

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
MUNICIPALITÉ RÉGIONALE D'OTTAWA-CARLETON

REPORT
RAPPORT

Our File/N/Réf. (23) 11-97-0581
Your File/V/Réf.

DATE 3 June 1997

TO/DEST. Co-ordinator, Planning and Environment Committee

FROM/EXP. Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner

SUBJECT/OBJET **SECOND ADDENDUM TO TRANSMITTAL REPORT ON
DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN**

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That Planning and Environment Committee receive the revised proposed Regional Official Plan with the changes contained in Annex A of this report, and the changes contained in the 6 May and 14 May 1997 reports to Planning and Environment Committee;**
- 2. That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council adopt the proposed Regional Official Plan, as amended.**

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to request Committee and Council approval of additional changes to the draft Regional Official Plan. This report should be read in conjunction with the original transmittal report to Committee dated 6 May 1997 and the addendum report to Committee dated 14 May 1997.

BASIS

The recommendations contained in this report arise from submissions heard at the public meetings of 20-22 May 1997 as well as from additional written submissions received between 13 May 1997 and 30 May 1997. In addition, there are a few instances where comments are included from earlier briefs which had been inadvertently omitted from the previous reports.

This report focuses primarily on: new issues raised for the first time at the public meetings or in new written briefs; and on issues raised specifically in response to recommendations contained in the transmittal report. In other words, where issues have already been dealt with in the two

previous reports to Committee and staff prefer the original recommendation, no further discussion is included in this report. For the most part, this report includes only those areas where staff recommend further change to the draft Regional Official Plan. In a few cases, comments are included to clarify matters arising from discussion at Committee.

Where submissions recommend minor wording or editorial changes, staff are making these changes directly in the revised text of the draft plan (distributed along with this report).

Recommendations coming from the 30 May 1997 Transportation Committee meeting on the Transportation Master Plan are not addressed in this report. Instead, a separate report summarising the proposed changes and their effects on the draft Official Plan is included for information as part of the Agenda for the 12, 13, and 16 June 1997 Planning and Environment Committee meeting.

CONTENT OF THE REPORT

Annex A contains staff response and recommendations on new verbal and written briefs, as described above. The format of this report follows the format of the previous reports, describing comments as they relate to individual sections of the draft Official Plan. Each comment is attributed to a submission number, or the name of the individual presenter at the public meeting.

Additional changes to Schedules A-K are noted in the text of this report and should be reviewed in the context of the revised Schedules A-K appended to the 6 May 1997 Transmittal Report.

Annex B includes an index of additional written submissions received since the release of the 14 May 1997 transmittal report up to and including 30 May 1997. In total, 365 written briefs have been received.

Annex C summarises the new changes proposed to Schedules A, B, C2, I, and K.

For convenience, a second draft of the Regional Official Plan has been distributed to Councillors to facilitate deliberation on the Plan. Changes from the first draft may be identified by the italicized text and are based on the recommendations contained in all of the transmittal reports. However, changes to the Glossary, the Monitoring Program, and the margin notes were not all completed in time to be included in the second draft. Copies of this second draft were also distributed to municipalities on June 6th.

CONSULTATION

The extensive public consultation undertaken during the release of the draft Regional Official Plan is described in detail in the original transmittal report of 6 May 1997. In addition, this report responds to additional comments received verbally or in writing since the release of the 14 May 1997 addendum report.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

A separate report on the legal and financial impacts of the draft Regional Official Plan is included in the Agenda of the 12, 13, and 16 June Planning and Environment Committee meeting.

*Approved by
N. Tunnacliffe, MCIP, RPP*

General Comments

747. Ecological Approach to Planning - Dave McNicoll argues that the current process and plan is seriously flawed for a variety of reasons. The fundamental concept behind this argument is that, on a per capita basis, residents of Ottawa-Carleton consume significantly more resources than are provided for in the Draft Plan. For example, “ecological footprint” of an average Canadian is between 4 and 7 ha.(depending on the source). In other words, we each consume resources equivalent to 4 - 7 ha. of land. Following on this assertion, the submission argues that the Draft Plan does not provide any indication of where the resources for 1 million people (up to 7 million hectares of land) will come from. More specific points include:

- the plan does not protect land on a per capita basis;
- the plan does not take a comprehensive view and does not deal with health, education, energy production, etc.;
- there has been inadequate monitoring and assessment of previous and proposed policies ;
- governance issues, environmental advisory committees, and master plan for the environment has not been included; and
- the cumulative impact of projects has not been assessed. (264)

Response - Mr. McNicoll has provided input in a number of forms throughout the process and, while his ideas are complex and challenging, they do raise important issues. RMOC, as an urban centered region, is clearly a net consumer of resources. This is a situation which, even with no population increase, will continue throughout the life of this Official Plan. The challenge becomes one of finding the most effective way to deal with these important issues at this point in time.

One approach which is discussed in this and previous submissions is to reject the current planning process in favor of a model which can:

- address a much broader land base to reflect the ecological footprint;
- take a comprehensive approach to all matters of public policy; and
- include measures to control population growth, rather than relying on projections.

While a planning system with the above characteristics would help address the fundamental problems raised in the submission, it is clearly beyond the current legal framework of land use planning, and beyond the ability of the RMOC as a municipal government.

A second approach involves working within the current land use planning process to both reduce the ecological footprint of residents, and protect the resources and future options that do exist in Ottawa-Carleton. This is the approach which staff have taken to date. It is reflected in the plan (and during the process) through such measures as:

- the criteria for the Regional Development Strategy which explicitly included measures designed to address/reduce per capita impact;
- efforts to promote compact development as a way to reduce consumption and environmental impacts ;

- integrating the land use, transportation and servicing aspects of the planning process;
- the Natural Environment Systems Strategy which accounted for ecological linkages beyond the RMOC, analysis conducted at a Site Region level (Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest - ANSIs), and a framework for watershed planning; and
- including a variety of general policies designed to reduce impacts on water quality, air quality, agricultural operations, tree cover, etc..

Other measures of a corporate nature include water conservation, waste diversion, and greening of regional roads.

In terms of protection of resources, an effort has been made to protect resources within RMOC including:

34,600 ha of environmental lands in no development categories
 41,800 ha of environmental lands in which proposals require environmental scrutiny
 95,000 ha of agricultural resource land
 8,700 ha of aggregate resource land

Additional resources are also provided by uses and areas within the General Rural Area and Open Space designations. Local plans also make a contribution. While this clearly cannot meet the per capita needs in terms of our ecological footprint, it is a reasonable approach given the nature of Ottawa-Carleton as an urban centered region.

In response to some of the more specific concerns:

- A separate Master Plan for the environment has not been produced as an effort has been made to integrate environmental concerns into all aspects of the Plan.
- Monitoring to assess performance will become a more important component of the Plan, and a number of baseline data sets created during the review will help.
- An environmental advisory committee is an option which can be pursued at any time, particularly once direction emerges from an adopted Plan.
- The governance issue is not specifically an issue in land use planning. An effort has been made to promote good planning regardless of the level of approval authority, and design a plan which can function without local Official Plans if necessary.
- Assessing cumulative impact explicitly and precisely on a project by project basis is difficult at best. The preferred approach suggested in most research is to establish a planning process which looks at broad impacts in an integrated fashion, and establishes an effective environmental planning framework. By combining the master planning and Official Planning processes, along with a broad evaluation criteria, an effort has been made to provide this framework. Monitoring is also a critical component and is addressed in more detail in the Transmittal Report.

In conclusion, the submission raises important points which, at a fundamental level, are not addressed by the Draft Official Plan. However, the options involve either putting significant time and resources into an effort to fundamentally restructure the planning process (with an uncertain outcome), or doing our best today to move in the right direction. Mr. McNicoll's work has helped to present the issues, and staff feel that the Draft Regional Official Plan moves us in the right direction, albeit within the current legal, fiscal and social frameworks.

Recommendation - No specific change

748. LeBreton Flats - Staff note that the Regional Official Plan Amendment for LeBreton Flats was referred back to Planning and Environment Committee at the 28 May 1997 Council meeting. Also see recommendation 676.

Response: Proposed changes noted in recommendations 114, 306, 658, and changes to Schedule C1 and C2 should be deleted. Appropriate inclusions in the new Regional Official Plan will be added once Amendment 66 is approved by Council.

Recommendation: Delete recommendations 114, 306, and 658 relating to LeBreton Flats and changes to Schedule C1 and C2 relating to LeBreton Flats.

Comments on Section 1: A User's Guide to the Regional Official Plan

749. Section 1.5, Interpretation - The City of Ottawa commented on recommendation #3, suggesting that the phrase "influence municipalities and other agencies" was too strong. They prefer using the phrase "guide municipalities and other agencies.."

Response - Staff agree to the proposal.

Recommendation - Change the last paragraph of Section 1.5 as proposed in recommendation #3 by replacing the phrase "influence municipalities and..." with "guide municipalities and..."

750. Section 1.6, policy 4 - A suggestion to permit wireless telecommunication facilities in Agricultural Resource Areas was not agreed to in recommendation #23. On 21 May 1997, Allison Platt made a presentation to Committee to further explain why such a request is appropriate. (160)

Response - As a result of Ms. Platt's presentation, staff agree to change the draft Regional Official Plan and change the original recommendation.

Recommendation - Include a new policy 4 of Section 1.6 : "Wireless telecommunication towers are permitted in all land use designations on Schedules A and B, except in Natural Environment Areas, Provincially Significant Wetlands, Sand and Gravel and Limestone Resource Areas, or in Flood Plains and Unstable Slopes shown on Schedule G subject to the provisions of policies 5a) - d) below." Renumber policies 4 - 15 accordingly.

Comments on Section 2: Regional Development Strategy

751. Study of Corel Centre Lands - A number of presentations at the public meetings focused on the need for a study around the Corel Centre, citing the uniqueness of the location and the importance of the investment at the interchange. This was not supported by staff originally (see recommendation #36). (83, 167, 212, 156, Fotenn, Essiambre).

Response - Following presentations by the Townships of Goulbourn and West Carleton, representatives of Terrace Corporation, and representatives of property owners in the vicinity, staff agree that a study of opportunities for non-residential development would be appropriate. Staff do not agree that the draft Regional Official Plan needs to be changed. Instead, staff could a draft Terms of Reference for an economic development study to address, among other things:

- boundaries of the study area
- components of the study, focusing on non-residential development opportunities
- alternative locations in RMOC for proposed new land uses
- participants in the Study.

Recommendation - **No change to the draft Regional Official Plan; however staff propose to prepare a Terms of Reference for an economic development study of the lands around the Corel Centre and submit these Terms of Reference to Committee and Council.**

752. Section 2.4.1, policy 9 - Staff note that Amendment 15 to the Regional Official Plan (1988) permits residential development on private individual services within the Urban Area on part Lot 10 Conc. 1 (Rideau Front) Gloucester.

Response - The policy should be amended to add the site specific exception. It was omitted in error.

Recommendation - **Add to the end of policy 9 of Section 2.4:**

“Notwithstanding this policy, residential development consisting of single detached dwellings on private individual services will be permitted on Part Lot 10 Conc.1 (Rideau Front), City of Gloucester designated as lot 36, Registrar’s Compiled Plan No. 904.”

Comments on Section 3: Community and the Built Environment

753. Section 3 (Introduction) - Ottawalk made a presentation at Committee commenting on the need to describe “community” in terms of walking-scale characteristics; specifically as a neighbourhood unit with schools children can walk to. Specific reference is made to recommendations #82 and #88. (142)

Response - Staff agree that this could be included in the concept of community. The appropriate place to include this would be in the introductory comments to Section 3.

Recommendation - **Change the fifth sentence of paragraph 1 of Section 3 to read: “A community is also a social space where residents can develop a sense of belonging and responsibility, and where children have the opportunity to walk to a neighbourhood school.”**

754. Section 3.1, Objective 4 - Ottawalk has re-iterated the comment discussed in item # 86. (142)

Response - Agree that the proposed wording provides a clearer statement of the objective.

Recommendation - Change new Objective 4 by replacing the words “reduce the need to travel” with the words “reduce the length of trips”.

755. Section 3.2, Policy 6 d) - Ms. Smith requested a definition of “reverse lotting”. (350)

Response - Staff agree to add a definition to the Glossary.

Recommendation - Add the following definition to the Glossary: “Reverse lotting: a development backing onto, but with no access to, a street”.

756. Section 3.2, Policy 13-- A submission (350) asks for clarification in the application of policy 13 e) of Section 3.2 referring to the layout of roads and development to provide opportunity for south-facing windows, and policy 4 in Section 6.11 regarding orienting buildings and roads to parallel topographic contours.

Response -- In Policy 13 e), Section 3.2 Council shall “ensure”, while in Policy 4, Section 6.11 Council shall “encourage”. This means the former policy has precedence over the latter. Further, in good development planning, both solar orientation and landform preservation can be adequately addressed.

Recommendation -- No change.

757. Section 3.3.2, policy 9 - David Kardish, on behalf of The Regional Group, responded to recommendation #108 in the transmittal report on condominium conversion. He proposed instead of “lifetime security for tenants” that security of tenure be decided on the basis of a formula tied to the vacancy rate: 3 years security when the vacancy rate is less than 4%; 2 years’ security when the rate is less than 5%.

Response - Staff’s original response is still valid, in that the Province’s proposed Tenant Protection Legislation guarantees lifetime security to sitting tenants of units converted to condominium. Also, the policy is one of “encouraging municipalities” not “requiring”. It is meant as a guideline.

Recommendation - No change.

758. Section 3.4.2, policy 2 - The City of Ottawa commented in their presentation that reference should be made to the local Official Plan to clarify the meaning of “visual integrity” and the notion of acceptable “heights” in the Central Area.

Response - Staff agree that further clarification is warranted.

Recommendation - Change policy 2 of Section 3.4.2 by adding the words: “In support of the local Official Plan,” at the beginning of the sentence.

759. Section 3.6, new policy - The Township of Goulbourn presented a new request to Committee to extend the urban boundary of Stittsville to accommodate a recreational complex and high school. Approximately 20 ha of land south of the former CPR right-of-way and east of the present urban boundary are proposed for redesignation to General Urban. This area is included in part of the draft Official Plan Amendment 69 (Davidson).

Response - Staff agree with Goulbourn. (A more complete discussion of this issue may be found in the separate report to Committee on Draft Official Plan Amendments 51 and 69).

Recommendation - Amend Schedules A and B to include 20 ha of land south of the former CPR right-of-way and east of the present urban boundary, Township of Goulbourn, in the General Urban Area; and change Section 3.6 by adding a new policy 2:

“2. Notwithstanding the uses permitted in policy 1 of Section 3.6, limit the uses of the lands designated General Urban in the north part of the north half of Lot 25, Concession 10, Township of Goulbourn, located immediately south of the former CPR right-of-way, to a recreational facility, a high school, or other institutional uses. The General Urban designation of these lands is subject to studies which provide sufficient soils and engineering information to indicate that, although the site is identified as organic soils on Schedule G, it is suitable or can be made suitable for development of a recreation facility, a high school, or other institutional uses.”

760. Section 3.7.3, policy 1 - In addition to a number of written briefs as noted in the discussion on recommendation #149, Mr. Delahunt made a presentation at Committee requesting that Village boundaries be rounded out in a way to make them less precise.

Response - The revised text proposed in recommendation #149 was intended to address this, but given that the concern remains, staff agree to denote Villages on Schedule A in a less precise manner. However, staff do not propose to replace boundaries with the use of a symbol. It is useful to generally identify the extent of Villages.

Recommendation - Change Schedule A by redrawing the boundaries of Villages in a way which is less precise.

761. Section 3.7.4 - An issue was raised on how to prevent conflicts for farmers in General Rural Areas. A representative from the March Rural Association raised the issue of the “right to farm.”

Response - Staff agreed to provide information to Councillors on provincial “Right to Farm” legislation. This will be circulated under separate cover.

Recommendation - No change

Changes to Schedule B

762. Cité Collégiale, Museum of Science and Technology, Museum of Nature, Aviation Museum - FCA, the City of Ottawa, and others commented on the appropriateness of designating these facilities as Major Community Facilities.

Response - Staff agree.

Recommendation - Designate the following as Major Community Facilities on Schedule B: Cité Collégiale, Museum of Science and Technology, Museum of Nature, Aviation Museum.

Errors, Omissions and Clarifications in Section 3

763. Interpretation of Central Area Boundaries - The City of Ottawa expressed concern about the response in Item #113 c) which stated that “Policies for the Central Area apply to both sides of the road boundaries.” They treat the exterior boundaries of the Central Area as firm boundaries.

Response - The earlier response was poorly phrased. The boundaries of the Central Area are described in Section 3.4 and shown on Schedule B and are firm boundaries. The earlier response should have said that the Region in the operation and reconstruction of roads which are Central Area boundaries will treat the entire road as a Central Area road in terms of its character.

Recommendation - No change.

Comments on Section 4: Economic Activity

764. Section 4.7.3. a) Please confirm that the Barrhaven Town Centre will be permitted to expand before any regional-scale retail facility in the Town Centre reaches 50,000 sq m. Can retail in the Town Centre be phased? Does the Plan protect retail in the Town Centres by limiting it in Business Parks? (362)

Response - The definition of Regional-scale retail refers to regional facilities as *planned as a unit and which may include free-standing buildings and other forms of retail development*, among other characteristics. The Barrhaven Town Centre expansion as well as other proposed retail in the Activity Centre (Town Centre) of the South Urban Centre (SUC) meet this definition in that they are the subject of a local official plan amendment and secondary plan. Together, these facilities constitute the regional-scale retail facility in the SUC of Nepean. Phasing of development within the Town Centre is not a Regional Official Plan matter. The plan protects retail in the Town Centres by permitting retail development of 10,000 sq m or more elsewhere in the Urban Centre (i.e., Nepean, Kanata, Orléans) only when the retail in the Town Centre is developed to 50,000 sq m. No reference is made to land in Business Parks.

Recommendation - No change

765. Section 4.7.3, policy 6. Janet Bradley, acting on behalf of St. Laurent Shopping Centre, requested consideration of an increase in the gross leasable area for the Centre to accommodate entertainment uses in the basement.

Response - The definition of “gross leasable area” proposed in the draft Official Plan would result in the St. Laurent Shopping Centre already exceeding the 77,000 square metre limitation for this regional shopping centre, as set out in Table 8. This situation is primarily because of basement space which, over the last few years, has been converted to recreational and entertainment type uses, such as a nautilus centre, a Cyberdome place of amusement and movie theatres. Staff are exploring various alternatives to address this concern which requires consultation with a number of parties.

Recommendation - Staff will provide a recommendation no later than 12 June 97.

Changes to Schedule B

766. Change small areas north of Cyrville Primary Employment Centre and south of Ogilvie Road from Business Park to General Urban Area.

767. Business Park - The City of Ottawa requested that Morrison Drive and Queensview Drive be shown as Business Parks. (109)

Response - Business Parks are shown in the Regional Official Plan if they have the potential to accommodate at least 2000 jobs. Smaller business parks are permitted in the General Urban Area designation. Queensview Drive has the potential for at least 2000 jobs; Morrison Drive is smaller in area and has less potential.

Recommendation - Change Schedule B to designate the area immediately north and south of Queensview Drive as Business Park.

Errors, Omissions and Clarifications in Section 4

768. Section 4.7.3 Policy 1 b) The second line of the definition refers only to built form and not use.

Recommendation - Change policy 1b) of Section 4.7.3 by deleting the word “retail” in the second line before the word “development”.

Comments on Section 5: Natural Environment

769. Section 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 - Lois Smith noted that Chapter 6 indicated that public access to waterfront land was to be addressed in Watershed and Sub-Watershed plans but no reference is made to this in the relevant sections in Chapter 5.(350)

Response - Agree that a cross-reference is appropriate.

Recommendation - Add the phrase “and public access as per Section 6.3” to Section 5.3.1, Policy 3 b) and Section 5.3.2, Policy 4 b).

770. Section 5.4.2, Policy 3e) - Mr. Balys suggested that a more specific reference be made to the General Rural designation.

Response - Agree

Recommendation - Change new Section 5.4.2, policy 3e) by replacing the phrase “in the rural area” with “in the General Rural Area”; and adding “of Section 3.7.4” after the word “requirements”.

771. Section 5.4.3 - Environmental Features - Several presenters suggested some wording modifications to clarify:

- that severances do not require an EIS,
- the meaning of the word “may” in Policy 1
- the meaning of non-residential uses (e.g. shouldn’t include forest management/nature interpretation, etc.)

Response - Agree that some clarification is appropriate.

Recommendation - Revise Section 5.4.3 to read as follows:

“5.4.3. Environmental Features

1. Council shall:

- 2. Protect significant environmental features and functions in addition to Natural Environment Areas A and B and Provincially Significant Wetlands by applying policies 2 and 3 below in areas which are shown as Environmental Features on Schedule K. These include:**
 - a) woodlands that are uncommon or large, high quality examples of more common woodlands;**
 - b) areas that contribute to the overall diversity of a natural area;**
 - c) areas that support endangered, threatened, or rare species;**
 - d) areas that support hydrological functions such as springs, seeps and recharge areas; and**
 - e) areas that have significant wildlife and fish habitat.**

3. **Require all applications for plans of subdivision, multiple unit development as per Section 3.7.4, Policy b) or non-residential use as per Section 3.7.4, policy 1, c) through h), within areas identified as having Environmental Features to demonstrate that the development will not have, or will be able to mitigate, any adverse impact on significant features and functions in the area. This will generally occur through the completion of an Environmental Impact Statement as per Section 5.4.4. Residential severances are exempt from this requirement but must conform to the policies for country lot severances in General Rural Areas in Section 3.7.4.**
4. **Recognise that the boundaries of the Environmental Features overlay are general in nature. Within the areas of Environmental Features, there will be a range of environmental significance. The Environmental Impact Statement process as outlined in Section 5.4.4 will recognise this through provisions for scoped impact statements. The boundaries of the Environmental Features overlay may be interpreted based on a preliminary field examination by the RMOC staff or their delegate, or through additional comprehensive studies such as sub-watershed plans, without amendment to this Plan.”**

Changes to Schedule A

772. West Carleton, Conc.5 (Torbolton), Pt. Lot 19 - Concerned with inclusion in the Natural Environment B area which is based on the provincial ANSI boundary (Smith, 32).

Response - Staff have now had a response from the Ministry of Natural Resources who have reviewed the report submitted by Mr. Smith. The Ministry has indicated that they do not consider a change in the boundary to be appropriate. While the primary values in the Constance Bay area relate to the higher and drier open sand hills, other vegetation types included within ANSI boundaries add considerably to the diversity and ecological integrity of the site. They recommend that the area remain within the ANSI and that proposed development proceed under the policies provided in the Provincial Policy Statement.

Staff recommend that the area remain in the Natural Environment B designation. A proposed estate development could be permitted subject to the appropriate environmental studies.

Recommendation - No change

Changes to Schedule B

773. MacKay Lake - Rockcliffe Park Council is concerned that the Natural Environment A designation appears to go beyond the surface of MacKay Lake to include private lands. (346)

Response - The limits of the designation are meant to reflect the surface of the lake and the public lands maintained as conservation area.

Recommendation - Revise the Natural Environment A Area on Schedule B and the Urban Open Space area on Schedule I to reflect public land ownership and the surface of MacKay Lake and the pond area.

774. Kanata, Conc.3, Lot 9 - Minto Developments has requested that their lands in the Kanata North Business Park area be designated General Urban or Natural Environment (B) rather than Natural Environment (A). (323)

Response - This land is currently designated Natural Environment Area in the Regional Official Plan. This designation is a continuation of a larger area previously owned by Genstar and shown as natural environment in the planning for the Marchwood-Lakeside Community (the submission comments that the land was erroneously included within the designations applied to the Genstar area). A Local Official Plan Amendment application has been filed with Kanata which includes a proposal for townhouse development and natural environment lands.

There are a number of land use issues surrounding this site. An overall development concept has not been finalised and Kanata has not approved the amendment application. While an environmental report submitted by Minto indicates that portions of the site do not contain significant environmental features, this report has only just been received and there has not been an opportunity to conduct a complete review (previous work in the area by Dan Brunton for the Kanata Lakes Area for Genstar and the City suggested that this area be included in the natural environment designation). Given the need to resolve these issues, staff are not prepared to recommend a change in designation at this time.

Recommendation - No change

Changes to Schedule K

As a result of the presentations and subsequent submissions, staff are recommending some revisions to Schedule K as follows:

775. West Carleton (Huntley), Conc.6, Lots 1 and 2 - An adjustment was recommended in the transmittal report (recommendation #273). However, the owner has argued that the remainder of the property is subject to a development concept and that the Draft Approvals issued to date, in particular a second access route to the development, are contingent upon the overall development concept. (Rampton, 21)

Response - Upon further review of the file, staff concur. Design with nature provisions and tree saving will continue to apply.

Recommendation - Delete the remainder of Lots 1, 2 and 3, Concession 6, West Carleton (Huntley) from the Environmental Features overlay on Schedule K.

776. West Carleton (Huntley), Conc.6, Lot 16 and 17 - Concerned with extent of Environmental Feature designation. Natural area was ranked as barely moderate. (49)

Response - Based on a further site visit, an adjustment in Schedule K to remove cleared areas and area with recently approved severances along the concession roads is appropriate.

Recommendation - Revise the Environmental Feature overlay on Schedule K to exclude the cleared and developed areas along the Concession road through lots 16 and 17, Conc.6 (Huntley), West Carleton.

777. Goulbourn, Conc.2., Lot 22- Concerned with area designated on Schedule K. (255)

Response - Refining the overlay to exclude a portion of the lands currently supporting a house and some cleared area is appropriate.

Recommendation - Revise the Environmental Features overlay on Schedule K to exclude the east half of Lot 22, Conc.2, Goulbourn.

778. Goulbourn, Conc.2, Lot 21 - Recommendation 266 in the Transmittal Report recommends an adjustment to remove an area with a draft approved plan of subdivision. Submission 351 suggests some additional modification to Schedule K. (351)

Response - Staff are recommending a minor modification which reflects the vegetation unit, but continues to maintain an overlay on the area adjacent to the Jock River.

Recommendation - Revise Schedule K in Conc.2, Lot 21, Goulbourn to shift the overlay approximately 150m south.

779. Kanata, Conc.7 and 8, Lot 26 - Concerned that a Registered Plan of Subdivision is included within the Overlay designation on Schedule K. (Kruyne, 126)

Response - Agree.

Recommendation - Remove Lot 26, Conc. 7 and 8, Kanata, from the Environmental Features overlay on Schedule K.

780. Goulbourn, Conc.2, Lots 9 and 10 - This submission generally objects to Schedule K. In the presentation, some concern was also expressed that an area of pasture had been included within the Environmental Feature overlay. (Langley, 26)

Response - Agree to remove pasture areas.

Recommendation - Revise the Environmental Features overlay in Schedule K, Conc.2, Lots 9 and 10, Goulbourn, to exclude cleared pasture areas.

Errors, Omissions, and Clarifications in Section 5

781. Section 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 - As a result of dealing with several applications involving developments requiring local official plan amendments such as LeBreton Flats, some clarification is suggested in these two policies dealing with sub-watershed and site management plans.

Recommendation - Revise the first sentence of Section 5.3.2, Policy 3b) to read “prior to considering Regional or local Official Plan Amendments which provide for new development or redevelopment areas, or subdivisions in locations which are largely undeveloped, ...”.

Add the following policy as Section 5.3.3, Policy 3:

“Require area municipalities to provide policies in local Official Plans to address Policy 2 above when reviewing site plans.”

Comments on Section 6: Regional Open Space and Cultural Heritage

782. New Section 6.4, Urban Open Space (recommendation #344). - Several submissions, including the City of Ottawa, suggested that the draft Official Plan Section 6, Regional Open Space and Cultural Heritage, should refer to the City of Ottawa Greenway System. (243, 109, 202, 310)

Response -- The Regional Official Plan could refer to the City of Ottawa Greenway System, in the introduction of the Urban Open Space sub-section 6.5 (recommended in item 344) as an example of locally identified elements which provide linkages and continuity in open spaces in the urban area.

Recommendation -- In the introduction to the new Urban Open Space Section 6.4, as proposed by recommendation #344, add: “such as those identified in the City of Ottawa Greenway System.” after: “Other smaller corridors and local parks not shown on Schedule I”.

783. New Section 6.4, Policy 2 (recommendation #344) - Several presenters expressed concern for the process to refine the boundaries of Urban Open Spaces. (243, 310)

Response -- Area municipalities should be the only agency able to make minor revisions to the boundaries of Urban Open Spaces without requiring a Regional Official Plan Amendment. This is especially important for the Urban Open Spaces designated in the emerging urban centres beyond the Greenbelt where detail planning has started, and where the limits of designations are very general and significant refinement is needed to prepare for community development. When refining the boundaries of Urban Open Spaces, municipalities should be able to draw upon the findings of various studies, such as their own studies (for example the City of Ottawa NOSS study), or those such as sub-watershed studies by conservation authorities, or provincial and federal environmental studies and assessments.

Recommendation: -- Revise new Section 6.4, policy 2 (Urban Open Space) by replacing: “The boundaries of Urban Open Space may be refined in the context of studies by area

municipalities or other agencies . . .” with: “Area municipalities may make minor revisions to the boundaries of lands designated Urban Open Space, based on their studies or on those of other agencies . . .”

784. New policy, Section 6.4, Urban Open Space - City of Ottawa staff noted that an item in their initial submission which suggested polices in support of encouraging area municipalities to identify and protect green corridors was not fully addressed (109)

Response -- Including policies encouraging area municipalities to identify local open and greenspaces linkages would provide several benefits. It would address remarks in the introduction of the Urban Open Space Designation (Section 6.4), and make the Region’s support for these local initiatives more explicit without necessitating inclusion of these links as a designation in the Regional Official Plan. This would also allow the area municipalities to identify and develop these linkages based on their own locally relevant criteria while integrating into an overall system.

Recommendation -- Insert a new policy 4 in Urban Open Space, Section 6.4:

“4. Encourage municipalities to include policies in local Official Plans to identify, conserve, and restore additional green and open corridors to link open spaces, public lands, and natural areas.”

785. New Section 6.5, Policy 3 - Waterfront Open Space (recommendation #367)-

In an accompanying written brief to their presentation, City of Ottawa staff was concerned that the policy as written would preclude recreation buildings from Waterfront Open Space.

Response - The choice of "open air recreation" is intentional. The intent of the policy is not to exclude to park pavilions, canteens and field houses, which contribute to the use and enjoyment of the waterfront. Rather the policy is intended not to allow large scale buildings, including indoor recreation facilities such as hockey arenas, and pools, which would significantly alter the site or its open air uses. The policy could be revised to ensure that smaller facilities are clearly permitted by revising 3 e) to refer to “small scale recreational facilities,” commercial activities and institutional uses.

Recommendation -- Revise Section 6.5, policy 3e) by adding: “small scale recreational facilities,” at the beginning of the phrase; and by adding the phrase “but do not detract from,” after “or are ancillary to..”.

Changes to Schedule I

786. Inclusion of City of Ottawa Greenway System in Regional Official Plan - Some presenters noted that some elements in the City of Ottawa Greenway System were not included in Schedules of the draft Regional Official Plan. In particular, Elmhurst Woods (in Elmhurst Park and Frank Ryan Park) is a local-ESA and was recommended to be identified on a schedule in the

Regional Official Plan. (243, 109) City of Ottawa Council requested the inclusion of the entire City of Ottawa Greenway System in the Regional Official Plan. (109)

Response -- The basis of the Region’s approach is to co-ordinate and contribute to the efforts of the area municipalities, ensuring that a coherent system which supports the continuity of recreational and natural environmental functions is created. The Regional Official Plan policies address such aspects as public land acquisition and management, and recreational pathway development.

The components of the regional open space system include policies for urban open space, river corridors, recreational pathways and scenic routes which build upon existing Official Plan policies and on the overall direction taken by the majority of area municipalities and other agencies. Staff from other area municipalities have expressed concern that the policies should support local efforts and not duplicate areas of local jurisdiction.

Nevertheless, based on public and agency comments, many policies in Sections 5 and 6 of the draft Official Plan have been enhanced to address open space, and natural environment issues in the urban area. These are addressed by recommendations #344, 360, 361, and 383.

One component of the City’s Greenway System which could be included in the Regional Official Plan is Elmhurst Woods (Frank Ryan Park, Elmhurst Park). It is the only publicly-owned Environmentally Sensitive Area designated in Ottawa’s Official Plan which has not been identified in the draft Regional Official Plan as open space or natural environment area. This area does not have the attributes to be designated “Natural Environment Area A” but should be designated as Urban Open Space on Schedule I.

Recommendation: On Schedule I, designate Frank Ryan Park and Elmhurst Park located north of the Queensway and west of the Pinecrest Creek Corridor as Urban Open Space.

Errors, Omissions and Clarifications in Section 6

787. Section 6.1, Objectives - Modifications to the policies for Recreational Pathways to include references to their corridors, should be reflected in the Objectives. This would ensure that the policies are not considered to be limited to just the recreational pathway travel surface area.

Recommendation -- Change Section 6.1, Objective 5, by inserting the word “corridors” after “recreational pathway”.

788. Section 6.2, policy 6 - Clarification is needed with regard to the Airport and its location within the Greenbelt.

Recommendation - Change policy 6 of Section 6.2 by adding the following phrase at the end of the sentence: “consistent with the objectives of this Section for the Greenbelt.”

789. New Section 6.5, policy 3, Waterfront Open Space, Recommendation #367 - Many areas designated Waterfront Open Space include scenic routes or the potential for scenic routes. This use was inadvertently omitted from the list of permitted activities and uses in Section 6.5.

Recommendation - Add a new subsection 3f) to Section 6.5, Waterfront Open Space to read: “Scenic Routes”.

790. New Section 6.7, River Corridors, Recommendation #361 - The proposed rewording regarding uses “not associated with the river” in fact makes the policy more confusing, rather than adding clarification.

Recommendation - Delete Recommendation 361 b).

791. Schedule B - The southern boundary of the Greenbelt Employment area for Nortel west of Moodie Drive is incorrect.

Recommendation - On Schedule B, move the southern boundary of the Nortel Greenbelt Employment area west of Moodie Drive to approximately midway between the eastern entrances to Moodie Drive from the school and the Nortel facility on Corkstown.

Comments on Section 7: Agriculture

792. Section 7.2 Policy 1 - Staff from Osgoode Township commented at the public meeting that the range of permitted uses is too restrictive and the policy should be modified to include such uses as bed and breakfasts and other secondary uses that are appropriate in the Agricultural Resource Area.

Response - Agree that secondary uses should be included as permitted uses within the Agricultural Resource Area designation.

Recommendation - Add a new policy d) to Section 7.2:

“d) secondary uses to the principal use of the property that are compatible with, and will not adversely affect, surrounding agricultural operations. Secondary uses include home occupations, home industries, and uses that produce value added agricultural products.

Section 7.2 policy 1 d), e), f), g) and h) be renumbered policies 1 e), f), g), h), and i).”

Changes to Schedule A

793. Gloucester Conc. B.F. Lots 26, 28 ,29 - At the public meeting Mr Booth and Mr Keenan submitted an agricultural survey in support of a request to change the designation from Agricultural Resource Area to a designation that would permit development. The conclusion of the report is that the soil classification for the properties (Class 2 according to the Ontario Institute of Pedology maps) is not correct and that the properties have a soil capability of 3, 4 & 5, with Class 4 being predominant. The LEAR scores for the properties were recalculated based on this information. The results of the LEAR, based on the revised soils information, indicate that the properties have poor agricultural potential. (358)

Response - The report was sent to the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) for review on May 23. The Ministry has been asked to confirm the accuracy of the results of the report. It is recommended that the property continue to be designated Agricultural Resource Area . Once a response is received from OMAFRA, staff will report back to the Planning and Environment Committee with a recommendation on the appropriate designation of the property.

Recommendation - No change to the Agricultural Resource Area designation.

794. Gloucester, Conc. B.F., Lot 27 - The owners (Fine's Flowers) are opposed to the Agricultural Resource Area designation and request that the lands be designated General Rural Area. An application (Amendment 64) was made in 1996 to amend the Regional Official Plan (1988) to change the designation of the property from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area. The application was refused by Council and it has been referred to the Ontario Municipal Board. We have asked the Board to allow us to undertake further agricultural studies of the subject property prior to their scheduling a hearing date. (362)

Response - The property is adjacent to the area owned by Mr. Booth and Mr. Keenan who are also requesting that the Agricultural Resource Area designation of the area be changed. The designation of this property will be considered in conjunction with the recommendation for Booth and Keenan, above.

Recommendation - No change to the Agricultural Resource Area designation.

795. Osgoode, Conc. 2, N 1/2 lot 33 - The owner has serious concerns regarding the lands surrounding Osgoode Village particularly to the east and the south. The supply of land in Osgoode village is depleting quickly, necessitating more land to be re-zoned accordingly.

His concerns are the following:

- 1) Why did your committee request Agricultural soil capability review of lands to the south of Osgoode and not the lands to the east?
- 2) It is my observation that the lands to the east are being farmed extensively and it was your observation that lands commencing from lot 39 and on southerly are being farmed extensively. On merely observation on could re-zone lots 32 - 39 south of the village for future growth.
- 3) The OMAFRA re-evaluation of the lands stated that due to improved tile drainage surrounding the Osgoode area, soil capability improved by one grade for instance a 5 to a 4 south of Osgoode Village. Would it not stand to reason that the same would apply east of Osgoode Village (from grade 4 to 3). So why is the land to the east of Osgoode being zoned Rural and not agricultural? (82)

Response - The Osgoode Official Plan provides for 3,500 additional dwelling units to be located in Villages to the end of the planning period (the year 2010). The Osgoode Official Plan designates sufficient land to accommodate the growth anticipated in villages to the year 2010. Staff requested that OMAFRA review the soil capability ratings south of Osgoode village because the area in question had Class 4 & 5 soils according to the Ontario Institute of Pedology maps. According to the soil classification definition class 5 soil has "very severe limitation or combination of lesser limitations which restrict their capability to producing perennial forage

crops; improvement practices are not feasible”. Field investigation of the area last summer revealed that corn and soybeans were the main crops being grown in the area. Staff wanted to verify the soil capability of the area that was being proposed for designation as Agricultural Resource Area. The lands east of Osgoode village also have a soil capability rating of Class 4 and 5. While there is some agricultural activity on those lands, much of the area is forested and with abandoned sand and gravel pits in the area. The soil capability information seems to be consistent with the type of land use that is occurring in the area.

Recommendation - No change to the Agricultural Resource Area designation.

796. Rideau, Conc. 3 Lot 16 (North Gower) - The property does not meet the criteria for designation as Agricultural Resource Area. 1) the soil capability for agriculture is class 5, 2) the land is not farmed there is an existing dwelling on the property, 3) the property is 8.5 acres is too small to support a viable operation. 4) there are no conflicts with agriculture; a hardwood bush to the north, a trailer storage yard to the south, a tree line and berm to the west and to the east is Regional Rd 73 with country lot subdivision (.8 ha lots) on the other side. The property is just north of the North Gower Village boundary and would not conflict with agriculture. Now is the time to properly designate the property rather than an exercise of time and expense later on. (185)

Response - Staff met with Mr Smith to discuss his concerns. The property is located within a pocket of Class 5 soils that is too small (approximately 22 ha) to be considered for designation as General Rural Area in the Official Plan. The pocket of poor soils is within a larger area where Class 2 soils and agricultural uses predominate. The area would meet the draft Official Plan criteria to be designated in the local Official Plan as a poor pocket. The difficulty is that Mr. Smith’s property is 3.4 ha in size and because the minimum lot size permitted within poor pockets is 2 ha, no further severances would be permitted on the property. Also the frontage for the property is on Regional Road 73 and severances on Regional Roads are discouraged. Mr. Smith did suggest that it may be possible to assemble lands within the poor pocket in order to have enough land to meet the minimum lot size requirement and provide frontage on a local road. This would be permitted under the poor pockets policy within the Agricultural Resource Area designation. Mr Smith does not favour this option and feels that the General Rural Area designation is the one that is the most appropriate for the area.

Recommendation - No change to the Agricultural Resource Area designation.

797. Osgoode, Conc. 1 E 1/2 Lot 35 - Would like to offer strong support for the redesignation of the property from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural. The land has poor soil structure, cannot be used for crops and is mostly trees. (357)

Response - The area was designated General Rural Area in the draft Official Plan. The designation for the area being recommended in the Transmittal Report (see Recommendation 451) is Agricultural Resource Area due to a re-evaluation of the soils in the area. The Transmittal Report was in error in that part of Lot 35 Conc. was not included in the list of lots to be changed from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area (the Transmittal Report referred to the East half of lots 32, 33, 34 but did not refer to the part of lot 35 south of the Sand and Gravel Resource Area designation).

Recommendation - On Schedule A, change the East 1/2 of Lot 35 Conc. 1, Osgoode from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.

798. Osgoode Conc. B.F. Lots 31-33 - The five land owners who own the majority of the lands in the block strongly support the original recommendation in the draft Official Plan to change the designation to General Rural Area. The Department changed the recommendation based on 6 letters of opposition to the General Rural Area designation (see recommendation #181). The credibility of two of the letters of objection is questioned because the family generating these letters pursued the identical General Rural Area designation on the identical block of land. They now say that the Agricultural Resource Area designation is the only one suitable to them. (352)

Response - Three of the letters received that objected to the General Rural Area designation raised the point that the uses within the General Rural Area designation would cause conflicts with agricultural operations in the surrounding area. The point was also raised that much of the area in question is currently being used for agriculture. While the area, comprising a total of 132 hectares, does not rate as having high agricultural potential using the LEAR evaluation system, the area is surrounded by active agricultural land uses to the north, east and south. The area has a mixture of forestry and agricultural uses with forestry being the predominant use. Forestry is compatible with agricultural operations. The land use of the lands is summarised below:

LOCATION	FOREST	FARMED
Lot 31	27.5 ha	35.3 ha
Lot 32	42.5 ha	10.2 ha
n 1/2 Lot 33	26.5 ha	0
TOTAL	96.5 ha	45.5 ha

To be consistent with the objectives for Agricultural Resource Areas to protect lands suitable for agriculture from loss to other uses and to ensure that uses that would result in conflicts are not established in productive farming areas, it is recommended that the area continue to be designated as Agricultural Resource Area.

Recommendation - No change to the Agricultural Resource Area designation.

799. Cumberland, Conc. 8 Lot 1 - Staff noted this area had been designated General Rural Area in the Regional Official Plan (1988) by Amendment 40 (approved by the Minister May 11, 1995).

Response - To be consistent with the approved Amendment 40, the designation should be changed on Schedule A from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.

Recommendation - Change Schedule A by including the area approved by Amendment 40 in Lot 1, Conc. 8, Cumberland, in the “General Rural Area” designation.

Comments on Section 8: Mineral Aggregate Resources

800. Section 8.1, Objectives - Springthorpe suggested inclusion of a specific objective with respect to protection of water.

Response - Agree.

Recommendation - Change Section 8.1 by adding a fifth objective:

“5. To protect ground and surface water from negative impacts from aggregate extraction activities.”

Changes to Schedule A

801. Osgoode, Conc. 3, part Lot 25 -(See recommendation #737) - This site requires a close examination to determine the boundary of the resource, as requested by the owner.

Response - Our geologist will advise as soon as possible.

Recommendation - No change to draft Official Plan until more information is available.

802. West Carleton (Huntley), Conc. 5, Lots 11 and 12 - (See item #508 in Transmittal Report.) Following another meeting and conversations with the owners and their representative, the owners have advised that they wish a Limestone Resource designation for the west half of Lot 11 and all of Lot 12. (95)

Response - This is a change from the earlier request for a Sand and Gravel designation. Our geologist has reviewed the studies done for the wayside pit (which do not cover the entire property). He advises that the data presented on quality and depth of material for the tested portion of the site indicates that the property would be designated as a Class 3, or possibly, a Class 4 deposit. Class 4 deposits are not recommended for protection. Class 3 deposits generally have been recommended for protection only where part or all of the deposit is already licensed or where the deposit occurs in combination with another aggregate resource (limestone or higher quality sand and gravel).

Our geologist advises that those parts of the lots not already proposed for a Limestone Resource designation were not mapped due to the depth of overburden. The landowner has demonstrated that the 1 to 2.5 m of material that does overlie the bedrock surface can be removed and used for select sub-grade or fill. The bedrock on the site is both the Bobcaygeon and Gull River formations.

This part of Lots 11 and 12 was designated Rural Resource in the draft Official Plan and changed to General Rural Area on Schedule A and Environmental Features overlay on Schedule K in the Transmittal Report. It is part of Candidate Natural Area 412, which was evaluated to have moderate significance. In making decisions in areas which had both natural environment and mineral aggregate values, staff gave preference to the natural environment values in cases where a Candidate Natural Area of moderate significance overlapped with a Bobcaygeon or Gull River

formation. Where the overlap was with a Sand and Gravel Resource (or March or Oxford formations or where the aggregate resource was already designated or licensed), the aggregate was given preference.

If the landowners wish to operate a pit in future, both the Limestone Resource and the General Rural Area designations permit pits. If however, they wish to operate a quarry, they require a Limestone Resource designation rather than General Rural. If the choice of an appropriate designation for the site is to be based on its natural significance, a closer look at the property is warranted. If field investigation does not identify a significant feature or function on the site, staff would be prepared to recommend a Limestone Resource designation. Any application for a quarry (or pit) license on this property would still be required by the regulations under the *Aggregate Resources Act* to submit studies which assess the impact on natural features and ecological functions. These studies would satisfy the EIS requirements for properties on Schedule K.

The other issue with regard to a Limestone Resource designation for this property is that of land use compatibility and notice to neighbours, since extension of the Limestone Resource designation to cover the entire property was not raised as an issue in either the draft Official Plan or the Transmittal Report and first addendum. There are lots along the south side of McGee Side Road across from the west half of Lot 11. To maintain a 300 m separation, staff recommend that the Limestone Resource designation be extended only on the north half of the west half of Lot 11 and in Lot 12. Although extension of the Limestone Resource designation is a new issue, there was no reaction to the proposed Limestone Resource designation on the west portions of this property (which reflects a designation in the approved Regional Official Plan).

Recommendation - Subject to further confirmation by fieldwork of the natural features and functions on the property, change the designation in West Carleton (Huntley), Conc. 5, parts of Lots 11 and 12 to extend the Limestone Resource designation to cover the north half of the west half of Lot 11 and all of Lot 12 and remove the corresponding area from the Environmental Features overlay on Schedule K.

803. West Carleton (Huntley), Conc. 7, Lots 16 and 17 - Objects to the proposed Sand and Gravel designation because there is little sand and gravel, and mapping was based on air photos, not fieldwork. (347)

Response - Our geologist has visited the site in response to this submission and advises that the site has been partially excavated. The depth of material which remains is sufficient only for local use.

Recommendation - On Schedule A, remove Sand and Gravel Resource designation in West Carleton (Huntley), Conc. 7, part of Lots 16 and 17 and replace with General Rural Area.

Errors, Omissions and Clarifications in Section 8

804. Recommendation - Change the first words of the third paragraph of Section 8.0 from “Existing extraction operations” to “Existing licensed extraction sites...”.

Comments on Section 9: Transportation

805. Section 9.2, policy 1b) - Linda Hoad (FCA) recommended that this policy apply to newly rebuilt roads as well as new roads, as proposed in the revised wording of recommendation #532.

Response - Staff agree that this proposed change would clarify the meaning of the policy.

Recommendation - Replace policy 1b) of Section 9.2 as amended by recommendation #532 to read: “on both sides of all other new or rebuilt roads serving transit routes as required by policies for Urban Communities in Section 3.2”

806. Section 9.9, Table 10 - Peter Vice, on behalf of two property owners on Montreal Road, requested deletion of the unequal widening provision for right-of-way protection for the portion of Montreal Road between Church Street and St. Laurent.

Response - Staff agree with the suggestion. The 26m right-of-way will not be subject to the “unequal widening” policy.

Recommendation - Change Table 10 of Section 9.9 by deleting the first line referring to the widening of Montreal Road between Church and St. Laurent; and remove the unequal widening from Schedule C2 for this portion of Montreal Road.

Comments on Section 10: Environmental Services

807. Section 10.1.4, Policy 3- Mr. Leonard Lee raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposed flow removal policy on his property. Staff believe that his concerns have been addressed through the changes proposed in recommendation #628. Committee requested a clarification of what the policy means and how it would be implemented.

Response - The proposed new flow removal policy was developed in recognition that the flows that dominate the design and operation of the wastewater system are due to wet weather. Several alternatives are proposed in the Wastewater Master Plan to address this issue over the planning period. These include three flow diversions from the core system and a system-wide flow management program. The draft Official Plan identifies these diversions as a First Priority project (Table 6 of Section 2).

Recognising that time is required to design and construct the three diversions and to develop a system-wide flow management program, the proposed flow removal policy in the draft OP was developed to bridge that timing gap.

The policy consists of carrying out an interim flow removal program, in co-ordination with the appropriate area municipality, until the longer term solutions could be implemented.

The program would identify where capacity constraints exist and what types of flow removal measures, e.g. disconnecting foundation drains and connected paved surfaces and extension of

storm sewers in combined areas to facilitate disconnection of catch basins from the sanitary sewers.

The overall concept would be to remove flows in problem sewer catchments, thus providing “flow credits” in those areas where development may occur. Development could then proceed and credits updated as required.

The proposed policy puts the onus for implementing flow removal solutions on both the regional and local municipalities. Individuals developing a site would be expected to come in to the Region for pre-development consultation in order to identify site-specific opportunities that may exist to minimise flows into the wastewater system through the regular development process.

This program would have to be implemented as soon as possible in order for work to be completed this season and for credits to be established.

Council also requested that staff report back on the requirements for flow removal for the Leon’s development in the vicinity of Mr. Lee’s property. No flow removal condition was applied to this property as there was no Council approved policy or a draft policy in place. A flow removal condition had been applied previously to a number of large scale developments because of their potential impact to the sanitary sewer system.

Recommendation - No further change

808. Section 10.3.7, Table 13. Mr. Bisson requested clarification on the capacity of the pipe to service Notre Dame des Champs, stating there is a lack of capacity in the pipe to service this Village.

Response - The capacity of the pipe to service Notre Dame-des-Champs has been sized to address the health-related issues for the Village plus some additional capacity for infilling within the Village. The 1988 Official Plan provides for 145 dwelling unit capacity for this Village. This has been increased to 165 in Table 13 of the new draft Official Plan (Table 13), and a new policy added to allow for more flexibility in interpreting Tables 13 and 14 in Section 10. (See recommendation #645).

Recommendation - No further change

Comments on Schedule H

809. Notre Dame-des-Champs - Mr. Bisson questioned why Schedule H shows a piped service to Notre Dame-des-Champs as it is urban servicing.

Response - Notre Dame-des-Champs is considered a Village in the 1988 Regional Official Plan and the Township of Cumberland Official Plan. This has been continued in the draft Regional Official Plan. The piped extension shown on Schedule H is appropriate as it is intended to show piped system extensions to the rural area as well as village-wide servicing.

Recommendation - No change

Errors, Omissions, and Clarifications on Section 10

810. Section 10.3.3 and 10.3.6 - Recommendation #638 in the transmittal report proposes to remove the term “demonstration projects” from the draft Plan. This also impacts Section 10.3.3, Policy 2 which describes requirements for designating servicing on Schedule H and includes a reference to demonstration projects. Schedule H was intended to capture major servicing requirements such as system extensions and Village-wide servicing related to servicing for health related issues or village wide servicing.

Recommendation - Change Section 10.3.3, policy 2 by deleting the words: “provided for a Demonstration Project, as..”

811. Section 10.3.6 - It is important to monitor the performance and cost of public communal services and this should be reflected in the Monitoring Program, as proposed by recommendation #19.

Recommendation - Add the following to the Monitoring Program annexed to the Plan, in the category of “Environmental Services: “cost and performance of public communal services for subdivisions”.

Comments on Section 11: Development Constraints

812. Section 11.2, Flood Plains - M. Bisson raised concerns about the flood plain shown on his property on Schedule G.

Response - Staff agreed to correspond with the South Nation River Conservation Authority on this matter, in particular to ascertain if a two zone concept for flood plain management would apply here.

Recommendation - No change pending response from Conservation Authority.

813. Section 11.4, Policy 2 -. The standard that will be accepted for a Phase 1 ESA should be defined. The standard used by the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario is the CSA document Z768-94. (337).

Response - Staff met with representatives from Golder Associates Limited to discuss concerns about how the Phase 1 ESA would be conducted. Staff agree that the reference to CSA document Z68-94 should be in the policy to clarify how the study should be conducted.

Recommendation - Change Section 11.4 policy 2 by deleting the last sentence in policy 2 and replacing it with “The Phase 1 ESA shall be undertaken using the requirements, methodology and practices described in the CSA document Z68-94.”

814. Section 11.4, policy 5 - A Record of Site Condition (RSC), as contained in the MOEE Guidelines for Use at Contaminated Sites (1996) should be required to document the final condition of the site. The RSC:

- makes MOEE aware of sites where site restoration has taken place
- indicates that the proponent has confirmed that the level of restoration is suitable for the intended use of the site
- establishes that the property owner(s) and consultant(s) have indicated that restoration has been completed in accordance with the information provided in the Phase 3 ESA
- MOEE will review the information provided in the RSC and acknowledge receipt of the document.

RSCs submitted to MOEE are subject to audit on a random basis.

Response - Staff met with representatives from Golder Associates Limited to discuss concerns about the policy. Staff agree that submission of a Record of Site Condition to MOEE should be required to document that the rehabilitation has been completed.

Recommendation - Add to the end of policy 5, Section 11.4: “The completion of a Record of Site Condition (RSC) as provided for in the MOEE *Guidelines for Use at Contaminated Sites in Ontario (June 1996)* and submission of the RSC to MOEE shall be required to establish that the site has been restored and made suitable for the proposed use.”

815. Section 11.6, Definition of Leq - Explain what Leq means. (350)

Response - Agree.

Recommendation - Add the following definition to the Glossary: “Leq: An indicator of noise which averages many measurements of a particular sound taken at different times over an extended period of time. This is called the Equivalent Sound Pressure Level (Leq).”

INDEX OF SUBMISSIONS
(RECEIVED SUBSEQUENT TO 13 MAY 1997)

<u>SUBMISSION NO.</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>CATEGORY</u>
347	Melville & Bryan Craig	Rural Landowner
348	Mrs. M. Sinha	Rural Landowner
349	Cedarhill Community Association	Community Association
350	Lois K. Smith	Individual
351	J.A. Hay & Associates	Consultant
352	Kent Currie	Rural Landowner
353	Earl Morrison	Individual
354	Bridlewood Community Asso.	Community Association
355	Township of West Carleton	Municipalities
356	Mr. R. Sinha	Rural Landowner
357	Fred W. Lohmann	Rural Landowner
358	Dillon Consulting	Consultant
359	Bill Wendt	Rural Landowner
360	Chapman Mills Centre	Developer
361	Vice & Hunter	Urban Landowner
362	Scanlon Associates	Consultant
363	Aird & Berlis	Business Owner
364	Robert Rosewood	Individual
365	Minto Developments Inc.	Developer

ANNEX C: SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CHANGES TO SCHEDULES

MUNICIPALITY	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE
Additional Changes to Schedule A		
Region-wide	Village boundaries	Redraw the Village boundaries in a way which is less precise
Cumberland	Lot 1, Conc.8	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area (ROPA40)
Goulbourn	Lot 25 Conc. 10	Change from General Rural Area to Urban Area (add existing house)
Osgoode	e.1/2 Lot 35, Conc. 1	Change from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource
West Carleton	part Lots 16,17, Con.7 Huntley	Change from Sand and Gravel Resource to General Rural Area
Additional Changes to Schedule B		
Goulbourn	N 1/2 Lot 25 Conc. 10	Add 20 ha of land south of the CPR right-of-way and east of the present day urban boundary to the General Urban Area
Gloucester	Ogilvie Road	Change small area North of the Cyrville Primary Employment Centre and south of Ogilvie Road from Business Park to General Urban Area
Nepean	Nortel Facility	Move the southern boundary of the Nortel Greenbelt Employment Area west of Moodie Drive to approximately midway between the eastern entrances to Moodie Drive from the school and the Nortel Facility on Corkstown Road
Ottawa	Major Community Facilities	Designate the following Major Community Facilities: Cité Collégiale, Museum of Science and Technology, Museum of Nature, Aviation Museum
Ottawa	Queensview Drive	Designate the area immediately north and south of Queensview Drive as Business Park
Rockcliffe Park	MacKay Lake	Revise the Natural Environment Area 'A' boundary to reflect public land ownership and the surface of MacKay Lake and the pond area
Additional Changes to Schedule C2		
Ottawa	Montreal Road	Remove unequal widening between Church and St. Laurent
Additional Changes to Schedule I		
Rockcliffe Park	MacKay Lake	Revise the Urban Open Space Area boundary to reflect public land ownership and the surface of MacKay Lake and the pond area
Ottawa	Frank Ryan Park & Elmhurst Park	Designate Frank Ryan Park & Elmhurst Park located north of the Queensway and west of Pincrest Creek Corridor as Urban Open Space

ANNEX C: SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CHANGES TO SCHEDULES

MUNICIPALITY	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE
Additional Changes to Schedule K		
Goulbourn	E 1/2 Lot 22 Conc. 2	Delete from Environmental Features overlay
Goulbourn	Lot 21 Conc. 2	Shift Environmental Features overlay approximately 150m south
Goulbourn	Lots 9 & 10 Conc. 2	Revise Environmental Features overlay to exclude pasture areas
Kanata	Lot 26 Conc. 7 & 8	Delete from Environmental Features overlay
West Carleton	Lots 1, 2, & 3 Conc. 6 (Huntley)	Delete from Environmental Features overlay
West Carleton	Lots 16 & 17 Conc. 6 (Huntley)	Revise Environmental Features overlay to exclude cleared and developed areas along Concession Road