski@airdberlis.com</a>
<b>F</b>	Town of Midland	Paul Peterson	<a href="mailto:ppeterson@hgrgp.ca">ppeterson@hgrgp.ca</a>
<b>G</b>	<b>G1</b> Township of Clearview <b>G2</b> Township of Tiny <b>G3</b> Town of Wasaga Beach	Ian Rowe Adrianna Pilkington	<a href="mailto:irowe@barristonlaw.com">irowe@barristonlaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:apilkington@barristonlaw.com">apilkington@barristonlaw.com</a>
<b>H</b>	<i>[Now Appellant 32]</i>		
<b>I</b>	<i>[Now Appellant 33]</i>		
<b>J</b>	<b>J1</b> Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association <b>J2</b> CBM Aggregates, a division of St. Marys Cement (Canada) Inc. <b>J3</b> Lafarge Canada Inc. <b>J4</b> Holcim (Canada) Inc. <b>J5</b> James Dick Construction Limited <b>J6</b> Walker Aggregates Inc.	Mary Bull Alexandra Sadvari	<a href="mailto:mbull@woodbull.ca">mbull@woodbull.ca</a> <a href="mailto:asadvari@woodbull.ca">asadvari@woodbull.ca</a>
<b>K</b>	Georgian International Land Corp.	Mary Bull Alexandra Sadvari	<a href="mailto:mbull@woodbull.ca">mbull@woodbull.ca</a> <a href="mailto:asadvari@woodbull.ca">asadvari@woodbull.ca</a>
<b>L</b>	San Marco in Lamis Ltd.	Michael Vaughan	<a href="mailto:michaelbvaughan@yahoo.ca">michaelbvaughan@yahoo.ca</a>
<b>M</b>	White Water Holdings Ltd.	Barry Horosko Caterina Facciolo	<a href="mailto:bhorosko@bratty.com">bhorosko@bratty.com</a> <a href="mailto:cfacciolo@bratty.com">cfacciolo@bratty.com</a>
<b>N</b>	<i>[Now Appellant 28]</i>		
<b>O</b>	No Jet Construction Inc. Remington Homes (Manhattan) Inc. <i>[Withdrawn]</i>	Caterina Facciolo Barry Horosko	<a href="mailto:efacciolo@bratty.com">efacciolo@bratty.com</a> <a href="mailto:bhorosko@bratty.com">bhorosko@bratty.com</a>
<b>P</b>	Sleeping Lion Development Corporation	John Dawson	<a href="mailto:jdawson@mccarthy.ca">jdawson@mccarthy.ca</a>
<b>Q</b>	John Barzo Limited	John Barzo	<a href="mailto:jbarzo@barzolaw.com">jbarzo@barzolaw.com</a>
<b>R</b>	Innisfil Mapleview Developments Limited	Susan Rogers	<a href="mailto:susan.rogers@sdrogerslaw.ca">susan.rogers@sdrogerslaw.ca</a>
<b>S</b>	2133952 Ontario Inc.	Harold Elston Aynsley Anderson	<a href="mailto:harold@elstons.ca">harold@elstons.ca</a> <a href="mailto:aynsley@elstons.ca">aynsley@elstons.ca</a>
<b>T</b>	Talisker Corporation	Harold Elston Aynsley Anderson	<a href="mailto:harold@elstons.ca">harold@elstons.ca</a> <a href="mailto:aynsley@elstons.ca">aynsley@elstons.ca</a>
<b>U</b>	<b>U1&amp;U2</b> <i>[Now Appellant 27 a &amp; b]</i>		
<b>V</b>	1651012 Ontario Ltd. now Sandycove Acres Limited	Ian Rowe Adrianna Pilkington	<a href="mailto:irowe@barristonlaw.com">irowe@barristonlaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:apilkington@barristonlaw.com">apilkington@barristonlaw.com</a>
<b>W</b>	Township of Oro-Medonte	Chris Williams	<a href="mailto:cwilliams@airdberlis.com">cwilliams@airdberlis.com</a>
<b>X</b>	998991 Ontario Inc.	Ian Rowe Adrianna Pilkington	<a href="mailto:irowe@barristonlaw.com">irowe@barristonlaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:apilkington@barristonlaw.com">apilkington@barristonlaw.com</a>

PL091167

## Ontario Municipal Board

**IN THE MATTER OF** ss. 17(40) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant:	451082 Ontario Limited
Appellant:	861945 Ontario Ltd. et al
Appellant:	County of Simcoe
Appellant:	Estate of Mary Louise Francom; and others
Subject:	Failure to announce a decision respecting Proposed Official Plan Amendment 43-OP-2008
Municipality:	Upper Tier of Simcoe
OMB Case No.:	PL091167
OMB File No.:	PL091167

### INDEX

	<u>TAB</u>
Notice of Motion of the County of Simcoe	1
Affidavit of Kathy Suggitt, sworn April 3, 2014	2

PL091167

## Ontario Municipal Board

**IN THE MATTER OF** ss. 17(40) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant:	451082 Ontario Limited
Appellant:	861945 Ontario Ltd. et al
Appellant:	County of Simcoe
Appellant:	Estate of Mary Louise Francom; and others
Subject:	Failure to announce a decision respecting Proposed Official Plan Amendment 43-OP-2008
Municipality:	Upper Tier of Simcoe
OMB Case No.:	PL091167
OMB File No.:	PL091167

### NOTICE OF MOTION PHASE 1a – 20,000 Population

**THE CORPORATION OF THE COUNTY OF SIMCOE** will make a motion to the Ontario Municipal Board on **Tuesday, the 15<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2014, at 10:30 am**, or as soon after that time as the motion can be heard at the County of Simcoe, Administration Centre, Council Chambers, 1110 Highway 26, Midhurst, Ontario, L0L 1X0.

#### THE MOTION IS FOR AN ORDER:

- (a) Allowing the Official Plan appeal in part and modifying and approving replacement policies for Sections 3.5.10 to 3.5.16, reserving ss. 3.5.10(i), 3.5.11.7, 3.5.11.9, 3.5.11A and the word "adopted" in ss. 3.5.11 for further adjudication at the June hearing;
- (b) Deleting Table 2 to the Official Plan;
- (c) Deleting the Issues List approved for Phase 1a and directing issues to be restated for remaining matters;
- (d) for such further and other relief as may seem just and appropriate.

#### THE GROUNDS FOR THE MOTION ARE:

- (a) The experts for parties involved in Phase 1a of the hearing met and supported modified policies resolving concerns

about most of the matters to be considered in the Phase 1a hearing.

- (b) The modifications provide a comprehensive policy framework for implementation of the additional 20,000 population.
- (c) Table 2 is now redundant and can be deleted.
- (d) The modified policies are consistent with both the 2005 and 2014 PPS, conform with relevant Provincial policy and represent good planning.
- (e) Approval as sought would resolve appeals and concerns of specific parties.
- (f) Such further and other grounds as counsel may advise and this Board may deem necessary.
- (g) *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, subsections 17(40), 17(45), 17(50).

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE will be used at the hearing of the motion:

- (a) the Affidavit of Kathy Suggitt, sworn April 3, 2014, and the Exhibits attached thereto;
- (b) the Reports of Meetings of Expert Witnesses on Phase 1a contained in the said Affidavit;
- (c) the pleadings and proceedings herein;
- (d) such further and other material as counsel may advise and this Board may permit.

APRIL 4, 2014

THOMSON, ROGERS  
Barristers and Solicitors  
Suite 3100, 390 Bay Street  
Toronto, Ontario, M5H 1W2

ROGER T. BEAMAN  
416-868-3157  
E-Mail [rbeaman@thomsonrogers.com](mailto:rbeaman@thomsonrogers.com)

Lawyers for the Corporation  
of the County of Simcoe

PL091167

**ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD**

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(40) of the *Planning Act*, R. S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: 451082 Ontario Limited  
 Appellant: 861945 Ontario Ltd., et al  
 Appellant: County of Simcoe  
 Appellant: Estate of Mary Louise Frankcom; and others  
 Subject: Failure of to announce a decision respecting Proposed  
 Official Plan Amendment No. 43-OP-2008  
 Municipality: Upper Tier of Simcoe  
 OMB Case No.: PL091167  
 OMB File No.: PL091167

**AFFIDAVIT OF KATHY SUGGITT, MCIP, RPP**

**I, KATHY SUGGITT, MCIP, RPP, of the City of Barrie, in the Province of Ontario,  
 MAKE OATH AND SAY AS FOLLOWS:**

1. I am the Manager of Policy Planning in the Planning Department at the County of Simcoe (the "County"). As such, I have knowledge of the matters deposed to herein.
2. I am a Full Member of the Canadian Institute of Planners and a Registered Professional Planner in the Province of Ontario. I have 23 years of experience in private and public sector planning. A copy of my Curriculum Vitae has previously been filed in these proceedings as attachment A to Motion Record Exhibit 7.
3. I have been directly involved in matters respecting the County's updated Official Plan at all stages of the process since August 2008 leading to its adoption by the County on November 25, 2008 through to the endorsement of the proposed modified Plan by County Council on January 22, 2013 and to the present including OMB proceedings to date.

**Growth Management Policies – Phase 1a (20,000 population)**

4. In an oral decision on April 19, 2013 and confirmed in a memorandum dated June 13, 2013 the Board approved parts of the County Official Plan with the exception of sections that remain under appeal either County-wide or on a site-specific basis. A major area that remains under appeal is the growth management policies, including sections 3.5.10 through 3.5.16 including Table 2, which are all related to the additional 20,000 population available to the County of Simcoe for approvals of redesignation of lands within settlement areas.



5. The Growth Plan Amendment 1 was introduced on January 19, 2012. The amendment added a new chapter to the Growth Plan, section 6 – Simcoe Sub-Area. The policies in section 6 provide specific direction on how the Growth Plan's vision is to be achieved in the Simcoe Sub-Area. Specifically it directs that a significant portion of growth is to be directed to settlement areas where it can be most effectively serviced and contribute to the achievement of complete communities, with particular emphasis on the primary settlement areas.
6. The Procedural Order for Phase 1 of the hearing set out the final issues list for Phase 1a. The parties involved in Phase 1a of the hearing were required to submit alternative wording for the policies under appeal related to this phase as a basis for discussions amongst the expert witnesses. Alternative wording was received from some but not all parties. Attached as **Exhibit "A"** is the final issues list for Phase 1a in this hearing taken from the Procedural Order.
7. The expert witnesses for the parties involved in this phase of the hearing met on several occasions to try to resolve issues and/or reduce the number of issues. Arising from the meetings, two experts' reports were provided to the County solicitor, which have been circulated to all parties and participants. Attached as **Exhibit "B"** are the two experts' reports and related attachments.

#### **Policies with No Modifications**

8. The experts have reached agreement on policy 3.5.13 as well as the Phasing policies 3.5.14 through 3.5.16 on the basis of the current wording, with no modifications required.

#### **Policy Requiring Minor Modifications**

9. The experts reached agreement on policy 3.5.12 based on the proposed minor modifications to add words for clarification. Attached as **Exhibit "C"** is the proposed modified policy 3.5.12. The modifications address the frequency of reporting to County Council (semi-annually rather than annually), clarify that the reporting addresses both policies 3.5.10 and 3.5.11, and include wording to address the possibility of an extension to the deadline of January 19, 2017, in the event that the Growth Plan specifies an alternate date through a subsequent amendment.

#### **Policies 3.5.10 and 3.5.11 Proposed Modifications**

10. The experts had extensive discussions related to policies 3.5.10, 3.5.11 and Table 2. Much of the discussion related to the need for transparency and consistency in determining the lands that would qualify within settlement areas and the accounting/reporting of the 20,000 population allocations; what would trigger the applications to be considered; what criteria would qualify an application for consideration; the perceived duplication of criteria between the two policies and the

Table 2 criteria; and the need for more clarity on the procedures that the County would follow to administer the program.

11. The experts agreed that Table 2 should be deleted and instead blended into policy 3.5.11. As well there was general agreement that the duplication of criteria should be addressed by listing the requirements to be met in policy 3.5.10 and the additional considerations should be listed in 3.5.11 along with the administrative framework. In that regard, the two policies work together. Attached as **Exhibit "D"** is proposed modified policy 3.5.10. Attached as **Exhibit "E"** is proposed modified policy 3.5.11.
12. Although the experts agreed to the approach and to blend Table 2 into policy 3.5.11, there remain some objections by individual Parties to the proposed modified policies 3.5.10 and 3.5.11 on specific sub-points, which are highlighted in the attachments and were noted in the Second Experts' Report (Exhibit "B").
13. The proposed modifications to policy 3.5.10 include the wording similar to the proposed modification in 3.5.12 where it covers the possibility of an extension to the deadline of this program beyond January 19, 2017 if there is a new date specified in the Growth Plan through a subsequent amendment. Furthermore, the first criteria has been expanded to clarify the qualification of servicing capability being demonstrated which it was felt was appropriate so there were no apparent conflicts with section 4.7 of the County official plan inadvertently created.
14. Policy 3.5.11 was completely reworked to remove the duplication of listing the requirements to be met by applications, since these are already specified in policy 3.5.10. As well, the additional considerations from Table 2 were put into a list within the policy instead, and the administration details were expanded upon to ensure clarity and better understanding of how the program would work. As highlighted in Exhibit "B" in the Second Experts' Report, consent by all Parties was not reached, as three Parties have identified sub-points of no agreement.
15. In my opinion the proposed modifications to policy 3.5.11 achieve the intent of the original policy which is to provide additional planning considerations to evaluate applications that qualify for part of the 20,000 population, as well as detailing the administrative procedures of the program for greater clarity and understanding.
16. Given the deadline imposed within the Growth Plan on the approvals by the County with respect to the additional 20,000 population, the policy and administrative framework to implement this program needs to be decided upon and come into effect in order for County Council to make decisions on the allocation of population to qualifying applications. Although the policies were modified to address the possibility of a further amendment extending the deadline of this program, it seems unlikely and it is best not to count on any extension being given. As such the urgency to get a policy framework in place to allow sufficient time for County Council to consider qualifying applications and allocate the population accordingly, is very real.


**Summary Opinion**

17. It is my professional planning opinion that the proposed modifications to policies 3.5.10, 3.5.11 and 3.5.12 accurately reflect the agreement reached by the experts involved in Phase 1a of this hearing, with the specific sub-points being contested. All policies addressed in this Phase of the hearing including the proposed modifications bring the policies into conformity with relevant Provincial policy. The modifications are consistent with both the 2005 and 2014 versions of the Provincial Policy Statement and represent good planning.

18. I make this Affidavit in support of the County's request for an order of the Board to allow the appeal in part of the Official Plan to approve policies 3.5.13, 3.5.14, 3.5.15 and 3.5.16 and to modify and approve policy 3.5.12, 3.5.10 and 3.5.11 with the exception of the sub-points with no agreement. The specific sub-points that remain with no agreement include 3.5.10(i), 3.5.11.7, 3.5.11.9, 3.5.11A and the word "adopted" in 3.5.11. These will require determination by the Board.

**SWORN BEFORE ME** )  
at the Township of Springwater )  
in the County of Simcoe )  
this 3rd day of April, 2014. )


  
Commissioner for Taking Oaths, etc. )

  
KATHY SUGGITT

Amanda Flynn, Deputy Clerk  
A Commissioner for the  
Corporation of the  
County of Simcoe

THIS IS EXHIBIT "A" REFERRED TO IN THE AFFIDAVIT  
OF KATHY SUGGITT SWORN BEFORE ME THIS

3rd DAY OF APRIL, 2014.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Amanda Flynn", written over a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

Amanda Flynn, Deputy Clerk  
A Commissioner for the  
Corporation of the  
County of Simcoe

## ATTACHMENT 2a

### Issues List for Phase 1a

1. Are the criteria listed on Table 2: Decision-Making Matrix for Applications considered by policy 3.5.10 appropriate, reasonable and sufficiently clear and do they represent good planning? Should more direction be given with respect to the application and evaluation of the criteria? *[Source - Appellants 2a, 2b, Issue 4; Appellant 3, Issue 3; Appellant 4, Issue 7; Appellant 5, Issue 2]*
2. Does policy 3.5.10 of the Simcoe County Official Plan conform to policy 6.3.2.2 of the Growth Plan? *[Source - Appellant 10, Issue 6]*
3. Is the cap in policy 3.5.11 on the amount of population that can be allocated to any one local municipality pursuant to policy 3.5.10 reasonable and appropriate? *[Source - Appellant 15, Issue 4]*
4. Are the criteria in Table 2 for the assessment of applications to be considered under policy 3.5.10 reasonable and appropriate? In particular, is it appropriate to assess an application on the basis of whether it is on lands within a Primary Settlement Area? *[Source - Appellant 15, Issue 5]*
5. Is additional detail needed with respect to how the criteria in Table 2 will be applied to assess applications to be considered under policy 3.5.10? *[Source-Appellant 15, Issue 6]*
6. Is the effect of policies ~~3.4,~~ 3.5.14-3.5.15, and ~~4.10~~ to restrict growth in local municipalities? Do these policies confirm with the Growth Plan? *[Source - Appellant 18, Issue 3]*
7. What does the phrase “the Environmental Assessment process is finalized” practically mean for purposes of policy 3.5.16? *[Source - Appellant 18, Issue 7]*
8. Is policy 3.5.15 appropriate to address phasing and does it represent good planning? *[Source - Appellant 18, Issue 8]*
9. What criteria should be added, deleted and/or qualified in Policy 3.5.10 of the Simcoe County Official Plan? Does the criteria contained Policy 3.5.10 conform with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and is it consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2005)? Should the criteria in Policy 3.5.10 be amended to encourage a good planning result for rural townships? *[Source - Appellant 33, Issue 12]*
10. Does Policy 3.5.11 need to be amended or modified? Does it conform with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and is it consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2005)? Should references to private communal services be deleted? What criteria should be added, deleted and/or qualified in Policy 3.5.11? Should the

criteria in Policy 3.5.11 be amended to encourage a good planning result for rural townships? *[Source - Appellant 33, Issue 13]*

11. What criteria should be added, deleted and/or qualified within Table 2 (the “Decision-Making Matrix”) of Section 3.5 of the Simcoe County Official Plan? Does the criteria matrix conform with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and is it consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2005)? Should the criteria in Table 2 be amended to encourage a good planning result for rural townships? *[Source - Appellant 33, Issue 14]*
12. Do proposed Simcoe County Official Plan policies 3.5.10, 3.5.11 and Table 2: Decision-Making Matrix for Applications considered by policy 3.5.10 conform to the policies of the Growth Plan, in particular Section 6.3.2.? *[Source - Appellant 36, Issue 1]*
13. Are the criteria listed in policies 3.5.10, 3.5.11 and Table 2: Decision-Making Matrix for Applications considered by policy 3.5.10 appropriate and consistent with good planning? Should any criteria be deleted, or amended? *[Source - Appellant 36, Issue 2]*
14. Should additional criteria or more policy direction be provided with respect to the operation of policies 3.5.10, 3.5.11 or the decision making criteria specified in those policies and Table 2: Decision-Making Matrix for Applications considered by policy 3.5.10? *[Source - Appellant 36, Issue 3]*
15. Do policies 3.5.10, 3.5.11 and Table 2: Decision-Making Matrix for Applications considered by policy 3.5.10 have the effect of prohibiting the approval of applications on lands that are not within Primary Settlement Areas? *[Source - Appellant 36, Issue 4]*
16. Do policies 3.5.10, 3.5.11 and Table 2: Decision-Making Matrix for Applications considered by policy 3.5.10 establish a preference that applications be on lands within a Primary Settlement Areas? If so is that warranted, appropriate, or reasonable? *[Source - Appellant 36, Issue 5]*
17. Should the deadline of January 19, 2017 in policy 3.5.10 be amended to refer to the date required by policy 6.3.2.5 of the Growth Plan, as such date may be amended? Is it good planning to require the County Official Plan to be further amended if the deadline in the Growth Plan is extended? *[Source - Appellant 36, Issue 6]*
18. Are the policies in sections ~~3.1.1, 3.2.11, 3.3.2, 3.4~~ and 3.5 of the Official Plan as they apply to lands within Settlements in conformity with the policies in the Growth Plan? Specifically, do these policies create confusion as to what development can or cannot take place within these areas? *[Source - Party A, Issue 2]*
19. Should the deadline of January 19, 2017, in Policy 3.5.10 be amended to allow for flexibility in the event an extension is granted by the Province?*[Source-Party D, Issue 10]*
20. Does the “Decision-Making Matrix” (Table 2) contain factors beyond what is authorized by the Growth Plan? *[Source - Party Q, Issue 10]*

21. Is it appropriate that Adjala-Tosorontio Official Plan Amendment #8, as approved by the County and the Township, be subject to any potentially more restrictive provisions contained in the Decision-Making Matrix in particular, and the County Official Plan in general? *[Source - Party Q, Issue 11]*

THIS IS EXHIBIT "B" REFERRED TO IN THE AFFIDAVIT  
OF KATHY SUGGITT SWORN BEFORE ME THIS

3rd DAY OF APRIL, 2014.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Amanda Flynn", is written over a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

Amanda Flynn, Deputy Clerk  
A Commissioner for the  
Corporation of the  
County of Simcoe



**OMB File No: PL091167**

**County of Simcoe Official Plan**

**Report on Meeting of Expert Witnesses on Phase 1a (20,000 population equivalent policies)**

**January 23, 2014**

**Attendees:**

Kathy Suggitt – County of Simcoe (Appellant Party 1)

Tim Cane – Town of Innisfil (Party D)

Tim Haldenby – MMAH (Party A)

Jacque Tschekalin – Township of Adjala-Tosorontio (Appellant Party 33)

Ron Palmer – for Township of Adjala-Tosorontio (Appellant Party 33)

Jim Hartman – for Township of Adjala-Tosorontio (Appellant Party 33)

Andria Leigh – Township of Oro-Medonte (Party W)

Tim Schilling – Town of New Tecumseth (Appellant Party 32)

Brent Spagnol – Township of Springwater (Appellant Party 6)

David Slade – Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd. (Appellant Party 4)

Jeanette Gillezeau – Carson Road Development Inc. (Appellant Party 2a), Midhurst Development Doran Road Inc. (Appellant Party 2b), Craighurst Land Corp. (Appellant Party 3), Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd. (Appellant Party 4) and D.G. Pratt Construction Limited (Appellant Party 30)

Paul Lowes – Carson Road Development Inc. (Appellant Party 2a), Midhurst Development Doran Road Inc. (Appellant Party 2b), and Craighurst Land Corp. (Appellant Party 3)

Ray Duhamel – D. G. Pratt Construction Limited (Appellant Party 30)

Darren Vella – Carson Trail Estates Inc. (Appellant Party 36), Innisfil Maplevue Developments Limited (Party R)

Brian Goodreid – Estate of Marie Louise Frankcom (Appellant Party 15)

Tony Biglieri – Tesmar Holdings Inc. (Appellant Party 10)

**Policies Under Appeal include: 3.5.10 through 3.5.16 including Table 2**

Alternative wording was provided by the Experts for the following: (due Jan 15<sup>th</sup>)

- Appellant Parties 2a, 2b and 3
- Appellant Party 4
- Appellant Party 10
- Appellant Party 15
- Appellant Party 33
- Appellant Party 36 and Party R
- Party A

**All Experts are in Agreement with the following Policies as adopted (no modifications):**

- 3.5.13
- 3.5.14
- 3.5.15
- 3.5.16

**Proposed Policy Modifications that all Experts agree to:**

- Policy 3.5.12 would be modified with the additional words in **bold underlined type** and yellow highlight as follows:

**3.5.12** The *County* will monitor and report semi-annually to County Council on the approvals made pursuant to 3.5.10 and 3.5.11 until the sum of the population growth that can be accommodated on the redesignated *lands for urban uses* approved pursuant to 3.5.10 and 3.5.11 reaches a maximum total population of 20,000 or until January 19, 2017 (or such date as is specified in the Growth Plan), whichever is sooner.

**Policies that remain under appeal with no agreement:**

- 3.5.10
- 3.5.11
- Table 2

The expert witnesses have agreed to meet again to further discuss policies 3.5.10, 3.5.11 and Table 2.

A second meeting is scheduled for Thursday February 13, 2014.

Report prepared by Kathy Suggitt, County of Simcoe

**Concurrence of all Attendees:**

This report was circulated via email to all attendees on January 24, 2014. All attendees have concurred with the report via reply email.

**OMB File No: PL091167**

**County of Simcoe Official Plan**

**Second Report on Meetings of Expert Witnesses on Phase 1a (20,000 population equivalent policies)**

**Attendees:**

Kathy Suggitt & Tiffany Thompson– County of Simcoe (Appellant Party 1)  
 Tim Cane – Town of Innisfil (Party D)  
 Tim Haldenby – MMAH (Party A)  
 Jacquie Tschekalin – Township of Adjala-Tosorontio (Appellant Party 33)  
 Ron Palmer – for Township of Adjala-Tosorontio (Appellant Party 33)  
 Andria Leigh – Township of Oro-Medonte (Party W)  
 Tim Schilling – Town of New Tecumseth (Appellant Party 32)  
 Brent Spagnol – Township of Springwater (Appellant Party 6)  
 David Slade – Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd. (Appellant Party 4)  
 Jeanette Gillezeau – Carson Road Development Inc. (Appellant Party 2a), Midhurst Development Doran Road Inc. (Appellant Party 2b), Craighurst Land Corp. (Appellant Party 3), Huntingwood Trails (Collingwood) Ltd. (Appellant Party 4) and D.G. Pratt Construction Limited (Appellant Party 30)  
 Paul Lowes – Carson Road Development Inc. (Appellant Party 2a), Midhurst Development Doran Road Inc. (Appellant Party 2b), and Craighurst Land Corp. (Appellant Party 3)  
 Ray Duhamel – D. G. Pratt Construction Limited (Appellant Party 30)  
 Darren Vella – Carson Trail Estates Inc. (Appellant Party 36), Innisfil Mapleview Developments Limited (Party R)  
 Brian Goodreid – Estate of Marie Louise Frankcom (Appellant Party 15)  
 Tony Biglieri – Tesmar Holdings Inc. (Appellant Party 10)  
 Nancy Farrer – Town of Collingwood (Party B)

**Policies Under Discussion: 3.5.10 and 3.5.11 and Table 2**

Further to the First experts' report of January 29, 2014, the expert witnesses have continued their discussions on policies 3.5.10, 3.5.11 and Table 2.

**Agreement Reached:**

There is agreement by all experts to modify policy 3.5.10, (Attachment 1), with the exception of one Party (Party 33) not agreeing to sub-point 3.5.10(i) as shown.

There is agreement by all experts to delete the proposed policy 3.5.11 and Table 2 and replace it with the proposed new policy 3.5.11 (Attachment 2), with the exception of one Party (Party 33) having no agreement on sub-point 3.5.11.7, two Parties (Parties 33 and R) having no agreement on sub-point 3.5.11A, and one Party (Party 4) having no agreement on the use of the word "adopted" and on sub-point 3.5.11.9, as shown.

The attachments contain the proposed modified policy 3.5.10 and new policy 3.5.11 and where there is no agreement by certain Parties, the sub-point is highlighted and the Party numbers are identified.

This report was prepared by Kathy Suggitt, County of Simcoe, acting as secretary for the group of experts.

**Concurrence of all Attendees:**

This report was circulated via email to all attendees on March 12, 2014. All attendees have concurred with the report via reply email and have agreed to allow the County solicitor to release it from privilege.

**Attachment 1 to Second Experts Report on Phase 1a)**

**Proposed Modified Policy 3.5.10**

**3.5.10** The County may approve adopted official plans or adopted official plan amendments regarding lands within ~~an existing a settlement area~~ that redesignate *lands not for urban uses* to *lands for urban uses* that are in excess of what is needed for a time horizon of up to 20 years or to accommodate the forecasts in Table 1, whichever is sooner, until January 19, 2017 or such date as is specified in the Growth Plan, for an amount of land to accommodate a total population not to exceed 20,000 for the County of Simcoe in total, provided the growth satisfies the following criteria:

- a) Can be serviced in accordance with applicable *provincial* plans, *provincial* policies and is in accordance with section 4.7 of this *Plan* and has demonstrated capability of being developable on *municipal sewage services* and *municipal water services* or *private communal sewage services* and *private communal water services*;
- b) Contributes to the achievement of the *density target* or *intensification* target, as applicable, set out in section 3.5.23 and 3.5.24 of this *Plan*;
- c) Contributes to the development of a *complete community*;
- d) Is subject to phasing policies of Sections 3.5.14 to 3.5.16;
- e) Contributes to the achievement of the jobs to residents ratio in Table 1 for the *local municipality*;
- f) Is in accordance with the requirements of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, 2009, if applicable;
- g) Is supported by appropriate transportation *infrastructure* and *public service facilities* and is in accordance with any transportation guidelines and policies developed by the County of Simcoe;
- h) Is in accordance with the other growth management policies of this *Plan*; and
- i) Does not involve an expansion of an existing a settlement area boundary

Comment [KS-21]: No agreement -- Party 33

Attachment 2 to Second Experts Report on Phase 1a)

Proposed New Policy 3.5.11

3.5.11 For purposes of this policy and Section 3.5.12 and the administration of the program outlined below, when the word "applications" or the word "matters" are used, either term is meant to include both terms and means adopted official plans or adopted official plan amendments (both privately initiated and municipality initiated). This policy provides additional criteria for consideration and the administration procedures to identify how the County of Simcoe will implement Section 3.5.10 and related policies.

Comment [KS-21]: No agreement by Party 4

Comment [KS-22]: No agreement by Party 4

In addition to the requirements of Section 3.5.10, the County will consider the following criteria in the evaluation of applications or matters:

- 1. how the application fits within the settlement area hierarchy or preferred growth areas for the local municipality;
2. if the application contains both employment and residential uses;
3. if the application is a redevelopment of a Brownfield site;
4. if the application includes policies detailing how the development will require the incorporation of affordable housing units;
5. if the application contains active transportation components;
6. if there are partnerships included on any financing proposal to reduce financial burden to the local municipality;
7. if the application is on lands within a primary settlement area;
8. if the lands provide a servicing linkage or provide critical mass for servicing feasibility; and
9. if the application contains a Council resolution from the local municipality to have an adopted official plan or adopted official plan amendment considered for this program.

Comment [KS-23]: No agreement by Party 33

Comment [KS-24]: No agreement by Party 4

The program will be administered as follows:

- A. The County, in collaboration with the local municipalities, will identify lands that qualify as lands not for urban uses for each local municipality;
B. The County will require a complete record of adoption in accordance with the Planning Act, a letter of request from the local municipality or land owner to have an adopted official plan or adopted official plan amendment considered for this program together with a planning report demonstrating how the application satisfies all of the criteria outlined in Section 3.5.10 and how the criteria of 1) through 9) above are addressed;
C. The County will maintain and publish on the County's website as part of the land budget, a ledger account for the 20,000 population that reflects the approvals and the declining balance of the available population and any pending applications for this program and provide a report to County Council semi-annually until the program concludes;
D. Despite the County's delegation by-law, County Council will receive a staff report for

Comment [KS-25]: No agreement by Party 33 and Party R

Comment [KS-26]: No agreement by Party 4

Comment [KS-27]: No agreement by Party 4

each application qualifying for consideration under policy 3.5.10 from County planning staff following their review of the application as soon as possible following receipt of all of the required items specified in B) above;

- E. The County planning staff report will provide an evaluation of the application based on the requirements of policy 3.5.10, consideration of the criteria in 1) through 9) above, and all other relevant policies of this Plan;
- F. A maximum of the equivalent land area to accommodate 2,000 population will be considered for approval for any given application;
- G. A maximum of the equivalent land area to accommodate 4,000 in population will be approved for any one *local municipality* for the entire timeframe, and
- H. Any unused portion of the equivalent to 20,000 in population may be considered in the final year of this program without limits despite F) and G) above.

THIS IS EXHIBIT "C" REFERRED TO IN THE AFFIDAVIT  
OF KATHY SUGGITT SWORN BEFORE ME THIS

3rd DAY OF APRIL, 2014.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Amanda Flynn", written over a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

Amanda Flynn, Deputy Clerk  
A Commissioner for the  
Corporation of the  
County of Simcoe



**Proposed Modifications to Policy 3.5.12**

**3.5.12** The *County* will monitor and report semi-annually to County Council on the approvals made pursuant to 3.5.10 and 3.5.11 until the sum of the population growth that can be accommodated on the redesignated *lands for urban uses* approved pursuant to 3.5.10 and 3.5.11 reaches a maximum total population of 20,000 or until January 19, 2017 (or such date as is specified in the Growth Plan), whichever is sooner.

THIS IS EXHIBIT "D" REFERRED TO IN THE AFFIDAVIT  
OF KATHY SUGGITT SWORN BEFORE ME THIS

3rd DAY OF APRIL, 2014.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Amanda Flynn", written over a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

Amanda Flynn, Deputy Clerk  
A Commissioner for the  
Corporation of the  
County of Simcoe

**Attachment 1 to Second Experts Report on Phase 1a)**

**Proposed Modified Policy 3.5.10**

**3.5.10** The *County* may approve adopted official plans or adopted official plan amendments regarding lands within ~~an existing a settlement area~~ that redesignate *lands not for urban uses* to *lands for urban uses* that are in excess of what is needed for a time horizon of up to 20 years or to accommodate the forecasts in Table 1, whichever is sooner, until January 19, 2017 or such date as is specified in the Growth Plan, for an amount of land to accommodate a total population not to exceed 20,000 for the County of Simcoe in total, provided the growth satisfies the following criteria:

- a) Can be serviced in accordance with applicable *provincial* plans, *provincial* policies and is in accordance with section 4.7 of this *Plan* and has demonstrated capability of being developable on *municipal sewage services* and *municipal water services* or *private communal sewage services* and *private communal water services*;
- b) Contributes to the achievement of the *density target* or *intensification* target, as applicable, set out in section 3.5.23 and 3.5.24 of this *Plan*;
- c) Contributes to the development of a *complete community*;
- d) Is subject to phasing policies of Sections 3.5.14 to 3.5.16;
- e) Contributes to the achievement of the jobs to residents ratio in Table 1 for the *local municipality*;
- f) Is in accordance with the requirements of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, 2009, if applicable;
- g) Is supported by appropriate transportation *infrastructure* and *public service facilities* and is in accordance with any transportation guidelines and policies developed by the County of Simcoe;
- h) Is in accordance with the other growth management policies of this *Plan*; and
- i) Does not involve an expansion of ~~an existing a settlement area~~ boundary.

Comment [KS-21]: No agreement - Party 33

THIS IS EXHIBIT "E" REFERRED TO IN THE AFFIDAVIT  
OF KATHY SUGGITT SWORN BEFORE ME THIS

3rd DAY OF APRIL, 2014.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Amanda Flynn", is written over a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

Amanda Flynn, Deputy Clerk  
A Commissioner for the  
Corporation of the  
County of Simcoe

**Attachment 2 to Second Experts Report on Phase 1a)**

**Proposed New Policy 3.5.11**

**3.5.11** For purposes of this policy and Section 3.5.12 and the administration of the program outlined below, when the word “applications” or the word “matters” are used, either term is meant to include both terms and means adopted official plans or adopted official plan amendments (both privately initiated and municipality initiated). This policy provides additional criteria for consideration and the administration procedures to identify how the County of Simcoe will implement Section 3.5.10 and related policies.

Comment [KS-21]: No agreement by Party 4  
Comment [KS-22]: No agreement by Party 4

In addition to the requirements of Section 3.5.10, the County will consider the following criteria in the evaluation of applications or matters:

1. how the application fits within the *settlement area* hierarchy or preferred growth areas for the *local municipality*;
2. if the application contains both employment and residential uses;
3. if the application is a redevelopment of a *Brownfield* site;
4. if the application includes policies detailing how the *development* will require the incorporation of *affordable* housing units;
5. if the application contains active transportation components;
6. if there are partnerships included on any financing proposal to reduce financial burden to the local municipality;
7. if the application is on lands within a *primary settlement area*;
8. if the lands provide a servicing linkage or provide critical mass for servicing feasibility; and
9. if the application contains a Council resolution from the *local municipality* to have an adopted official plan or adopted official plan amendment considered for this program.

Comment [KS-23]: No agreement by Party 33

Comment [KS-24]: No agreement by Party 4

The program will be administered as follows:

- A. The County, in collaboration with the *local municipalities*, will identify lands that qualify as *lands not for urban uses* for each *local municipality*;
- B. The County will require a complete record of adoption in accordance with the *Planning Act*, a letter of request from the *local municipality* or land owner to have an adopted official plan or adopted official plan amendment considered for this program together with a planning report demonstrating how the application satisfies all of the criteria outlined in Section 3.5.10 and how the criteria of 1) through 9) above are addressed;
- C. The County will maintain and publish on the County’s website as part of the land budget, a ledger account for the 20,000 population that reflects the approvals and the declining balance of the available population and any pending applications for this program and provide a report to County Council semi-annually until the program concludes;
- D. Despite the County’s delegation by-law, County Council will receive a staff report for

Comment [KS-25]: No agreement by Party 33 and Party R

Comment [KS-26]: No agreement by Party 4  
Comment [KS-27]: No agreement by Party 4

each application qualifying for consideration under policy 3.5.10 from County planning staff following their review of the application as soon as possible following receipt of all of the required items specified in B) above;

- E. The County planning staff report will provide an evaluation of the application based on the requirements of policy 3.5.10, consideration of the criteria in 1) through 9) above, and all other relevant policies of this Plan;
- F. A maximum of the equivalent land area to accommodate 2,000 population will be considered for approval for any given application;
- G. A maximum of the equivalent land area to accommodate 4,000 in population will be approved for any one *local municipality* for the entire timeframe, and
- H. Any unused portion of the equivalent to 20,000 in population may be considered in the final year of this program without limits despite F) and G) above.

**ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD**

**MOTION RECORD  
PHASE 1a – 20,000 Population**

THOMSON, ROGERS  
Barristers and Solicitors  
Suite 3100  
390 Bay Street  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5H 1W2

ROGER T. BEAMAN  
L.S.U.C. No. 14079T  
416-868-3157  
Fax No. 416-868-3134

Lawyers for the Corporation of the  
County of Simcoe

(050873 /aph)