

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
Michael Nisbet (michaelnisbet@hotmail.com)	Short Term Vacation Rental Units – how will policies in the OPA protect neighbourhoods against short term vacation rental units	Policies to protect neighbourhoods with regards to short term vacation rentals have been added through the OPA.
Merle Hazzard/Jim Hazzard/Paul Hazzard ( <a href="mailto:mwhazzard@gmail.com">mwhazzard@gmail.com</a> ) for Sandbar Lake Investment Co.	Property South of Courtright Line & St. Clair Parkway (Zoned M2 and Agricultural). Desire to have the property rezoned to residential.	Outside of scope of review – private applications can be made.
Dave Hannam Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Would like to be added to future communications.	Noted.
Paul & Jan Smith (pauljansmith@gmail.com)	Smith Homestead (84 acres) Including policies in the Official Plan to encourage sustainable farming practices. Also about preserving the property through a Farmland Trust or Nature Trust.	Policies in the OPA do encourage sustainable farming practices. Staff have also encouraged this landowner to reach out to OMAFRA.
Karina DeLorey – Realtor representing Errol and Barbara Clark owner of vacant land in Courtright	Request through the OPA process that Council review the proposed subdivision for the Clark’s land in Courtright and to consider a Boundary Expansion and residential designation.	Settlement Area expansions are not part of the Township OPA process. County planning staff have dealt with the matter separately. Lands of potential interest have been noted in an Appendix.
Marilyn Robbins (November 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2023 comments from the Blackline)	1.2 Maybe this should be removed as it is duplication verbatim as k) below	Typo noted, change has been made.
	1.4 & 19.d) I think the County OP references LPAT Order numbers for minimums in each of Lambton’s townships. If LPAT numbers come out of Toronto this 25% reduction warrants further discussion and	The policy proposed implements the County OP.

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	<p>consideration by residents and their elected reps on Council. If avoiding fragmentation is the goal reducing the minimum by that much is significant. Perhaps it should be similar to the 38 ha minimums for Brooke-Alvinston, Enniskillen, Plympton-Wyoming and Warwick or remain at the current 40 ha.</p>	
	<p>1.10 Wondering if it would be appropriate to reference the Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas here rather than just in the Cannabis section? Or suggest referencing similar to Lambton County OP 4.1.23 “In implementing the Agricultural policies of this Plan, local municipalities should have regard for the province’s Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas, especially respective agriculture-related issues, on-farm diversified uses, and agri-tourism uses.”</p> <p>If appropriate to an OP would support seeing “limited in area” further defined as per the Guidelines referenced in previous comment . “..the standard for</p>	<p>Noted. The policies have regard for the guideline.</p>

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	the acceptable area occupied by an on-farm diversified use is up to 2% of a farm parcel to a maximum of 1 ha”	
	1.11 30 ha is too great a reduction and counter to the intent of reducing fragmentation - keep at 40 or 38 ha minimum.	The policy proposed implements the County OP.
	1.18 At least 38 ha minimum preferably, 40 ha ideally.	The policy proposed implements the County OP.
	<p>4.1 Consider replacing “Green Energy” with “Green and/or Renewable Energy”</p> <p>NPG’s earlier presentation and the “Green Energy Projects” poster at the Nov 6 Open House read “Decision making on green energy is with Municipal Council” where is that reflected in this OP?</p> <p>The first bullets on the Green Energy poster Nov 6 read 1) “Rezoning required for green energy projects” is that clearly reflected in this OP?</p>	<p>Green Energy is intended to encompass renewable energy.</p> <p>The OPA states that alternative and renewable energy systems will be regulated through the implementing Zoning By-law.</p>
	4.1.2 Is this necessary considering the highlighting of our proud petroleum heritage referenced in the Lambton County OP?	This section is required to address green energy projects.
	4.2 I think Lambton County Council has a motion on the books that we are	

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	<p>not a willing host for wind. Should that be reflected here?</p> <p>At the Nov 6 Open House the third bullet on the “Green Energy Projects” poster read “Policy requirements for industrial wind turbine based on community submissions.” Not sure what that means and how it shows here?</p> <p>Are the Guidelines approved by Council? How is the process monitored by Council?</p> <p>4.2 c) spelling error should be sizes not sized</p>	<p>The Province has changed the legislation and green energy projects are now a decision of Council. Council’s decision cannot be appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal.</p> <p>Noted. Typo has been changed.</p>
	<p>4.3 What’s the rationale for the limitation in kw instead of land mass ha? Or what does 10 kw equate to in terms of acreage or hectares? Whatever represents the smallest footprint is preferable.</p>	<p>This is to be consistent with the OMAFRA guidelines.</p>
	<p>5.1.1 Are there additional objectives coming out of Council’s strategic planning work that should be included here? Would like to see support for agriculture added to this list.</p>	<p>CIP is intended to apply to commercial areas. If the CIP is to be extended, Council would need to make a direction to do that. Outside of scope of OP review.</p>
	<p>5 I understand these are public meetings – could the agendas and</p>	<p>Noted. The comment has been passed along to the Township Clerk.</p>

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	minutes be posted to be publicly available? Plympton-Wyoming has a good web structure for this that could maybe be duplicated for St. Clair?	
	11.1 If the Official Plan is foundational to how Township land planning is organized to best utilize finite land resources to meet residents needs, I hope there is fulsome discussion about delegation of this authority – be it all or perhaps just some of the items listed in 11.2. What guidelines does Council provide to those delegated and how does Council monitor any delegation of their authority for OP items? Do tools exist to support Council in determining most appropriate opportunities for delegation of their authority rather than a blanket directive?	The Official Plan provides policy direction in accordance with the <i>Planning Act</i> .
	11.3 How and when is this monitored? What is the line of sight for Council and the public they represent?	The Official Plan provides policy direction in accordance with the <i>Planning Act</i> .
Marilyn Robbins 3071 Tecumseh Road, Courtright  November 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2023 (excerpts from the email)	<u>Agricultural</u>  - Maintain the minimum lot size for agricultural uses at 40 ha. A 25% reduction to a 30 ha minimum as proposed is contrary to the stated goal of	See responses as outlined previously above.

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	<p>unwarranted fragmentation of farmland see 1.4 in Part B.  <i>"I think the County OP references LPAT Order numbers for minimums in each of Lambton's townships. If LPAT numbers come out of Toronto this 25% reduction warrants further discussion and consideration by residents and their elected reps on Council. If avoiding fragmentation is the goal reducing the minimum by that much is significant. Perhaps it should be similar to the 38 ha minimums for Brooke-Alvinston, Enniskillen, Plympton-Wyoming and Warwick or remain at the current 40 ha".</i></p> <p>- Please reference <i>The Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario's Prime Agricultural Areas</i> more broadly. It seems to appear only in the section on Cannabis whereas the Lambton County Official Plan references it more broadly with 4.1.23 reading <i>"In implementing the Agricultural policies of this</i></p>	

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	<p><i>Plan, local municipalities should have regard for the province’s Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas, especially respective agriculture-related issues, on-farm diversified uses, and agri-tourism uses.”</i></p>	
	<p><u>Green Energy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPG’s latest presentation at Council and the “Green Energy Projects” poster at the November 6 Open House read “<i>Decision making on green energy is with Municipal Council</i>” and “<i>rezoning is required for green energy projects</i>” though these points aren’t clearly reflected in the Green Energy section 4.1 in Part C.</li> <li>- Is including 4.2.Wind Energy consistent with Lambton County Council direction as I thought they had made a motion that we are not a willing host for wind turbines?</li> </ul>	<p>See responses as outlined previously above.</p>

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	<p>- Am curious in 4.3 Solar Energy as to why limits for ground mounted solar are in kilowatts and not hectares or both? I have no idea how 10kw translates in physical size unless the wattage is a safety or other concern? I understand when it comes to Prime Agricultural Land that ground mounted solar is considered to be land extensive and subject to the criteria for On-farm Diversified Uses.</p>	
	<p><u>Community Improvement Policies – General Objectives</u></p> <p>- With the objectives listed under 5.1.1. in Part D I wonder if additional or revised guidance might come out of the strategic planning process underway. Would like to see support for agriculture added to the list. According to the story in the October 2023 Beacon “vital agriculture” topped the list</p>	<p>See responses as outlined previously above.</p>



ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	<p>of priorities at the public session held September 21.</p>	
	<p>Implementation – Part E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5. Committee of Adjustment. Perhaps not appropriate for the Official Plan but I can't seem to find online any of the materials for the Committee of Adjustment but understand that the meetings are open to the public? If so, would appreciate the materials being posted similar to the approach in Plympton-Wyoming.</li> <li>- 11. Delegation of Authority. Council delegating any authority for the foundational work described in the Official Plan shouldn't be taken lightly. It is a serious responsibility and thoughtful consideration should be given to exactly what is appropriate for delegation, and how Council will monitor it. What tools are available to Council to provide assurance that their delegation is being exercised as intended and understood by all Council members.</li> </ul>	<p>See responses as outlined previously above.</p>

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
<p>Tracy Kingston  <a href="mailto:moore.optimist.tracy@gmail.com">moore.optimist.tracy@gmail.com</a>                      519-312-3747</p>	<p>Provide definition of: significant woodlands, temporary garden suite, affordable housing</p>	<p>Significant Woodlands are defined in County OP. Use definitions typically occur in a zoning by-law. The province has recently updated a definition for affordable housing.</p>
	<p><b>p. 5 Part B Land- 1.5</b> use the word insects instead of flies to cover all types of insects</p>	<p>This wording is consistent with County OP policy 4.1.5.</p>
	<p>p. 11 Part B Land d) ii – 0.4 hectares (1acre) this should be 2 acres</p>	<p>Noted. Change has been made.</p>
	<p>p.77 Part B Land: 13.10 update company names? Nova Chemicals and Dow Chemicals are now there not Dupont-needs confirmation. Ethyl still in existence?</p>	<p>Noted. This will be revised through a housekeeping amendment.</p>
	<p>15.1.5 1 hectare per 600 dwelling units. I feel this is too high, consider 1 hectare per 450 dwelling units.</p>	<p>1 hectare per 600 dwelling units is the specified number outlined in the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p>
	<p>P74 &amp; 75 Part C Municipal Services</p> <p><b>St. Clair Parkway</b></p> <p>The St. Clair Parkway, which runs along the St. Clair River, is an integral part of the St. Clair Parkway Commission area. The St. Clair Parkway Commission was created by special legislation. While the</p>	<p>Noted. Policies related to the Parkway Commission will be revised.</p>

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	<p>Commission has no regulatory powers, its mandate is to develop or manage a network of recreational facilities and parks along the St. Clair shoreline from Sarnia to Chatham, and to assist municipalities by advising on development of the balance of the parkway.</p> <p>St. Clair Parkway Master Plan</p> <p>The Parkway Commission has, and periodically updates, the St. Clair Parkway Master Plan. While the Master Plan has no regulatory authority, it will be used by the Township as a guideline document for development and land use along the Parkway. The Township has included special provisions in this Plan relating to the preservation and enhancement of the Parkway concept. The Zoning By-law may also include special provisions relating to development along the Parkway.</p> <p>Should these sections be updated or removed as the St. Clair Parkway Commission no longer exists?</p>	

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	<p>P. 91-95 Part D: Community Development</p> <p>Policies 1.1.1 to 1.1.17 The existing St. Clair Heritage Committee should be consulted for their opinion and suggestions on these items to determine if this is feasible.</p> <p><b>Part 1.1.1</b> The Township recognizes the value of preserving significant historical buildings and sites of cultural/historical merit Council may consider the establishment of a Municipal Heritage Committee to consult on issues related to cultural heritage resources and conservation.</p> <p>This paragraph suggests the establishment of a Municipal Heritage Committee- one already exists so perhaps the wording in this paragraph needs to be changed to:</p> <p>The Township recognizes the value of preserving significant</p>	<p>Noted. The change has been made.</p>

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	<p>historical buildings and sites of cultural/historical merit. Council will support the St. Clair Heritage Committee and will consult with them on issues related to cultural heritage resources and conservation.</p> <p>The Heritage Committee needs a policies and procedures manual to outline the expectations and role of the committee. Our current role would change from one of a heritage resource to one of administrative and legislative. A role the current committee is not in favour of and not willing to take on.</p> <p>Although the St. Clair Township Heritage Committee agrees that history needs to be preserved and documented, a number of members have reviewed Sections 1.1.4 to 1.1.13 of Part D and feel these additions will add tremendous amount of</p> <p>Administrative and bureaucratic burden not only on the committee,</p>	<p>These policies are derived from the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>, Ontario Heritage Toolkit and the Provincial Policy Statement.</p>

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Contact	Comment	Action Taken
	<p>but on staff and property owners. Even the use of qualified heritage professionals in evaluating a property will add undue financial stress.</p> <p>The committee applauds these measures however, many of these conditions that bear the legal weight of the municipal regulations would be regarded as arbitrary, autocratic and development-deadening measures. We feel that these regulations may be met with hostility by most of the owners of Township heritage properties.</p>	
	<p><b>p. 103 3.8 Parking</b></p> <p>b) Where surface parking areas are situated adjacent to a public street in the front yard, their layout should be subdivided into smaller areas to avoid large monotonous asphalt surfaces.</p> <p>This seems a little too restrictive, for example</p>	<p>Noted. This policy is meant to provide guidance and incorporate design considerations with regards to parking areas.</p>

ST CLAIR OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

<b>Contact</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
	for a long narrow plaza like 446 Lyndoch St., Corunna or is this for residential multi unit?	