



January 28, 2026

Rossalyn Workman
Clearview Township
217 Gideon Street
Stayner, ON L0M 1S0

**Re: Addendum to a Planning Justification Report
To Support a Zoning By-law Amendment
For a Townhouse Condominium Development
1191 County Road 42
Town File: 2019-003**

The original Planning Justification Report (PJR) for the above noted applications was prepared in January of 2019 and updated in May of 2024. Subsequent to the submission of the updated PJR the Province of Ontario has updated several of the applicable policy documents. All Planning Act decisions made after the effective dates of each of those new or updated policy documents must comply with the new documents. Furthermore Simcoe County approved a new Clearview Township Official Plan subsequent to the May 2024 PJR.

Development Concept

The previous submission in 2024 included a revised concept plan showing proposed changes to the site layout, but did not include a revised Draft Plan of Subdivision. As described in the May 2024 submission the development concept had changed since the original application. No substantial changes to the layout have occurred since the May 2024 submission. As such, the current Draft Plan of Subdivision included with this submission is consistent with the description provided in the May 2024 version of the PJR and the conceptual layout that accompanied that submission. Please refer to that document for more details.

Provincial Planning Statement 2024

The Province of Ontario released a new Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) revising some previous policies that were in the former Provincial Policy Statement, incorporating new policies, including some that were previously contained within the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, which itself has now been repealed, with exception to certain sections that are referenced in the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. The general intent of the 2024 PPS policies appears generally consistent with the previous 2020 version of the Provincial Policy Statement, The new 2024 Provincial Planning Statement is to apply to all land use planning decisions after October 20, 2024.

As it is our opinion that the 2024 Provincial Planning Statement is consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement that is analyzed in the May 2024 PJR, the arguments and planning opinion established in the May 2024 PJR remain valid for the this addendum, as will be demonstrated in the examples provided below.

The Vision for the Province of Ontario, is outlined in Chapter 1 of the PPS. The themes and topics in the Vision were present in the previous 2020 version, however, some of the details are new. Most importantly is

statement regarding the Province's goal of constructing at least 1.5 million homes by 2031. This simple statement provides critical guidance regarding how to interpret the policies within the PPS, and can be considered as a directive to the approval authorities to work with developers and builders in order to ensure the housing target it met.

Section 2.1 of the PPS provides new guidance related to growth forecasts, and with the elimination of the Growth Plan, the municipal planning authorities are to set their own growth forecasts, based on data provided by the Ministry of Finance, which can be modified when appropriate. Given that the County of Simcoe Official Plan that is currently in effect is the same that was previously reviewed, and those growth forecasts have not be revised, there is no change to impact this development would have on the Township or County's efforts to meet the established growth targets.

Section 1.1.1 of the 2020 PPS is partly replaced by Section 2.1.6 of the new PPS. Both encourage municipalities to plan for complete communities, by allowing "*range and mix of land uses, housing options...to meet long terms needs*". The proposed development continues to seek approval for a development that provides housing options that are underrepresented in the community of Stayner and Township of Clearview.

Section 1.4 of the 2020 PPS provided specific policies related to housing, and those policies are generally replicated in Section 2.2 of the new PPS. These policies include the following themes that are consistent between both versions of the document:

- A range of housing options to meet current and future needs
- Encourage residential intensification
- Efficient use of land and resources
- Transit supportive development, and prioritizing intensification in proximity of transit-supportive

As noted in the May 2024 PJR update, the Proposed Development consists of townhouse units, apartment units, and single detached units at a density that exceeds the density target established in the County of Simcoe Official Plan and will help balance out the other lower density developments under construction along with the density of the existing community. This higher density development is located along County Road 42, and although public transit is available in Stayner, the current routes do not extend to the Subject Property or adjacent developments. The additional population that will reside in the Proposed Development will improve the viability of a future route expansion and may help bring transit service to the surrounding and existing neighbourhood. Density targets are measured across a wide geographic area, as compared with density limits that apply to a specific parcel or development project. As such, it is to be expected that some developments will exceed the density target, to average out with those projects and existing development that is less than the density target.

Settlement Area policies that were provided in Section 1.1.3 of the 2020 PPS are similar to the new Settlement Area policies of Section 2.3 of the new PPS. These policies continue to direct the "*focus of growth and development*" to settlement areas, and repeat the themes of complete communities, land use efficiency and transit supportive densities. The Proposed Development remains consistent with these policies, and the rationale provided in the May 2024 PJR update is still valid and applicable.

Section 2.4 of the 2024 PPS provides policies for Strategic Growth Areas in Section 2.4. The concept of Strategic Growth Areas is new in this PPS and was not included in the 2020 version. It is generally defined as areas that have been identified by a municipal planning authority where growth and development should

be focused, based on some general guidance provided in the definition of the term. Neither the County of Simcoe nor Clearview Township have identified any strategic growth areas at this time in their Official Plans, however, the Subject Property does meet some of the guidance criteria, such as adjacent to a major road.

The environmental themes previously in Section 1.8.1 of the 2020 PPS are now included in Section 2.9 of the new PPS, however, the newly worded policies are less specific and allow more flexibility. This section continues to seek compact and transit supportive development and the provision of complete communities and the Proposed Development is consistent with these policies.

Given the above examples, and a review of the remaining policies within Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the 2024 PPS, we are of the opinion that the Proposed Development is consistent with the policies related to Building Homes, Sustaining Strong and Competitive Communities, Infrastructure and Facilities, Wise Use and Management of Resources and Protecting Public Health and Safety.

Clearview Township Official Plan

The County of Simcoe approved a new Official Plan for the Township of Clearview on November 26, 2024 with a number of exceptions, primarily related to the 2051 planning horizon that are described in Amendment 7 to the Simcoe County Official Plan that is not yet approved by the Province. Those sections of the Clearview Township Official Plan reflect the current in force Simcoe County Official Plan planning horizon of 2031.

Municipal Official Plans may be subject to the Clergy Principle which was established at the Ontario Municipal Board, and has been clarified by a Divisional Court decision in 2021 which found that it was not a true legal principle but a rather a procedural policy of the LPAT (which was a successor to the OMB, and has since been replaced by the OLT). The essence of the Clergy Principle is that a development application should be evaluated against the policy documents that existed at the time the application was submitted. As such, in light of the Clergy Principle, the new Clearview Official Plan does not apply to these existing applications. However, subsequent to the original Clergy Properties tribunal hearing the OLT (and its predecessors) have refined the applicability of the procedural policy and have indicated that new planning policies can be taken into consideration, but that the Clergy Principle should only be set aside in rare instances.

As such, the new Official Plan of the Township of Clearview should not be applied to the Proposed Development. Despite the Clergy Principle, the Mamta Homes has indicated a willingness to consider the new OP policies. As such, an analysis of the most relevant policies of the 2024 Official Plan are provided below.

Schedule B12 – Land Use Plan Stayner of the new Official Plan continues to designate the Subject Property as Residential, which is consistent with the previous Official Plan.

Tables 1.1 and 2.1 indicate that the target population for Stayner in 2031 is 6,074 persons which represents 52.5% of all growth between 2021 and 2031 for the Township. This projection confirms Stayner as the largest settlement in Clearview and assigns the majority of all growth within the Township to Stayner. The Proposed Development will assist the Township in meeting this target.

Table 1.3 provides further guidance and indicates that more than half of the growth in Stayner is to be in the designated greenfield area. This equates to 480 dwellings out of a total of 768 by 2031. The term

designated greenfield is a carryover from the repealed Growth Plan and is no longer a distinction within the Provincial Planning policy documents, however, it is still described and used in the Clearview Official Plan and is described in Section 2.2 Community Structure as having the same meaning as “designated growth areas” which is a term used in the 2024 PPS.

The Proposed Development will be connected to full municipal services in accordance with Policies 2.2.1.1 and 2.3.1.2, and will be contiguous with Delineated Built Up Area on the north side of Margaret Street in accordance with Policies 2.2.1.2 and 2.3.1.3 of the OP.

Policy 2.3.2.3 provides a minimum density target for designated greenfield (growth) areas of 45 residents and jobs per hectare. This is greater than the minimum density target for the Township as a whole of 32 residents and jobs per hectare as stated in the County of Simcoe Official Plan. This is reflective of the fact that Stayner is an urban area, whereas the Township is predominantly rural with lower densities. As per the calculations in the May 2024 PJR the projected population of the proposed development is 66.6 persons per hectare and will exceed the minimum target. Density targets are not to be treated as limits or maximums, rather they are a metric to guide how the community should develop, and recognize that there are various external influences that could result in a designated greenfield area that has more or less density than the target.

Table 2.3 provides the target distribution of new dwelling units by 2031 and does not appear to match Table 1.3. Table 2.3 indicates that between 2021 and 2031 there are to be 744 new residential units in the designated greenfield (growth) area, whereas Table 1.3 references 480 new dwelling units in the designated greenfield (growth) area within the same time period. Regardless, the Proposed Development will assist the municipality in meeting these targets.

The General Housing Policies in Section 2.4.1 provide the density ranges for low, medium and high density development in Policy 2.4.1.2. There are some differences between these policies and those in Section 4.6.2.3.2 of the former OP. The previous plan did not include a high density residential category which is now provided in the current OP. However, the high density residential category indicates that densities should be in a range between 24 and 30 units per gross hectare, which is a substantial reduction from the previously allowable medium density development policies which permitted development up to 50 units per gross hectare. As noted in the May 2024 PJR, the overall density of the Proposed Development would be 21.3 units per gross hectare, and as such, will comply with the new OP policies for Medium-density residential.

Table 2.4 indicates that the housing mix for Urban Settlement Areas is to be 60% Low-density, 30% Medium-density, and 10% High-density. Policy 2.4.1.6 indicates that these targets are to be measured across all new development, and as such, individual projects are not required to provide this mix. The overall density of the project, as noted above is 21.3 units per gross hectare, and as such, this project will contribute to the target of 30% Medium-density residential for the settlement of Stayner.

A more detailed evaluation of the project density, in a manner consistent with Policy 2.4.1.7 is provided in Table 1: Residential Unit Mix below

Table 1: Residential Unit Mix

	Area (ha)¹	Unit Count	Unit Mix	Density (upgh)
Single Detached	1.36	31	24.2%	22.7
Townhouse	2.03	61	47.7%	30.0
Apartment	1.2 ²	36	28.1%	30.1

The project unit mix is skewed toward higher densities as compared with the overall Urban Settlement Area targets, however, as noted previously, the higher densities and unit mixes for the Proposed Development will compensate and balance out other lower density projects in Stayner.

“2.4.1.11 The Township will cooperate with developers and with the private sector to ensure the provision of the full range of housing options through development agreements, plan of subdivision approvals, and any other such tools that Council has at its disposal.”

The Proposed Development includes higher density dwelling types than generally are available in Stayner, and will ensure that there is a full range of housing options available to the community. As such, it is anticipated that Council should be supportive of the project in accordance with the above policy.

Section 2.4.3 of the Official Plan provides policies related to Affordable Housing. It is currently too early in the development approvals process to determine what the eventual sale price will be for the proposed units. Furthermore, the housing and construction markets in Ontario have experienced challenges over the past few years, introducing additional uncertainty to any effort to predict the cost of future residential dwellings. As such, Mamta Homes is unable to determine if any of the units will meet the affordability criteria. Regardless of this uncertainty, townhouses, apartments and other higher density residential dwellings typically are more cost efficient to construct and will command lower sale prices, and will help address housing affordability concerns, regardless of whether they meet the definition of affordable.

Section 4.2 confirms that *“higher-density forms of residential development”* will be *“directed to Urban Settlement Areas in support of their role as primary centres for activity.”* The Proposed Development includes higher density uses in accordance with this policy.

“4.2.1.1 A full range of residential uses, including a full range of dwelling types and sizes, shall be permitted in the “Residential” designation, so long as the development of such uses generally takes place in accordance with, or in a manner that does not conflict with:

- (a) the population forecasts and related policies set out in Section 2.3.1 of this Official Plan, including the target distribution of population growth shown in Table 2.1;*
- (b) the intensification and density targets established in Section 2.3.2, as well as the policies for residential infilling set out in that section; and*

1 Area calculated as Gross Hectare in accordance with 2.4.1.3 and includes half of the abutting road and adjacent amenity areas.

2 Apartment area includes entirety of hydro easement, excluding any roads within the easement as those are already included in the calculations for Detached or Townhouse dwellings.

- (c) *the housing policies set out in Section 2.4, including the target distribution of new units shown in Table 2.3 and the distribution of density types shown in Table 2.4.*

The policies reference in the above section were discussed previously in this report, and it is my opinion that the Proposed Development conforms with those reference policies, and as such, with the above noted policy.

- “4.2.1.25 In considering the siting of residential development, priority will be given to locations:
(a) where appropriate infrastructure and services already exist; ...”*

As noted in the Functional Servicing Report (FSR) prepared by CAPES Engineering and dated August 27, 2025, the Proposed Development will connect to a future sanitary sewer that will be constructed to the east through a draft approval Plan of Subdivision under related ownership and leading to the existing sewers within the Ashton Meadows development. A watermain is available, adjacent to the Subject Property along Margaret Street. The FSR has proposed that a looped watermain connection be provided, connecting to both Margaret Street and the Ashton Meadows site (through the adjacent draft approved plan of subdivision). As such, it has been demonstrated that the necessary services exist, and any service extension would be through lands under a related ownership and control of the project proponent.

- “4.2.1.26 High-density residential development should be located:
(a) on a site within, or directly abutting, the delineated built-up area in an Urban Settlement Area;
(b) on a parcel where the abutting uses are predominantly other high-density residential uses, medium-density residential uses, or compatible non-residential uses;
(c) within walking distance (approximately 800 metres) of at least one public service facility; and
(d) on a site where existing infrastructure has capacity to support the proposed development, or where infrastructure capable of supporting the development will be provided at the developer’s expense.”*

Margaret Street represents the geographic limit of the delineated built-up area as shown on Schedule B-12 of the Official Plan, and as such, the proposed apartment block 9 at the south end of the Subject Property is not abutting. However, the adjacent existing uses are rural and commercial, and the adjacent proposed use are the medium density townhouses of the Proposed Development. It is surmised that sub-sections (a) and (b) of the above policy are intended to address, in part, land use compatibility and appropriate transitions. As such, despite the proposed apartment uses not abutting the delineated built-up area, the location is suitable due to the limited potential for impact on adjacent land uses.

The proposed apartments are within walking distance of Ives Park, St. Patrick Roman Catholic Church, and Clearview Community Church, all of which are between 700 and 850 m away. There is a park under construction as part of Ashton Meadows, located on the east side of Wilcox Drive that will only be 600 m from the proposed apartments.

The availability of servicing was confirmed previously in this Planning Report.

- “4.2.1.28 Medium-density residential development should be located:*

- (a) *within an Urban Settlement Area or a Community Settlement Area;*
- (b) *on a site within, or directly abutting, an existing built-up area, or that abuts an existing or approved high-density residential development;*
- (c) *within a reasonable distance (approximately one kilometre) of at least one public service facility; and*
- (d) *on a site where existing infrastructure has capacity to support the proposed development, or where infrastructure capable of supporting the development will be provided at the developer's expense."*

The proposed townhouse units are centrally located on the Subject Property, and as such, are within the Urban Settlement Area, and generally abut the existing built-up area on the north side of Margaret Street. Given that the proposed high-density apartment is at the south limit of the Subject Property, the townhouses are marginally closer to the public service facilities mentioned previously in this Planning Report. Also within the reasonable distance of one kilometre is the Township civic centre, and most of the historic commercial strip along Highway 26.

Policy 4.2.1.29 indicates that if a proposed development does not meet the criteria for medium or high density residential development, that an Official Plan Amendment is required. Because 4.2.1.26(a) indicates that high-density residential development should be within the delineated build-up area, it does not fully comply with the location criteria. However, as described at the beginning of this report, the Clergy Principle suggests that a development application should only be required to conform with the policies in place at the time the applications were initially submitted. Accordingly, it is my opinion that an Official Plan Amendment is not required, despite policy 4.2.1.29.

"4.2.1.30 The form, scale, and design of medium-density and high-density residential uses shall be sensitive to the overall character of, and be compatible with, existing uses in the surrounding area."

The proposed apartment building is currently envisioned as being 3 storeys in height, which will not be tall enough to dominate the skyline, thus helping to ensure the compatibility with existing residential uses. Furthermore, the location of the apartment building will not abut any existing residential uses, as the low and medium density uses proposed as part of this development will provide a buffer.

The proposed townhouses will only abut 199 Margaret Street and that property provides a buffer to the nearby existing residential on the north side of Margaret Street. The proposed architectural style of these buildings will blend traditional and contemporary design elements, using traditional materials and contemporary colours. As such, the dwellings will be similar to, but distinctive from the surrounding residential structures. Furthermore, the architectural style is subject to change or refinement during the Site Plan application process. Any potential incompatibility in terms of architectural character should be addressed at that time.

Margaret Street is shown as a Collector Road and County Road 42 shown as a Primary Arterial Road on Schedule G – Transportation System. Providing access to higher order roads as required by Policy 4.2.1.31.

Two parking spaces are provided for each of the townhouse dwellings, plus visitor parking, which will meet the Zoning By-law requirements in accordance with Policy 4.2.1.32. Parking for the apartment building is provided at a rate of 1.61 spaces per dwelling unit, and does not meet the current Zoning By-law

requirements of 2 spaces per residential unit per Section 2.14.2.1 of the By-law. It should be noted that the design, layout, and type of dwellings for the portion of the Subject Property south of the Hydro easement are preliminary and still subject to change. As such, the determination of the appropriate parking rate will be re-examined at the time the plans for this area are finalized. Despite this uncertainty, it is anticipated that the eventual development option for the south portion of the Subject Property will be consistent with the permitted uses and standards of the RS6 zone.

Sidewalks that can provide active transportation connections are proposed for Margaret Street, and along Streets C and D, through the draft approved plan of subdivision to the east in accordance with policy 4.2.1.35.

The design of the detached dwellings will comply policy 4.2.1.36 and ensure that the garage does not dominate the streetscape. Additionally, the design of the townhouse dwellings will provide each unit with direct access to both the front and rear yards in accordance with policy 4.2.1.37.

Schedule C-1 Natural Heritage System Wetlands identifies an unevaluated wetland on the west side of County Road 42 opposite the Subject Property. Policy 5.2.1.6 states that lands within 120 m of a wetland that measures 2 hectares or more are to be considered as adjacent to the wetland. Given that the wetland is not located on the Subject Property, it is not possible to confirm the exact area of this wetland. However, Provincial mapping indicates that this wetland is only 1.36 hectares and as such, the Subject Property would not be considered to be adjacent to a wetland.

Schedule C-2 Natural Heritage System Woodlands indicates that there are two Significant Woodlands on the Subject Property. However, the previous Official Plan did not designate any Greenlands areas on the Subject Property as demonstrated on Schedule A – Map 4 – North Central Land Use and Transportation Map. In accordance with the Clergy Principle, the policies related to the evaluation and possible preservation of these woodlands should not be applicable to the active applications that pre-date the new Official Plan. Furthermore, 5.2.2.2(d)(i) indicates that one of the criteria by which a woodland could be considered significant is if it is 2 ha or larger when it is within a Settlement Area. These supposed woodlands have not been staked on site by the appropriate professionals, and their actual sizes have not been established, however, Schedule C-2 was reviewed with software that can scale and measure graphics. The two polygons that represent the Significant Woodland designation measure just 0.65 ha and 0.85 ha in area, well below the minimum to be considered as significant.

As noted above, there is an unevaluated wetland on the west side of County Road 42 that is on property under unrelated ownership, and as such, a detailed evaluation of that wetland is not possible. Policy 5.2.3.5 requires a minimum 30 m setback from all wetlands. This required minimum setback is provided by the County Road 42 right of way, which is currently 20 m in width, and will be increased to 30 m through the provision of a 10 m widening as part of the Proposed Development. The widening is identified as Block 11 on the accompanying Draft Plan of Subdivision.

Policy 5.3.1.3 suggests that a Hydrological Study should be provided for development within 120 m of a wetland. Although the wetland on the west side of County Road 42 is less than 120 m from the Proposed Development, a Hydrological Study was not deemed to be required for the active Planning Act applications.

A Stormwater Management Report is provided within the Functional Servicing Report prepared by Capes Engineering and dated August 27, 2025, as required by Policy 5.3.1.17 of the Official Plan.

“7.2.1.2 Subject to the policies in this section of the Plan, all development shall be provided with municipal water services and municipal wastewater services wherever such services are available.”

“7.2.2.1 Subject to the policies in this section, all new development occurring in an Urban Settlement Area, including redevelopment and infill development, shall be provided with municipal water services and municipal wastewater services.”

As outlined in detail in the FSR prepared by CAPES, the Proposed Development will be connected to the existing and available water and wastewater infrastructure in the Ashton Meadows development through an interceding, draft plan approved, property under related ownership.

Water conservation measures promoted in Section 7.2.1.9 can be further explored during the detailed design and Site Plan process. At this time it is premature to confirm which measures are feasible or possible for the Proposed Development.

Policies 7.2.1.12 through 7.2.1.14 deal with the extension of municipal services. These policies are not directly applicable to the Proposed Development as the services are not being extended inasmuch as the Proposed Development will be connected to existing and draft approved adjacent services, in a logical fashion, and as previously planned by the Township for the entire settlement area of Stayner.

“7.2.2.2 In areas where the installation or extension of systems or infrastructure for the provision of municipal water services and municipal wastewater services is planned, or where such systems or infrastructure are under construction, the implementing Zoning By-law may apply holding provisions to ensure that development either occurs at an appropriate time or is adequately designed for the eventual provision of services.”

It is acknowledged that a holding zone may be necessary if the Mamta East lands have not yet extended the necessary services to the Subject Property.

The CAPES FSR is provided in accordance with policy 7.2.2.7 and includes a water balance as required by policy 7.2.6.23.

“7.3.2.4 The Township may require that a Stormwater Management Report submitted in support of a development application specifically address and consider the use of LID strategies and design elements in the proposed development and, where such strategies and elements are not used, may require that the report provide justification.”

Low Impact Design measures have yet to be confirmed, and will be considered through the detailed design process. The current soil and groundwater conditions are not conducive to promoting infiltration, however, it is anticipated that the fill required to raise the site grades will allow for improved infiltration sufficiently to meet the NVCA requirement to retain 5 mm of rainfall on site as described in the Stormwater Management Design section of the FSR prepared by CAPES. The FSR also proposes using increased topsoil depth to reduce runoff and peak stormwater flows.

The FSR report prepared by CAPES also includes a Stormwater Management Report in accordance with

Section 7.3.3 of the Official Plan.

- “7.5.3.1 It is the intent of this Official Plan that all new development in the Township will be served by public roads and that, in all circumstances, the public road network will take priority over private roads.”*
- “7.5.3.2 The establishment of new private roads may be permitted for some small-scale forms of condominium development, but such development should incorporate public roads as much as is reasonably possible in order to maintain the overall intent of this Plan.”*

The Proposed Development was designed for private, condominium roads. Due to the relatively narrow configuration of the Subject Property, policies discouraging reverse frontage lots (8.2.2.1(e)), together with the presence of the hydro corridor easement, the inability to create new intersections with County Road 42 (Policies 7.5.3.19 and 7.5.3.23), and the holdout property carving out the north west corner of the site, it was not possible to efficiently layout a development with public roads, due to the additional land requirements associated with the width of public roads as compared with condominium roads. Although this approach is not perfectly aligned with Policy 7.5.3.1 it is a reasonable approach as the Proposed Development is functionally isolated from the rest of the road network in Stayner, and would not attract external through traffic.

A total of 3 connections are proposed to the surrounding road network, and the proposed condominium roads could be generally considered to provide a grid pattern in accordance with Policies 7.5.3.3 and 7.5.3.4 of the Official Plan.

Section 7.5.5 provides policies related to the provision of Public Transit. Although these policies are not directly applicable to development applications, the increased density proposed as part of this development will support the Township’s objective of providing “efficient” public transit services as noted in Policies 7.5.5.1 and 7.5.5.5(c) of the Official Plan.

A robust sidewalk network including several external connections is shown on the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision in accordance with the active transportation policies in Section 7.5.6 of the Official Plan. These sidewalks will be part of the private, condominium common element, and not part of the public right of way, however, as noted above, they will provide a connection for the future condominium residents to access the public active transportation infrastructure.

Policies 7.6.1.5 and 7.6.1.6 encourage the provision of secondary uses within hydro corridors. At this time, no specific uses are proposed for the hydro easement, however, it will provide a substantial amount of passive open space for use by the future residents of this project. Through the detailed design and site plan processes, opportunities for other uses, such as community gardens or additional parking can be explored with Hydro One.

- “8.2.1.10 The Township will ensure that open spaces and areas generally accessible to the public within private developments and condominium developments are designed to be inclusive and integrated into the public realm by obtaining easements for public access and public trails.”*

The open spaces shown on the conceptual site plan are internal to the Proposed Development and are of a sufficiently small scale that they would generally appeal only to the future residents of this development. As

such, it may not be appropriate to provide the easements discussed in the policy above as these spaces would not provide the space or amenities that would draw people from greater distances. However, during the detailed design and Site Plan application process, opportunities for public use and access can be further discussed and explored with Township staff in accordance with the description provided in the introduction to Section 8.2 of the Official Plan.

Although a Plan of Subdivision application has been submitted, it is of a technical nature to allow for the future use of the exemption from part lot control provisions in Section 50(7) of the Planning Act, as described in greater detail in the legal opinion prepared by Andrew Ain and dated December 23, 2025. As such, the policies in Section 8.2.2 related to Subdivision design are not directly applicable, in particular given the lack of public rights of way, and because the detailed design of the Proposed Development, including matters such as, streetscape design, dark sky compliant lighting, architectural control, and grading, will be reviewed under the Site Plan application process.

Notwithstanding the preceding paragraph, there are a number of matters in Section 8.2.2 that will be established through the Plan of Subdivision process, and these are discussed in the following paragraphs.

- “8.2.2.1 New residential neighbourhoods and new development should be designed:*
- (a) to complement the historical pattern of development in the surrounding area;...*
 - (d) to incorporate a range of housing types and an appropriate diversity of land uses;*
 - (e) to avoid the inclusion of reverse-frontage residential lots;*
 - (f) to be integrated with adjacent development and with the transportation network; and*
 - (g) to provide a compact and walkable pattern of streets and blocks, with a grid-like road system that allows for the efficient movement of vehicles and pedestrians.”*

The historic pattern of development for Stayner is the typical street grid layout, although the lands between Christopher Street and Highway 26 are skewed on an angle that is parallel to the former Barrie-Collingwood Railway. The proposed development implements a similar grid pattern to the extent possible given the constrained site area and configuration. An internal sidewalk network is also proposed with external connections to the existing and planned infrastructure surrounding the Subject Property.

As discussed in detail in the original Planning Justification Report, the Proposed Development will incorporate a minimum of 3 different housing types and sizes that will increase the diversity of housing choice in the Township.

Reverse frontage lots are not proposed adjacent to County Road 42.

The draft approved Plan of Subdivision to the east included two stub streets for provide the necessary connection to the planned transportation network, these stub streets will become two of the three access locations for the Proposed Development.

The three proposed access locations exceed the requirements in Policy 8.2.2.8(b) of the Official Plan.

Landscape design policies in Section 8.2.3 will be reviewed and addressed as part of the detailed design

and Site Plan application processes. It is anticipated that the eventual landscape design will conform with these policies.

Similarly Section 8.3.1, which addresses design principles, specifically notes that these matters will be “*applied during site plan control*”.

“11.8.1.1 All residential development shall be by approved plan of subdivision...”

The required Plan of Subdivision application is currently under review by the Township in accordance with the above policy and policy 11.8.1.3 of the Official Plan.

All proposed lots and blocks will have access to a condominium road, which will lead to existing and planned public roads in accordance with Policy 11.8.1.4 of the Official Plan.

Summary

The Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision to facilitate the approval and construction of a residential development containing 31 detached homes, 61 townhomes and 36 multi-family residential units accessed by a common element condominium road has previously been demonstrated to meet the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement 2020, the County of Simcoe Official Plan, and the Township of Clearview Official Plan consolidation dated January 2019. Subsequently the Province released the 2024 Provincial Planning Statement and the Township adopted a new Official Plan, which was then approved by the County of Simcoe. All Planning Act decisions must be consistent with any applicable Provincial Policy in effect at the time the decision is made, and as demonstrated in this addendum to the previous Planning Justification Report, the Proposed Development will provide a range of housing options, will meet current and future needs, will provides residential intensification as encouraged by the PPS, represents an efficient use of land and resources, and with the increased density and location is transit supportive.

As noted previously in this addendum, the Clergy Principle suggests that unless there is a strong reason to do so, any applications that were commenced under a previous set of municipal planning policy documents do not need to conform with new documents that were approved subsequent to the submission of those applications. Notwithstanding this Principle, it has been demonstrated above that the Proposed Development is sympathetic to the historic development patterns in Stayner, provides a range of housing types, and implements an appropriate transition from higher density and more intensive uses to nearby existing residential areas.

It is my Professional Planning Opinion that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision represent good planning and are appropriate for the development of the Subject Property.

Yours Truly,

ROBERT RUSSELL PLANNING CONSULTANTS INC.



Rob Russell, MCIP, RPP
President