

**From:** [planning@grey.ca](mailto:planning@grey.ca)  
**To:** [Southgate Planning](#); [Lindsey Green](#); [Elisha Milne](#)  
**Subject:** County comments for B11 and B12-23 Watson  
**Date:** November 16, 2023 6:40:22 AM

## County comments for B11 and B12-23 Watson

Hello Southgate,

Please note that County staff have reviewed Consent applications B11-23 Trustees of the Old Order Mennonite Conference and B12-23 Watson - Dale and Lynda Watson.

County staff understand that the applicants are proposing to create a new easement across an existing lot (containing the cemetery) and a recently severed lot (not formally registered). The severed portion was proposed to be added to the existing cemetery site through a previous consent application: B13-22. The proposed easement would facilitate access to an existing coverall building on the subject farm property.

The subject lands are designated 'Rural,' Hazard Lands,' and 'Provincially Significant Wetlands' in Schedule A of the County's Official Plan. While the proposed easement would be situated entirely within the 'Rural' designation, the existing coverall building is located fully within the 'Hazard Lands,' and in the adjacent lands of 'Provincially Significant Wetlands.' It is recommended that further comments be provided by the Conservation Authority.

Generally, the County recommends avoiding access easements, to avoid creating future conflict between landowners. Easements may be permitted in cases where they are seeking to correct a planning error of the past. Prior to approval of a lot addition or new lot creation, access considerations should be resolved prior to finalization, rather than through a subsequent easement agreement. County staff would recommend that both parties ensure that they are satisfied that the movement of farm equipment across the proposed easement would not interfere with institutional land uses associated with the new 'Meeting House' and cemetery. Staff would inquire whether the existing driveway on the eastern portion of the proposed institutional lands could be a preferable location for the easement.

The proposal has been reviewed by Planning Ecology staff who have provided the following comments:

*The subject property contains potential 'Habitat of Threatened or Endangered Species', 'Significant Wetlands', 'Other Identified Wetlands', 'Significant Woodlands', 'Significant Wildlife Habitat', potential 'Fish Habitat', and a watercourse. County staff have reviewed the proposal, which includes creating an easement for driveway access. County staff have also reviewed the EIS completed in November 2022 for the subject lands and support the recommended 6m hazard setback from top of slope of the watercourse valley, as well as the 30m setback from wetland community. As the proposed location for the easement is outside of*

*the recommended setback, County staff have no concerns with the proposal. As a proposed mitigation measure, any tree removal required to accommodate the driveway should be compensated at a 2:1 ratio and connected to the existing larger Significant Woodlands feature. Trees should be native species and suitable for the site-specific conditions. Tree removal during breeding bird nesting season from April to September should be avoided.*

County staff would ultimately defer to Southgate for a decision on this matter. Staff would recommend that the applicants ensure that there is sufficient lands available to achieve an adequate development footprint for the proposed meeting house, parking area, etc. outside of the easement area, including any recommended setbacks.

County staff have no further comments at this time. Please note, a paper copy will not be provided unless requested.

Let us know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Becky Hillyer