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

Our File/N/Réf. 11-96-0212
Your File/V/Réf.

DATE 20 December 1996

TO/DEST. Co-ordinator
Planning and Environment Committee

FROM/EXP. Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner

SUBJECT/OBJET **PROVINCIAL AIRPORT POLICY REVIEW**
POLICY OPTIONS

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council forward the following report to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing as Council's position on the Provincial Airport Policy Review.

BACKGROUND

Ontario's airports, and the services they provide, are critical to the well being of the Ontario economy. The Ottawa-Macdonald-Cartier International Airport (OMCIA) for example, is an important economic generator in the National Capital Region, as is the case in most Ontario communities which have an airport. OMCIA employs nearly 2,900 persons (December, 1995). The airport itself generates about $121 million in salaries/wages. The direct economic output is estimated to be over $240 million a year to the local economy. When indirect and induced impacts are considered, the total annual economic output is over $700 million and represents nearly 6,500 jobs in the regional economy (source: Transport Canada).

Ottawa airport now ranks 8th in Canada in passenger and cargo movements with 2.4 million passengers, and handles 118,000 international visitors a year.

Currently, some five airports in Ontario are being transferred from the federal government to local airport authorities. Ottawa airport is scheduled to be assumed by the local airport authority on 1 February 97.

Residential development near these airports has sometimes resulted in restrictions being placed on their operations. This, in turn has had direct economic impacts for airports as well as the communities they serve.

Transport Canada has recently released "**Land Use in the Vicinity of Airports, 7th Edition**", as amended on May 1, 1996, which clarifies that new residential development should not take place above the 30 NEF/NEP contour. This is set out on maps by Transport Canada, which are revised from time-to-time.

Given these recent changes, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing recently announced his intent to examine provincial land use policy options to protect the long-term economic viability of Ontario's major airports. The intent of reviewing the policy is to promote compatibility between land uses in areas surrounding airports for the overall economic benefit of the affected local municipalities and the province. The review of Land Use Planning policy around airports is focusing on all airports (24) in Ontario which have Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) or Noise Exposure Projections (NEP) mapping in place. In the Ottawa-Carleton region this includes the Carp airport and the Ottawa-Macdonald Cartier International airport.
The Minister has requested input on whether to recommend changes to the Provincial Policy Statement under Section 3 of the *Planning Act.* The Ministry has undertaken a 30-day consultation process, which included an open house held on 3 December 96 at the RMOC headquarters where provincial staff received input from various interested parties and requested that stakeholders provide written comments on a series of policy options (Annex A refers). It is important to note that the Minister hopes to move quickly on this important matter.

The review deals with provincial policy on land use planning around airports and not airport operations or changes to the airport itself.

DISCUSSION

The Province has identified five possible policy options for addressing the issue of protecting airport operations. The details of these options are included as part of Annex A.
The proposed possible options are:

Option A: Status Quo

Making no change to the existing provincial position, as set out in section 1.1.3 g of the *Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)*. The policy now calls for municipalities **to plan in a way that achieves compatibility** between sensitive land uses (for example, residential) and major facilities, such as airports, through appropriate design, buffering and/or separation from each other to prevent adverse effects from noise and other contaminants.

Option B: Revising the Provincial Policy Statement

Revising policy under section 1.1.3g of the PPS to strengthen the existing policy **to restrict new sensitive land uses** (including residential development and redevelopment) on lands above 30 NEF/NEP contour (as set out on Transport Canada noise contour maps) near the five major airports, which would include Ottawa International Airport.

This does not include already approved land uses. The definition of approved land uses for the purposes of this policy would mean approved draft plans of subdivision, zoning by-laws, consents, minor variances and site plan approvals, as they existed at the time of approval of this provincial policy.

Option C: Establish a stricter control over new incompatible development near airports

This suite of options could involve a variety of approaches. Three approaches are listed as separate options as follows:

Option C1 : Prohibition on noise sensitive land uses in a specific protection area

Adding a new section 1.1.3 h to the PPS for those five major airports with airport authorities that would prohibit incompatible land uses (including residential development and redevelopment) on lands within an airport development zone, as set out in local and regional official plans. These airport protection zones would encompass lands above the 30 NEF/NEP but be delineated along existing roads, existing property lines or other discernible boundaries but will not include already approved land uses.

Option C2: Develop a new Provincial Plan

Developing a new Provincial Plan, under the *Ontario Planning and Development Act*, with associated provincial zoning controls, to prohibit new development within a specified planning area in the vicinity of an airport (encompassing lands above the 30 NEF/NEP). This would not include approved land uses. This option would apply only to those five major airports with airport authorities.

Option C3: Adopt new or revised legislation

Adopting new legislation or revising existing legislation, such as the *Planning Act*, to establish controls over new development in the vicinity of airports above 30 NEF/NEP. This could include adapting, for example, approaches used in Alberta or other jurisdictions for protecting airport operations from encroachment of incompatible land uses for economic purposes. This would not include approved land uses. This option would apply only to those five major airports with airport authorities.

<u>The case for change</u>

It is noted that the Province has proposed that: "***A review of Land Use Planning policy around airports will be conducted focusing on all airports in Ontario which have Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) or Noise Exposure Prediction (NEP) mapping in place***". From the material provided by the Province it would seem that the proposed policy changes are only being considered for the <u>five</u> major airports with airport authorities. If this is a provincial policy which purports to ensure compatible land use development in the vicinity of Ontario's airports then any policy change should apply to all 24 airports (those that have either NEF/NEP mapping in place) regardless of the presence or absence of an airport authority. For example, in the Ottawa-Carleton region this should include the Carp airport.

Status Quo- Option A

Provincial land use polices established in 1969 to protect lands near airports were revised in 1978 through the adoption of a policy based on the federal NEF (Noise Exposure Forecast) system. The "***Land Use Policy Near Airports, Ministry of Housing, March, 1978"*** document was based

on Transport Canada's "**Land Use in the Vicinity of Airports",** but this was not a Provincial Policy issued under the *Planning Act.* The current Regional Official Plan (1988) aircraft noise policy is based on the Provincial policies as expressed in the Ministry of Housing's 1978 document.

When the Comprehensive Set of Policy Statements (CSPS) were issued under Section 3 of the *Planning Act* in 1995, aircraft noise was only considered in its broadest sense as part of Policy B17 dealing with land use compatibility. In fact a guideline was released which replaced the previous "***Land Use Policy Near Airports, March 1978".*** This guideline identified that a NEF/NEP Land Use Compatibility Table (referred to as Schedule A in the guideline) be employed to review the computability of all new development proposals in the vicinity of airports in relation to aircraft noise. The applicable NEF/NEP value was to be determined from contour maps prepared by Transport Canada and the more restrictive NEF/NEP values were to apply. The NEF/NEP values started at 28 up to 40. The document identified the 28 to 35 noise exposure contour as a discretionary range leaving the ultimate decision about whether residential development is acceptable to the municipality. The guideline also mentioned the use of a detailed noise study for proposed developments at or above NEF/NEP 28. The guideline was to be used as part of and consistent with the implementation of the CSPS. When the CSPS were replaced with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) the reference to these noise provisions disappeared as implementation guidelines- even though advisory-associated with the "have regard to policy" on noise were not released. Thus there is little provincial policy to provide for consistent planning decisions regarding land use compatibility and airports across the province. Therefore in staff's opinion the "Status Quo" option as provided in the set of options is not acceptable.

In fact, the previous aircraft noise guideline was also difficult to administer in that it provided for the opportunity for a municipality to permit residential development in the 30-35 NEF/NEP zone subject to conditions but did not indicate under what circumstances this would be appropriate. This has led to a situation in the region where no municipality has turned down residential development in these higher aircraft noise zones. In fact the previous policy guideline has been interpreted as meaning that minor interior building modifications to address noise attenuation is all that is required to meet the conditions of the policy. Furthermore, it has been staff's experience that it has been difficult to enforce some conditions associated with residential development in these higher noise levels, for example, requirements for sealed windows and air conditioning. It is staff's opinion that outdoor noise levels should govern what is an appropriate use of the land given possible development alternatives, for example, industrial or other employment uses. This was a weakness in the previous guideline.

The result of this situation was: that residential developments have been permitted to occur in these discretionary zones; purchasers are notified of the possible high levels of aircraft noise; and in most, though not all circumstances, interior noise attenuation is provided in the new residential structures. It has been staff's experience that these efforts are not entirely effective and that complaints are being made to the airport to curtail their flight activity.

Options B and C1 are different ways of strengthening the existing Provincial Policy. They have some merit especially in the context of the "have regard to policy".

It is important that the lands around our airports be afforded a degree of protection from encroachment by non compatible development. In this regard it is suggested that the Province review the approach taken by the Province of Alberta in more detail and develop over the next

few months permanent airport vicinity protection area regulations which go beyond the vagaries of projections of aircraft noise, which would include the protection of other aspects of airport operations including restrictions on development related to aircraft safety (obstacles, electronic facilities and bird hazards) as part of new legislation or enacted under the provisions of the *Planning Act* (**Option C3).**

Since this will take some time, it is suggested for the immediate future, the Province clarify the existing Policy Statement by amending the current Policy Statement along the lines suggested in (**Option B)**. The policy must be clarified so that it would apply to all airports in Ontario and include the concept that the noise contours are the minimum area for protection and that good planning concepts would dictate that for the balance of lands that are split by noise contours that only non-noise sensitive uses would be permitted. This would avoid the situation where one part of a lot is assumed to be appropriate for residential development while the other side is not. This concept is proposed in part in Option C1. The problem with Option C1 is that the Airport Development Zone (ADZ) would be set out in municipal official plan maps. These maps would have to be developed and added through amendments to official plans. This can be a long process and if the maps are not shown in the official plans then presumably the prohibition on land uses within the ADZ cannot be undertaken.

The proposed wording for a revised Option B could be:

OPTION B: Add after PPS Policy 1.1.3g)-

"h) not permitting new sensitive land uses, including residential development and redevelopment, on lands above the 30 NEF/NEP contour, as set out on maps by Transport Canada (revised from time to time) near airports* in Ontario. The principle of land use compatibility would also require that the prohibition on new sensitive land uses above the 30 NEF/NEP contour be extended to coincide with existing property lines, roads and other discernible boundaries. This does not include already approved land uses**.

* ***This includes all airports in Ontario which have Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) or Noise Exposure Projection (NEP) mapping in place: Brantford, Buttonville, Carp, Hamilton, Kingston, London, Maple, Markham, North Bay, Oshawa, Ottawa (Macdonald-Cartier), Pembroke, Pickering, Sarnia, Sault Ste. Marie, Sioux Lookout, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Toronto (Pearson), Toronto Island (City Centre), C.F.B. Trenton, Waterloo-Guelph, Wiarton and Windsor.***

** ***For the purposes of this policy, approved land uses are registered plans of subdivision, zoning by-laws, consents, minor variances and site plan approvals, as they existed at the time of the approval of this policy.***

It should be noted that it is suggested that registered plans of subdivision be "grandparented" and not draft approved plans of subdivision. The intent would be to give municipalities some discretion in implementing the "have regard to policy" for draft approved subdivisions.

CONSULTATION

No formal consultation took place due to the time constraints imposed by the Province. However, the Province invited various stakeholders to participate in the process by attending an open house in Ottawa and by requesting that interested parties send written comments directly to the Airport Policy Review team in Toronto.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct financial implications.

Approved by
N. Tunnacliffe, MCIP, RPP

ANNEX A

WELCOME

TO THE

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

OPEN HOUSE

for

PROVINCIAL AIRPORT POLICY REVIEW

Ottawa
December 3, 1996

MINISTRY OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

OPEN HOUSE

PROVINCIAL AIRPORT POLICY REVIEW

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing staff welcome you. This OPEN HOUSE is being held to provide information on the land use planning policy options for protecting airport operations at the Ottawa International Airport. As this is an information and public consultation session, formal presentations will not be made by Ministry staff.

A number of policy options are being explored. For your information, these options are included in this handout package and are posted around the room.

To assist you in understanding the NEF/NEP contour map, we have also included an explanation of what the terms "NEF" and "NEP" mean.

You will also find a comment sheet included at the back of this handout package. Your response to the options and any other comments you may have are valued. You may leave the completed comment sheet with Ministry staff in attendance or send it by mail or facsimile to the address or facsimile numbers set out below.

Should you wish to provide written submissions on this matter, please forward your submission by **December 19, 1996** to:

Airport Policy Review
Planning Policy Branch
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
11th Floor, 777 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 2E5

(416) 585-6870 or 585-6540

If you have any questions, please call Barbara Konyi, Manager, Planning Policy Branch at (416) 585-7189.

OPTION A - STATUS QUO

KEEP EXISTING PPS POLICY ON COMPATIBLE LAND USES

"It is the policy of the Province of Ontario that:

1.1.3 Long term economic prosperity will be supported by:

g) planning so that major facilities (such as airports, transportation corridors, sewage treatment facilities, waste management systems, industries and aggregate activities) and *sensitive land uses* are appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated from each other to prevent *adverse effects* from odour, noise and other contaminants."

OPTION B - REVISE PPS

STRENGTHEN POLICY TO RESTRICT RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT NEAR AIRPORTS BY REVISING PPS POLICY 1.1.3 g) AS FOLLOWS:

"not permitting new sensitive land uses, including residential development and redevelopment, on lands above the 30 NEF/NEP contour, as set out on maps by Transport Canada (revised from time to time) near airports* in Ontario operated by an Airport Authority."

Approved land uses are not included.**

* *This includes Lester B. Pearson International Airport, Ottawa International Airport, London Airport, Sudbury Airport, Thunder Bay Airport.*

** *Approved land uses means approved draft plans of subdivision, zoning by-laws, consents, minor variances and site plan approvals, as they existed at the time of approval of this policy.*

OPTION C

PROHIBITION ON RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN A SPECIFIC PROTECTION AREA

THIS MAY TAKE A VARIETY OF FORMS, INCLUDING:

C1 ADD AFTER PPS POLICY 1.1.3 g) -

"h) prohibiting incompatible land uses, including residential development and redevelopment, on lands within an *airport development zone* (ADZ), as set out on municipal official plan maps. The ADZ will encompass lands over the 30 NEF/NEP but will follow roads, existing property lines or other discernable boundaries and will not include approved land uses. An ADZ will be established for lands near airports* in Ontario operated by an Airport Authority."**

* *This includes the 5 major airports.*

** *Approved land uses means approved draft plans of subdivision, zoning by-laws, consents, minor variances and site plan approvals, as they existed at the time of approval of this policy.*

OPTION C2

C2 DEVELOP A NEW PROVINCIAL PLAN

Develop a new provincial plan under the *ONTARIO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT*, with associated provincial zoning controls, to prohibit new development within a specified planning area in the vicinity of the airport* (encompassing lands above the 30 NEF/NEP).

Approved land uses are not included.**

* *This includes the 5 major airports.*

** *Approved land uses means approved draft plans of subdivision, zoning by-laws, consents, minor variances and site plan approvals, as they existed at the time of approval of this policy.*

OPTION C3

C3 ADOPT NEW OR REVISED LEGISLATION

Adopt new legislation or revise existing legislation, such as the *PLANNING ACT*, to establish controls over new development in the vicinity of airports* above 30 NEF/NEP.

This could include adapting, for example, approaches used in Alberta or other jurisdictions for protecting airport operations from encroachment of incompatible land uses for economic purposes.

Approved land uses are not included.**

* *This includes the 5 major airports.*

** *Approved land uses means approved draft plans of subdivision, zoning by-laws, consents, minor variances and site plan approvals, as they existed at the time of approval of this policy.*

HOW IS NOISE MEASURED?

Two different methods can be used to assess the effect of airport noise on a community. The first method calculates the total accumulation of noise during a representative day, where results are displayed by a set of contours drawn on a map of the community. The second method assesses the noise created by the flight of a single aircraft. The first method is used to assess long term annoyance due to aircraft noise. The second method provides assessment of noise from a specific aircraft type only.

Noise Exposure Forecast System (NEF)

Transport Canada uses the Noise Exposure Forecast System to produce contour maps. Noise contours are calculated using data such as the noise emitted by various types of aircraft, the number and time of day of flights, flight paths and aircraft operating procedures, and the distance from the aircraft.

Noise contour maps provide a guideline for land use and a general indication of the anticipated level of aircraft noise. Specific conditions on a given day or created by a particular flight can produce a different noise pattern. For example, hot humid weather, wind, aircraft mix and flight path violations can contribute to daily variations from the established contours. It should also be noted that noise is a relative term and specific noise levels do not disturb all people to the same degree.

Three types of noise contours are produced. **The Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF)** contours are based on forecasts five to ten years in the future. The **Noise Exposure Projection (NEP)** contours consider projections up to twenty years. NEF and NEP contour maps are used to encourage compatible land-use planning in the vicinity of airports. They are revised only when changes to the forecast assumptions or operational procedures are considered to be long-lasting. **Planning contours** are produced to investigate the impact of additional runways, changes in the types of aircraft or changes in flight paths.

The 1996 Pearson NEP (prepared in 1984) and the 2000 Pearson NEF (prepared in 1994) are contours currently used by area municipalities for land-use planning.

Maps produced by Transport Canada illustrate contours for five noise levels: 40, 35, 30, 28 and 25 NEF. Industrial and commercial activities are feasible in most of these zones.

.../2

According to Transport Canada's noise guidelines (revised in May 1996), annoyance caused by aircraft noise on residential development may begin as low as NEF 25 and noise exceeding 30 NEF should preclude residential development. Transport Canada guidelines are advisory only, whereas provincial governments have the ultimate authority with respect to land use planning. However, this authority is often delegated to municipalities, who set their own policies regarding noise levels and residential development based on NEF/NEP contours, the provincial policy and the Transport Canada guidelines.

Single Event Measurements

Decibels are the scale most commonly used for measuring loudness levels. The dBA is a weighted scale. Noise levels are normally perceived to double for each increase of 10 dBA. Changes of less than 3 dBA are generally not detectable to the human ear.

Single event measurements include the maximum noise level, the length of time the noise exceeds a certain level, and other statistics related to short time periods. Single event footprints of individual aircraft types may also be displayed by contour maps. To forecast the frequency and magnitude of noise levels for Pearson Airport's new runways, noise levels were measured at 34 locations around the airport during the summer of 1990.

For more information on aircraft noise, consult the following publications:

New Housing and Aircraft Noise (1981)
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
Catalogue Number NH17-6/1981 or library ISBN 0-660-50724-0

Land Use in the Vicinity of Airports (May 1996)
Transport Canada
Catalogue Number TP1247E

Land Use Compatibility Policy B17 (1995)
Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing

Noise Assessment Criteria in Land Use Planning (April 1995)
Publication LU-131
Ministry of Environment and Energy

A NOISE GLOSSARY

Here are some of the terms related to aircraft noise used in the Environmental impact Statement.

NEF/NEP CONTOURS
Noise Exposure Forecasts (NEF) predict noise impacts 5 to 10 years in the future. Noise Exposure Projections (NEP) forecast noise up to 20 years in advance. The 1996 Pearson NEP prepared by Transport Canada in 1984 is the contour currently used by area municipalities for land-use planning.

DECIBELS AND dBA
Decibels are the scale most commonly used for measuring loudness levels. The dBA is a weighted scale. Noise levels are normally perceived to double for each increase of 10 dBA. Changes of less than 3 dBA are normally not detectable by the human ear.

SINGLE EVENT MEASUREMENTS
A method for assessing the noise impact at a selected location of, for example, an individual aircraft in flight. The single event approach is normally based on direct measurements.

PLANNING CONTOURS
Unofficial contours used to examine the impact of new flight procedures, mix of aircraft, runway use or changes to other variables.

MINISTRY OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING
PROVINCIAL AIRPORT POLICY REVIEW

OTTAWA OPEN HOUSE

December 3, 1996

COMMENT SHEET

OPTION A ✈ **STATUS QUO**	**KEEP EXISTING PPS POLICY 1.1.3. g)**	**Agree** . . . . . ☐ **Disagree** . . . . ☐
OPTION B ✈ **REVISE PPS**	**STRENTHEN PPS POLICY 1.1.3 g)**	**Agree** . . . . . ☐ **Disagree** . . . . . ☐
OPTION C ✈ **STRICTER CONTROL**	**PROHIBIT INCOMPATIBLE LAND USE WITHIN AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT ZONE**	**Agree** . . . . . ☐ **Disagree** . . . . ☐
OPTION C2 ✈ **STRICTER CONTROL**	**DEVELOP NEW PROVINCIAL PLAN**	**Agree** . . . . . ☐ **Disagree** . . . . ☐
OPTION C3 ✈ **STRICTER CONTROL**	**ADOPT NEW OR REVISED LEGISLATION**	**Agree** . . . . . ☐ **Disagree** . . . . ☐

✈✈✈ OVER

YOUR OPTION IDEA ✈	**SUGGESTED POLICY OPTION**

ANY OTHER COMMENTS?:

Should you wish to provide written submissions on this matter, please forward your submission by **December 19**, 1996 to:

Airport Policy Review
Planning Policy Branch
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
11th Floor, 777 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 2E5

FAX: (416) 585-6870 or 585-7540

Thank You for Your Input

Land Use Planning Near Airports
- A Backgrounder -

Airports as Economic Engines: Airports are an important part of Ontario's economic infrastructure and generators of jobs and investment in our province. Pearson and the industries it supports generate about $2.8 billion a year in salaries/wages and $5.4 billion a year in direct revenues to local businesses. Pearson directly employs 49,000 persons. As markets become more global, access to market is critical for all Ontario communities to remain competitive. For example, the growth in Canada's high tech sector in Ottawa has been assisted by the "open skies agreement" and the Ottawa Airport providing direct access to major global markets.

Ottawa Airport now ranks 8th in Canada in passenger and cargo movements with 2.4 million passengers, and handles 118,000 international visitors a year. Pearson, Canada's largest airport, had more than 312,000 aircraft take-offs/landings, handling 22.4 million passengers. Pearson serves as a tourism gateway to over 2.5 million international visitors annually. One-third of Canada's air passenger traffic and 40% of the country's air cargo pass through Pearson.

And, the role of airports is expanding. At Pearson, activity has grown dramatically with 7.9 percent more passengers and 10.9 per cent more aircraft movements during 1995 over the previous year. Forty scheduled and charter carriers provide service to 145 destination and 45 countries.

Airports Serve A Local Need: Airports are important not only for industry and commerce, but, also for local residents. For example, 75% of Pearson's passengers have started and ended their trips at Pearson. 46% of the passengers originating or terminating their flights were based in the adjoining metropolitan area. Airports also support many types of businesses, including: cargo carriers and handlers, freight forwarders, general aviation operators, aircraft maintenance, freight catering and car rental companies.

Airport Management is Changing: Transport Canada recently announced that on December 2, 1996, the Greater Toronto Airports Authority (GTAA) is assuming responsibility for the management and operation of Pearson Airport. Ottawa Airport is scheduled to be assumed by the local airport authority on February 1, 1997. The remaining three airports (London, Thunder Bay and Sudbury) are to be scheduled in the future.

Airport Operations Can Be Restricted Due To Airport Noise Concerns: With the demand for airport authorities to accommodate changing schedules and provide better connections between airports, airport operations may need flexibility. For example, Pearson has constructed a new north/south runway and is planning to construct two more east/west runways. A single modern terminal building has been planned to replace Terminal 1 and 2 and allow better groundside and airside access. And, during a time of expanded airport needs, residential development plans are being prepared surrounding the airport. For example, the Meadowvale Secondary Plan area in Mississauga will ultimately accommodate 7,360 housing units or 22,000 persons.

Federal Noise Guideline: On May 1, 1996, Transport Canada issued its revised noise guideline on development near airports. Amendment 3 to the Federal guideline clarifies that new residential development should not be approved above 30 NEF/NEP. Being advisory, the guideline acknowledges that local approval authorities have the power to approve residential proposals in these areas.

Noise Exposure Forecasts are a Useful Land Use Planning Tool: Noise exposure forecasts, called "NEF", are an indicator of people's discomfort with aircraft noise. They are produced by Transport Canada based on aircraft movements over a five to ten year period into the future. For longer range planning purposes, Transport Canada also produces "NEP", noise exposure projections, for aircraft movements up to 20 years. NEP is based on projected aircraft types and runway configurations that may materialize within 20 years. The NEF/NEP contours have been used by municipalities in planning community growth and development since 1978. Based on the policies undertaken since 1978, some municipalities retain a more restrictive standard of 28 NEF/NEP for development around airports as their current official plans policies.

Current Provincial Policy Around Airports: The existing provincial position, as set out in Section 1.1.3 g of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), calls for municipalities to plan in a way that achieves compatibility between sensitive land uses (e.g. residential) and major facilities, such as airports, through appropriate design, buffering and/or separation from each other to prevent adverse effects from noise and other contaminants.

The effectiveness of the policy is now being reviewed by MMAH in light of the province's interests in protecting the on-going economic viability of major airports to their local communities and the province.